

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Haier US Appliance Solutions, Inc. DBA GE Appliance v. Oleksandr Kliuiev,
Henryslist.com
Case No. D2026-2617

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Haier US Appliance Solutions, Inc. DBA GE Appliance, United States of America ("United States"), represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Oleksandr Kliuiev, Henryslist.com, Ukraine.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <geappliance.support>, and <monogramappliance.support> are registered with CloudFlare, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 16, 2026, in relation to the disputed domain name <monogramappliance.support>. On June 17, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name <monogramappliance.support>. On June 18, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name <monogramappliance.support> which differed from the named Respondent (DATA REDACTED) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 18, 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 on June 23, 2026, and requested the addition of the disputed domain name <geappliance.support> in the proceedings.

On June 23, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name <geappliance.support>. On the same date, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

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 26, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 16, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Iris Quadrio as the sole panelist in this matter on July 23, 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, Haier US Appliance Solutions, Inc. DBA GE Appliance, is a corporation organized under the laws of Delaware, United States, and headquartered in Louisville, Kentucky, United States. The Complainant is part of the Haier group of companies and operates in the home appliance industry. It offers home appliances under several brands, including GE and MONOGRAM. The MONOGRAM brand is used in connection with high-end kitchen appliances, including refrigerators, ranges, dishwashers, ovens, and cooktops. The GE brand is also used in connection with a broad range of home appliances.

The Complainant is the owner of trademark registrations for the MONOGRAM mark in several jurisdictions. For the purposes of this proceeding, the Panel notes in particular the following registrations: (i) United States: Reg. No. 1662205, registered on October 29, 1991, for classes 7 and 11; (ii) Canada: Reg. No. TMA387827, registered on August 16, 1991, for classes 7 and 11; (iii) Australia: Reg. No. 1254659, registered on July 10, 2009, for classes 7 and 11; and (iv) European Union: Reg. No. 006622575, registered on December 5, 2008, for classes 7 and 11. These registrations cover, inter alia, dishwashers, refrigerators, freezers, ovens, microwave ovens, and cooktops. The evidence submitted with the Complaint identifies the Complainant as the current owner of these registrations.

The Complainant is also the exclusive licensee of the GE trademark owned by General Electric Company. For the purposes of this proceeding, the Panel notes in particular the following registrations: (i) United States: Reg. No. 35089, registered on September 18, 1900, for class 21; (ii) Australia: Reg. No. 1504, registered on August 2, 1906, for class 7; and (iii) United Kingdom: Reg. No. UK00000291287, registered on March 13, 1907, for classes 7, 9 and 12. The registrations cover, inter alia, electrical machines, equipment, devices, and appliances. All of the above-mentioned MONOGRAM and GE trademark registrations substantially predate the registration of the disputed domain names.

The Complainant operates websites at the domain names <monogram.com>, and <geappliances.com>, registered on September 20, 1995, and November 4, 1996, respectively, through which it provides information about its products and services.

The disputed domain names <geappliance.support>, and <monogramappliance.support> were both registered on December 19, 2023. The Registrar-disclosed information identifies the registrant of both disputed domain names as Oleksandr Kliuiev, Henryslist.com, located in Ukraine.

According to the evidence submitted with the Complaint, the disputed domain names resolved to commercial websites offering repair services for appliances bearing the Complainant's respective GE and MONOGRAM trademarks. The website associated with the disputed domain name <geappliance.support> presented itself as “GE Support” and offered repair services for GE-branded home appliances. The website associated with the disputed domain name <monogramappliance.support> offered repair services for MONOGRAM-branded home appliances and represented that its technicians were certified and that genuine parts were used.

At the time of this Decision, both disputed domain names continue to resolve to active commercial websites offering repair services for GE- and MONOGRAM-branded home appliances, respectively. The website associated with <geappliance.support> presents itself as “GE Support & Service” and “the GE specialist”, offers online appointment scheduling, and states that it uses factory-authorized parts and factory-trained technicians. The website associated with <monogramappliance.support> presents itself as “Monogram appliance support”, offers repair services for MONOGRAM appliances throughout the United States, and states that it uses genuine original equipment manufacturer parts. The latter website also contains statements identifying the service as an independent GE Monogram repair specialist.

The Respondent has previously been named as respondent in UDRP proceedings before the Center, including *Wilshire Refrigeration & Appliance, Inc. v. Oleksandr Kliuiev, Henryslist.com*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-0962](#), and *Whirlpool Properties, Inc. and Maytag Properties, LLC v. Oleksandr Kliuiev, Henryslist.com*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-2620](#), in which the respective panels ordered the transfer of the disputed domain names.

