

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

PUMA SE v. David Hung

Case No. D2026-2543

1. The Parties

The Complainant is PUMA SE, Germany, represented by Göhmann Rechtsanwälte Abogados Advokat Steuerberater Partnerschaft mbB, Germany.

The Respondent is David Hung, Viet Nam.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <jobswithpuma.com> is registered with Gname.com Pte. Ltd. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 11, 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 (Identity not fully disclosed) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 16, 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 16, 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 July 4, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 24, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Charles Gielen as the sole panelist in this matter on August 11, 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 one of the world's leading sports and lifestyle companies. For decades, the Complainant and its affiliated companies have designed, manufactured, marketed, and sold footwear, apparel, accessories, and related goods and services under the trade mark PUMA. The Complainant owns several registrations for this mark such as European Union Trade Mark registration No. 018673382, registered on September 29, 2022, for goods in class 9 and services in classes 35, 41 and 42, as well as International registration No. 437626, registered on April 12, 1978, for goods in classes 18, 25 and 28, covering multiple jurisdictions in the world.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 5, 2026 and resolves to a blank page.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trade mark.

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name. The Complainant first argues that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trade mark. It incorporates the Complainant's PUMA mark in its entirety. The additional words "jobs" and "with" do not avoid confusing similarity. They are descriptive words which, in the present context, increase rather than reduce the likelihood of confusion because they point directly to employment, recruitment, and career opportunities with PUMA. The generic Top-Level Domain ".com" is a technical registration requirement and does not distinguish the disputed domain name from the Complainant's trade mark.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant gives several reasons for this. First, the Complainant has not authorised, licensed, permitted, or otherwise consented to the Respondent's registration or use of the PUMA mark as part of a domain name. The Respondent is not an authorised recruiter, agent, HR service provider, employment intermediary, licensee, representative, or other commercial partner of the Complainant. Second, the Complainant contends that there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. Third, there is no evidence that, before notice of this dispute, the Respondent used or made demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services and the Respondent is also not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Finally, the Complainant argues that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Complainant gives several reasons for this. With respect to the registration of the disputed domain name, the Complainant argues that it was registered long after the Complainant had acquired extensive trade mark rights and reputation in the trade mark PUMA. Given the distinctiveness and reputation of this trade mark, it is implausible that the Respondent selected and registered the disputed domain name by coincidence.

The disputed domain name was deliberately structured to make Internet users believe that it is connected with jobs, recruitment, or career opportunities at the Complainant. Regarding the bad faith use of the disputed domain name, the Complainant contends that the Respondent intentionally attempts to attract Internet users to its website or other online location for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement. The disputed domain name does not merely risk confusion in the abstract. According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name is built around that confusion. Its commercial or abusive value lies in the fact that users will understand it as if it is referring to employment with the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 trade mark 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 trade mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's PUMA trade mark. It contains the Complainant's trade mark in its entirety and the only difference between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trade mark is that the disputed domain name has the additional words "jobs" and "with" preceding the Complainant's trade mark. This difference does not prevent the finding of confusing similarity between the trade mark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

Therefore, the requirement under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy is met.

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.

First, the Respondent is in default and did not show that it owns any rights to the name “jobswithpuma” nor that it has any license or other authorisation from the Complainant to use its trade mark PUMA. Second, based on the available record, there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by, or that it has ever been known under the name “jobswithpuma”. Furthermore, the Panel did not find any evidence that the Respondent has used, or prepared to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. On the contrary, the disputed domain name falsely suggests an affiliation with the Complainant. Such false suggestion cannot give any rights or legitimate interests.

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.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant’s trade mark PUMA. With respect to the registration of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that the Respondent clearly had the trade mark of the Complainant in mind when registering the disputed domain name. Therefore, the Panel finds that the registration of the disputed domain name was done in bad faith. Regarding the use of the disputed domain name, it does not resolve to an active website. However, the Panel notes the composition of the disputed domain name incorporating the Complainant’s trade mark in its entirety, the failure of the Respondent to submit a response, and the implausibility of any good faith use to which the disputed domain name may be put, and finds that the non-use of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. The Panel rather finds that it was deliberately structured to make Internet users believe that it is connected with jobs, recruitment, or career opportunities at the Complainant.

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 <jobswithpuma.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Charles Gielen/

Charles Gielen

Sole Panelist

Date: August 20, 2026