

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Acer Incorporated v. Alex Harrison
Case No. D2026-2485

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Acer Incorporated, Taiwan Province of China, represented by COHAUSZ & FLORACK Patent- und Rechtsanwälte Partnerschaftsgesellschaft mbB, Germany.

The Respondent is Alex Harrison, Ireland.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <buypackardbell.com> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 9, 2026. On June 9, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 9, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy Purposes, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 13, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint June 16, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “UDRP”), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 18, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 8, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 17, 2026.

The Center appointed Federica Togo as the sole panelist in this matter on July 24, 2026. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant provides a wide range of computer-related products and accessories to customers worldwide under the trademark PACKARD BELL.

The Complainant is the registered owner of several trademarks for PACKARD BELL, e.g. European Union Trademark registration No. EUTM 002785608 PACKARD BELL, registered on October 16, 2003, for goods and services in classes 9, 16 and 42.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 2, 2025. Furthermore, the undisputed evidence provided by the Complainant proves that the disputed domain name resolved to a website displaying the Complainant's trademark and a similar logo, offering monitors and identifying itself as "buypackardbell.com is a participant in the Amazon Services LLC Associates Program. This affiliate advertising program allows sites to earn fees by linking to Amazon.com. If you buy something through these links, I may earn a small commission at no extra cost to you – it simply helps support the site". In addition, the Complainant's undisputed allegations are that when clicking the "check price" buttons displayed below the individual products, the user is redirected to Amazon offers of the Complainant's competing products.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark since it is a mere variant of the trademark preceded by the term "buy" which may be considered as being a reference to a special store offering PACKARD BELL products of the Complainant.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant, the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has never been licensed or authorized to use the Complainant's mark PACKARD BELL, or register or use the disputed domain name. Further, there is no evidence indicating that the Respondent is commonly known by the mark PACKARD BELL. The disputed domain name is being used to host product offers containing links to the Amazon sales platform for those products, which is also explicitly explained on the bottom of the page as follows: "AFFILIATE DISCLOSURE buypackardbell.com is a participant in the Amazon Services LLC Associates Program. This affiliate advertising program allows sites to earn fees by linking to Amazon.com. If you buy something through these links, I may earn a small commission at no extra cost to you – it simply helps support the site". Such use demonstrates a clear intent to trade off the goodwill associated with the Complainant's mark. By directing Internet traffic to competing or related services, the Respondent creates a likelihood of confusion and diverts users for commercial gain, which undermines the Complainant's rights. This behavior does not reflect a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use, as required. When clicking on the "check price" buttons below the different products, one is redirected to Amazon offers which neither belong to the Complainant nor refer to genuine PACKARD BELL products offered by the Complainant.

Furthermore, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. According to the Complainant, given the substantial worldwide recognition which the Complainant's mark enjoys, the Respondent very likely knew of the Complainant and its trademark rights

when he registered the disputed domain name. It is implausible to think that the Respondent did not know of the Complainant and its exclusive trademark rights and registered the disputed domain name for any reason other than to opportunistically exploit those rights by attempting to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant for a profit.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to "decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable". Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires a complainant to prove each of the following three elements in order to obtain an order that the disputed domain name be transferred or cancelled:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel will therefore proceed to analyze whether the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are satisfied.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here "buy" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving that a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the difficult task of "proving a negative", requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or

legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Moreover, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name contains the Complainant's registered trademark and the term "buy" and redirects users to Amazon offers of the Complainant's competing products. The nature of this disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation: in fact, terms with an "inherent Internet connotation" (e.g., <e-trademark.com>, <buy-trademark.com>, or <trademark.online>) are seen as tending to suggest sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner, see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) at section 2.5.1. Moreover, the use of the disputed domain name that reproduces the Complainant's mark to redirect users to Amazon offers of the Complainant's competing products cannot be considered a bona fide offering of goods and services.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name resolves to website displaying the Complainant's mark and logo and redirecting to Amazon offers of competing products. For the Panel, it is therefore evident that the Respondent positively knew the Complainant's mark when registering the disputed domain name. Consequently, and in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, the Panel is convinced that the Respondent knew that the disputed domain name included the Complainant's trademark when it registered the disputed domain name and aimed to target it for commercial gain.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1. On this regard, the further circumstances surrounding the disputed domain name's registration and use, taken together, confirm the findings that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith:

- (1) the nature of the disputed domain name, incorporating the Complainant's mark plus the addition of the term with an "inherent Internet connotation", i.e. "buy";
- (2) the content of the website to which the disputed domain name resolves (i.e. website displaying the Complainant's mark and similar logo and redirecting to Amazon offers of competing products);
- (3) the absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with no response for the Respondent's choice of the disputed domain name; and
- (4) the Respondent concealing its identity through a privacy service.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <buypackardbell.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Federica Togo/

Federica Togo

Sole Panelist

Date: August 7, 2026