On April 7, 2026, the Complainant’s representative sent a cease-and-desist letter concerning the disputed domain name <monogramappliance.support>, requesting that the use of the MONOGRAM mark be discontinued and that the disputed domain name be transferred to the Complainant. Further notices were subsequently sent, including a third and final notice dated April 30, 2026. The record does not indicate that the Respondent replied to any such communications.

The record does not indicate any relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent, nor does it indicate that the Complainant has authorized the Respondent to register or use any domain name incorporating the MONOGRAM or GE marks. The Respondent did not submit a Response and was notified of its default on July 20, 2026.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its MONOGRAM and GE trademarks, as they reproduce the respective marks in their entirety together with the term “appliance”, which directly relates to the Complainant’s business. The Complainant further submits that the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.support” is to be disregarded for purposes of the comparison.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. The Respondent is not affiliated with or authorized by the Complainant, is not commonly known by the disputed domain names, and is using them for commercial websites offering repair services for appliances bearing the Complainant’s trademarks. According to the Complainant, the websites do not accurately disclose the Respondent’s lack of relationship with the Complainant and create the impression that the Respondent is an authorized service provider.

Moreover, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. The composition of the disputed domain names and the content of the associated websites demonstrate the Respondent’s knowledge of the Complainant and its trademarks. The Complainant submits that the Respondent intentionally uses the disputed domain names to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the websites and the services offered therein. The Complainant further relies on the Respondent’s alleged pattern of registering domain names incorporating third-party trademarks and its failure to reply to the cease-and-desist letters.

The Complainant requests that the disputed domain names be transferred to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Procedural Issue – Location of the Respondent

Under paragraph 10 of the Rules, the Panel is required to ensure that the Parties are treated with equality and that each Party is given a fair opportunity to present its case, and also that the administrative proceedings take place with due expedition.

The location of the Respondent disclosed by the Registrar appears to be in Ukraine, which is subject to an international conflict at the date of this Decision that may impact case notification. It is therefore appropriate for the Panel to consider, in accordance with its discretion under paragraph 10 of the Rules, whether the proceedings should continue.

Having considered all the circumstances of the case, the Panel is of the view that it should. The record shows that the Center sent the Notification of Complaint by email to the Respondent at the email address disclosed by the Registrar, and there is no indication in the record that the notification sent to that address was unsuccessful. The Center also employed additional means of notification, including sending notice through the online contact form associated with the disputed domain names and attempting delivery to other available email and physical contact details.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain names were registered on December 19, 2023, during the international conflict, and currently resolve to active commercial websites. These circumstances indicate that the Respondent appears capable of controlling the disputed domain names and their associated content and of receiving electronic communications concerning them.

Moreover, for the reasons set out below, the Panel has no serious doubt, albeit in the absence of a Response, that the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain names with knowledge of the Complainant and its trademarks.

The Panel concludes that the Respondent has been given a fair opportunity to present its case. In order that the administrative proceedings take place with due expedition, the Panel will proceed to a Decision accordingly.

6.2. Substantive Issues

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, for this Complaint to succeed in relation to the disputed domain names, the Complainant must prove each of the following for each disputed domain name, namely that:

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

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 names. 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 record shows that the Complainant is the owner of multiple trademark registrations for the MONOGRAM mark and that he is the exclusive licensee of the GE trademark, as set out in the Factual Background above.

The entirety of the MONOGRAM mark is reproduced and recognizable within the disputed domain name <monogramappliance.support>, and the textual element "ge" of the GE mark is reproduced and recognizable within the disputed domain name <geappliance.support>. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the respective marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.10.

Disregarding the generic Top-Level Domain ".support", the disputed domain names differ from the respective MONOGRAM and GE marks solely by the addition of the term "appliance".

Although the addition of the term "appliance" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the respective marks 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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Complainant asserts that it has not authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the MONOGRAM or GE marks or to register any domain name incorporating them, and that no relationship exists between the Parties. There is no evidence in the record suggesting that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain names or that the Respondent holds any trademark or other rights corresponding to them. The Registrar-disclosed information identifies the Respondent as Oleksandr Kliuiev,

Henryslist.com, names that do not correspond to the disputed domain names.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain names resolve to commercial websites offering repair services for appliances bearing the Complainant's respective marks. UDRP panels have recognized that resellers, distributors, or service providers using a domain name containing a complainant's trademark may make a bona fide offering of goods or services and thus have a legitimate interest in such domain name if their use meets certain cumulative requirements. These include the actual offering of the goods or services at issue, use of the website only in connection with the trademarked goods or services, accurate and prominent disclosure of the registrant's relationship with the trademark owner, and the absence of an attempt to "corner the market" in domain names reflecting the trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.8.

