

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Phoenix Contact GmbH & Co. KG v. he jxing
Case No. D2026-2521

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Phoenix Contact GmbH & Co. KG, Germany, represented by Taylor Wessing Partnerschaftsgesellschaft mbB, Germany.

The Respondent is he jxing, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <phoenixcontactus.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (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 (Unknown) 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 June 15, 2026.

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 Reyes Campello Estebaranz as the sole panelist in this matter on July 15, 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

Founded in 1923, the Complainant operates in the electrical engineering, electronics, and automation sectors, providing components, systems, and solutions in these fields. Headquartered in Germany, the Complainant employs approximately 21,000 people worldwide, and its products and services are available in more than 100 countries through an extensive network of subsidiaries and distribution partners. In 2024, the Complainant achieved total annual sales of EUR three billion, establishing itself as a market leader in electrical engineering.

The Complainant owns multiple trademark registrations for PHOENIX CONTACT throughout the world, including International Registration No. 1125907, PHOENIX CONTACT (word), registered on October 28, 2011, in classes 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 16, 17, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, and 42, designating, among others, the European Union, the United States of America ("United States"), China, the United Kingdom, Australia, Singapore, Switzerland, the Republic of Korea, and Japan.

In addition, the Complainant owns various domain names incorporating its PHOENIX CONTACT mark, including the domain name <phoenixcontact.com> (registered on February 20, 1996), which resolves to its main corporate website, and the domain name <phoenix-contact.com> (registered on May 5, 2000), which redirects to the same corporate website.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 22, 2026, and it resolves to an English-language website that purportedly commercializes electrical engineering products, solutions, and services for various industries. The website displays the sign "PHOENIX CONTACT" in its header alongside a graphic depiction of a bird with spread wings. The site does not display pricing for the advertised products and services, instead directing users to fill out an online form to request specific quotes. The "About Us" section of the website refers to the company's long-standing tradition and German origins, featuring statements such as: "Two decades of engineering reliable connectivity solutions for industrial applications — from a single workshop to a global manufacturing network", and "Founded in 2003 in Düsseldorf, Phoenix Contact began as a specialized manufacturer of DIN rail terminal blocks. Today, with 4 manufacturing facilities and over 680 employees, we deliver certified connectivity solutions to customers across 58 countries — while maintaining the engineering precision and personal service that defined our first day". The website contains no information regarding its actual operator or the registrant of the disputed domain name, referring throughout exclusively to "Phoenix Contact." The "Contact Us" section provides an inquiry form, a physical address in Germany, a German telephone number, and two email addresses associated with the domain name <phoenix-contact.com>. Furthermore, this section lists company names, addresses, and phone numbers for "Regional Offices" in North America (Charlotte, United States), Asia-Pacific (Singapore), and the Middle East (Dubai, United Arab Emirates). The website contains no disclaimer or disclosure regarding the lack of affiliation with the Complainant or its trademark. Finally, the copyright notice at the footer of the website reads: "© 2026 Phoenix Contact. All rights reserved."

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 PHOENIX CONTACT mark has been used in connection with electrical products, solutions, and components since 1982 (initially in Germany) and currently enjoys widespread worldwide renown and a high degree of market recognition within the electrical engineering field. The Complainant further contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its PHOENIX CONTACT mark, as it fully incorporates the mark with the mere addition of the geographical abbreviation “us”, which fails to prevent the risk of confusion and false affiliation. The disputed domain name is virtually identical to the Complainant’s trademark, as well as to its primary domain name <phoenixcontact.com>.

Furthermore, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not authorized to use the PHOENIX CONTACT mark, is not an official intermediary or distributor of the Complainant, and there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. A reseller may only use a third party’s trademark in a domain name if the cumulative criteria established in *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#) are satisfied, which is not the case here. The Respondent’s website fails to accurately disclose its lack of relationship with the Complainant and misleads the public into believing it is an official store. Additionally, the Oki Data doctrine generally requires clarifying descriptive terms (e.g., “parts”) within the domain name to dispel any implied affiliation; however, a simple geographical term or suffix such as “us” or “-ru” does not clarify a reseller relationship but, on the contrary, strongly implies official authorization or endorsement. In support, the Complainant cites *Phoenix Contact GmbH & Co. KG v. Igor Kolesnikov*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-1035](#) (concerning <phoenixcontact-ru.com>), which affirmed that affixing a country indicator to a well-known mark creates the false impression of an official regional homepage and impersonates the trademark owner.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name to intentionally attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark. Given the global reputation of the PHOENIX CONTACT mark, its full incorporation into the disputed domain name, and the Respondent’s website promoting products in the exact same commercial sector, the Respondent knew or should have known of the Complainant’s mark and targeted it in bad faith. The Respondent’s website impersonates the Complainant, features a misleading copyright notice, and fails to clarify the absence of an association between the parties. Furthermore, the Respondent actively attempted to conceal its identity behind a privacy/proxy service without any legitimate justification. The Complainant stresses that even if the Respondent purports to offer genuine products (albeit to the Complainant’s knowledge, these are fake offers), bad faith is established where a confusingly similar domain name is used alongside a website that fails to accurately and prominently disclose the lack of authorization or endorsement. The Complainant cites various prior UDRP decisions in support of its allegations.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

The Complainant has submitted all relevant assertions under the Policy, and the dispute properly falls within its scope. The Panel has the authority to decide the dispute by examining the three elements set forth in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, taking into account all relevant evidence, annexed materials, and submissions. The Panel may also conduct limited independent research pursuant to its general powers, as provided, inter alia, in paragraph 10 of the Rules.

