

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Arc-Led Limited v. Yasir Karikkayil

Case No. D2026-2519

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Arc-Led Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Ashfords LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Yasir Karikkayil, United Arab Emirates.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <arcleruk.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 10, 2026. On June 11, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 12, 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 (Registration Private Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 15, 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 amendment to the Complaint on the same date.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 16, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 6, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 7, 2026.

The Center appointed John Swinson as the sole panelist in this matter on July 9, 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 is a United Kingdom business that sells lighting, in particular various LED lighting goods with a particular emphasis on strip lighting. The Complainant was incorporated on November 27, 2020, and soon after commenced use of the ARC-LED brand name.

The Complainant owns United Kingdom trademark registrations for ARCLD, in both word and logo format. The earliest was filed on September 29, 2023, being Registration No. UK00003962429 for ///ARCLD in device format which has a registration date of March 29, 2024. The Complainant also owns Registration No. UK00004074658 for a series mark that includes ARCLD.

The Complainant uses the domain name <arc-led.co.uk>.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 16, 2023.

The Respondent did not file a response, so little information is known about the Respondent.

The website at the disputed domain name is a website selling lighting. It has the heading “ARC LED UK Lighting Solutions for Indoor & Outdoor”. The title of the website is “Trusted Provider of Lighting Solutions | ARC LED UK”. The meta-tag description for the website is “Trusted provider of innovative and reliable LED lighting solutions for residential, commercial, and industrial applications.” The About section of the website states: “Arc LED UK is a leading manufacturer of high-quality lighting products, specializing in Neon flex, Strip Lights, Down lights, Spot lights, and Flood lights.” The website gives an address of a residential flat in London.

The Complainant’s solicitors wrote a cease and desist letter to the Respondent on April 10, 2026. No response was received.

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.

In summary, the Complainant makes the following submissions.

The Complainant trades in the United Kingdom with a turnover of more than GBP three million and has spent significant sums on marketing. The Complainant has unregistered trademark rights for ARC-LED mark since its incorporation in 2020. In addition, the Complainant provided evidence showing that the Complainant used ARC-LED mark and sold LED lighting on its website “arc-led.co.uk” as early as August 21, 2018.

The goods advertised by the Respondent on the website at the disputed domain name are similar to the goods sold by the Complainant. The Respondent’s only interest in the disputed domain name is to trade off the reputation of the Complainant. This is not legitimate or bona fide use of the disputed domain name.

The website at the disputed domain name competes directly with Complainant’s trademarked goods. This is frequently seen as evidence of use in bad faith.

The Complainant relies upon the following statement from a prior decision under the Policy:

“use of the disputed domain name will divert potential customers from the Complainant’s business to the website under the disputed domain name by attracting Internet users who mistakenly believe that the disputed domain name is affiliated to the Complainant, and which may further mistakenly believe that the services offered on this website are offered by the Complainant, or by an entity affiliated to the Complainant”. *Barclays Bank PLC v. PrivacyProtect.org / Sylvia Paras*, WIPO Case No. [D2011-2011](#).

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements enumerated in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied, namely:

- (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 onus of proving these elements is on the Complainant.

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 term (here, “UK”) 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.

The Complainant provided detailed evidence of its use and reputation in ARCLED from 2020, which is before the disputed domain name was registered. The Respondent is using the disputed domain name to promote products that compete directly with the Complainant's business. The website at the disputed domain name provides product information regarding unbranded lighting products but does not allow the direct purchase of those products from the website. Some of the links on the Respondent's website, such as the LinkedIn and Facebook links, are not operational. There is no privacy policy. There are no details regarding the Respondent or any other legal person on the website at the disputed domain name. In the circumstances, the Panel concludes that the Respondent's website at the disputed domain name is not sufficient on its own to demonstrate "a bona fide offering of goods or services" for the purposes of the second element of the Policy.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Generally speaking, a finding that a domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith requires an inference to be drawn that the respondent in question has registered and is using the disputed domain name to take advantage of its significance as a trademark owned by (usually) the complainant.

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.

In the present case, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name after the Complainant had established a reputation in ARCLED in the United Kingdom. The disputed domain name refers to the geographic location of the Complainant, and the website at the disputed domain name is directed to the same consumers (in respect of both subject matter and location) that would be interested in the Complainant and its products. The disputed domain name is also confusingly similar to the Complainant's domain name.

The Respondent has not come forward with any explanation as to why the disputed domain name was selected by the Respondent or the purpose of the website at the disputed domain name.

In the circumstances, the Panel concludes that by using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's ARCLED mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website or location or of a product or service on the respondent's website or location. This is evidence of the Respondent's bad faith under the Policy.

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 <arcl eduk.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/John Swinson/

John Swinson

Sole Panelist

Date: July 23, 2026