In the present case, the available record does not support a finding that the Respondent's use satisfies the above mentioned requirements. The website associated with the disputed domain name <geappliance.support> presents itself as "GE Support & Service" and "the GE specialist", and states that it uses factory-authorized parts and factory-trained technicians. The website does not appear to contain any clear and prominent disclosure that the Respondent is independent of and unaffiliated with the Complainant. Rather, the composition of the disputed domain name and the presentation of the website are apt to convey the impression that the website is operated by, affiliated with, or authorized by the Complainant.

The website associated with the disputed domain name <monogramappliance.support> describes itself as "Monogram appliance support". Viewed as a whole, however, the website does not establish rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name incorporates the MONOGRAM mark in its entirety together with the terms "appliance" and "support", while the website prominently identifies itself as "Monogram appliance support" and refers to "factory-authorized parts" and "trained technicians". It neither clearly identifies the service provider nor adequately explains the Respondent's relationship with the Complainant. After the filing of the Complaint, the Respondent made a statement describing itself as "an independent GE Monogram repair specialist". However, panels tend to assess claimed respondent rights or legitimate interests at the time of the filing of the complaint. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.11. Even considering the limited references to independence added after the filing of the Complaint, they do not dispel the overall impression, created by the disputed domain name and website, of affiliation with or authorization by the Complainant.

Finally, the websites are commercial in nature, and there is no evidence that the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy.

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.

The Complainant's MONOGRAM and GE trademark registrations substantially predate the registration of the disputed domain names. The composition of the disputed domain names demonstrates that the Respondent had the Complainant and its trademarks in mind when registering them. Each disputed domain name reproduces one of the Complainant's marks together with the term "appliance" under the ".support" generic Top-Level Domain. Both "appliance" and "support" directly relate to the Complainant's products and to the repair services advertised on the associated websites. The subsequent use of the disputed domain names for websites offering repair services specifically for GE- and MONOGRAM-branded appliances confirms that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its respective marks at the time of registration.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent has used the disputed domain names intentionally to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the associated websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's respective marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the websites and the services offered therein, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

In particular, the website associated with <geappliance.support> presents itself as "GE Support & Service" and "the GE specialist", while also referring to factory-authorized parts and factory-trained technicians. The disputed domain name and the presentation of the website are apt to convey the impression that the repair services are operated, authorized, or endorsed by the Complainant.

The website associated with <monogramappliance.support> presents itself as "Monogram appliance support" and refers to "factory-authorized parts", "trained technicians", and genuine original equipment manufacturer parts. Although the website added statements identifying the service as an independent GE Monogram repair specialist only after the filing of the Complaint, the Panel finds that these statements do not dispel the likelihood of confusion created by the composition of the disputed domain name and the overall presentation of the website. In particular, the disputed domain name itself combines the MONOGRAM mark with terms suggesting an official appliance support channel, and the website does not clearly identify the entity operating the advertised services.

The Panel further finds that the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of conduct within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy. In *Wilshire Refrigeration & Appliance, Inc. v. Oleksandr Kliuiev, Henryslist.com*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-0962](#), the Respondent was ordered to transfer the domain names <officialwilshirerefrigeration.com> and <wilshireappliance.repair>. In *Whirlpool Properties, Inc. and Maytag Properties, LLC v. Oleksandr Kliuiev, Henryslist.com*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-2620](#), the Respondent was ordered to transfer the domain names <amanaappliance.support>, <jennairappliance.support>, <maytagappliance.support>, and <whirlpoolappliance.support>. The latter domain names were registered on the same date as the disputed domain names, followed the same "trademark + appliance.support" naming pattern, and were used in connection with websites purporting to offer repair services for the respective branded products. These circumstances establish a pattern of registering domain names incorporating third-party trademarks in order to prevent the relevant trademark owners from reflecting their marks in corresponding domain names.

The Panel also notes that the Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's cease-and-desist letters concerning <monogramappliance.support> and did not submit a Response in this proceeding. While the Respondent's failure to respond does not by itself establish bad faith, it constitutes an additional circumstance supporting the Panel's conclusion in the absence of any explanation for the registration and use of the disputed domain names.

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 names <geappliance.support>, and <monogramappliance.support> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Iris Quadrio/

Iris Quadrio

Sole Panelist

Date: August 7, 2026