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, namely the PHOENIX CONTACT mark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name, with the sole addition of the letters "us", which represent a common geographic abbreviation for the United States. The Panel finds that the Complainant's mark is clearly recognizable 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, the letters "us", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such element 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.

Consequently, 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 Panel finds that nothing in the record indicates that the Respondent possesses any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

The Panel notes that the Respondent's name shares no similarity with the terms "phoenix contact", and there is no evidence on the record suggesting that the Respondent is commonly known by these terms. In this regard, the Panel has corroborated, through various independent searches on the WIPO Global Brand Database, that the Respondent holds no trademark rights for these terms.¹

The Panel further finds that the Respondent's website cannot be considered a bona fide offering of goods or services under the Policy, as it intentionally creates confusion and a false affiliation with the Complainant and its affiliated entities in an attempt to pass itself off as an official distributor or an affiliated company of the Complainant. In reaching this conclusion, the Panel highlights: (i) the prominent display of the

¹ Under the general powers articulated in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, a panel may undertake limited factual research into public records if such information is useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.8.

PHOENIX CONTACT mark in the website's header and body content; (ii) the inclusion of specific language referencing the German origin and multi-decade history of the mark; (iii) the offering of products and services identical to those provided by the Complainant under its mark; and (iv) the inclusion of misleading contact details that belong directly to the Complainant or its corporate affiliates.

Regarding the latter point, the Panel notes that the "Contact Us" section of the Respondent's website displays physical addresses, telephone numbers, and email addresses belonging to the Complainant and its subsidiaries. Notably, several listed email addresses incorporate the Complainant's official domain name, while the section explicitly references the Complainant's regional entities in the United States (Phoenix Contact Inc.), Singapore (Phoenix Contact Asia Pte. Ltd.), and the United Arab Emirates (Phoenix Contact FZCO).

Furthermore, the Panel observes that the Respondent's website lacks direct online e-commerce functionality. Instead, it relies on contact forms that require users to input personal and potentially sensitive information to receive pricing quotes for the advertised products and services.

Under these circumstances, the criteria established under the Oki Data test are clearly not met. The Respondent's website fails to disclose the lack of relationship between the parties; on the contrary, it actively fosters confusion and passes off the Complainant and its authorized distribution network. Moreover, it remains questionable whether the Respondent actually offers or sells any genuine goods or services, or whether the website serves as a fraudulent vehicle for phishing sensitive user data or engaging in other deceptive schemes.

UDRP panels have consistently held that using a domain name for illegal or illegitimate activities - such as passing off, phishing, or other forms of fraud - can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

Finally, in cases where a domain name consists of a trademark plus a geographic term (such as "us"), WIPO panels consistently hold that such composition carries an inherent risk of implied affiliation, effectively preventing any finding of fair use or legitimate interest. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

Accordingly, 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 the long-standing continuous use and global reputation of the PHOENIX CONTACT mark. Prior decisions under the Policy have consistently recognized the renowned character of this mark within the electrical engineering, electronics, and automation sectors, a finding with which this Panel fully concurs. See, e.g., *Phoenix Contact GmbH & Co. KG v. Nazmul Hussain*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-4155](#).

Taking into account the well-known character of the PHOENIX CONTACT mark and the fact that the Respondent operates in the exact same industry, the Panel finds it highly likely - if not certain - that the Respondent was fully aware of the Complainant and its trademark at the time of registering the disputed domain name.

Additionally, the Panel finds that the overall circumstances of this case unequivocally establish both bad faith registration and bad faith use. In particular, several factors demonstrate that the Respondent knew of the Complainant's rights and specifically targeted its trademark when registering and deploying the disputed domain name, namely: (i) the full incorporation of the PHOENIX CONTACT mark within the disputed domain name; (ii) the use of the disputed domain name in connection with a website offering

identical products and services to those for which the Complainant's mark is famous; and (iii) the inclusion on the Respondent's website of contact details related to the Complainant and its corporate affiliates (including email addresses built on one of the Complainant's official domain names, and contact details for its international subsidiaries that have the appearance of being genuine contact details for the Complainant and its international subsidiaries).

The Panel finds that the Respondent's website deliberately fosters confusion and a false sense of affiliation with the Complainant and its mark in an effort to unfairly exploit their reputation for commercial gain. The Respondent selected a domain name structure combining the mark with the geographic abbreviation "us" and paired it with an English-language website designed to impersonate an official presence of the Complainant in this jurisdiction. This intentional attempt to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, or affiliation constitutes clear evidence of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Furthermore, the prominent display of the PHOENIX CONTACT mark, the explicit references to its German heritage and multi-decade history, the inclusion of official corporate domain names and Complainant's subsidiary companies with their contact details, the misleading copyright notice claiming rights for "Phoenix Contact", and the complete absence of any disclaimer clarifying the lack of relationship between the parties collectively evidence a deceptive scheme designed to pass the website off as an official platform of the Complainant or one of its affiliates. UDRP panels have firmly established that the use of a domain name for illegal or deceptive activities - such as passing off, phishing, or fraud - constitutes bad faith per se under the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

Finally, the Panel notes that the Respondent failed to submit a Response, offering no explanation or rebuttal regarding its rights, legitimate interests, or bad faith. Moreover, the Respondent employed a privacy service to conceal its identity. While the use of privacy services is not inherently bad faith, when used in conjunction with passing off, it serves as an additional indicator of bad faith designed to evade detection and accountability. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.6.

Consequently, based on the totality of the record, the Panel concludes that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the third element of the Policy has been satisfied.

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 <phoenixcontactus.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Reyes Campello Estebaranz/

Reyes Campello Estebaranz

Sole Panelist

Date: July 28, 2026