

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

PK Products, Inc. dba PK Lures v. WILLIAM VERDIANSYAH, WM Digital
Case No. D2026-2624

1. The Parties

The Complainant is PK Products, Inc. dba PK Lures, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Fredrikson & Byron, PA, United States.

The Respondent is WILLIAM VERDIANSYAH, WM Digital, Indonesia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <pklures.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 11, 2026. On June 17, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On the same date, 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 19, 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.

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 July 2, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 22, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 23, 2026.

The Center appointed Assen Alexiev 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 was founded in 2009. It designs and sells fishing lures and other fishing products under the brand PK LURES, and its official website is located at the domain name <pklure.com>, registered on August 11, 2014.

The Complainant's original founders were Messrs. McKinley and Mr. O'Grady. The Complainant states that its current owner is Mr. Reeff. Each of these persons is mentioned again below.

Mr. Reeff is the owner of the United States trademark  with registration No. 5135243, registered on February 7, 2017, for goods in International Class 28 (lures for fishing), with claimed date of first use on January 1, 2012 (the "PK LURES trademark"). The element "LURES" in the PK LURES trademark is disclaimed. The PK LURES trademark was originally registered by Mr. O'Grady, who transferred it to Mr. Reeff with an agreement recorded by the USPTO on July 18, 2018. Mr. O'Grady transferred to Mr. Reeff all rights in the PK LURES trademark together with the goodwill of the business in respect of which the trademark was being used.¹ The Complaint states that the PK LURES trademark has been exclusively licensed to it by Mr. Reeff.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 4, 2008, by Mr. McKinley. On June 4, 2018, Mr. O'Grady commenced a UDRP proceeding against Mr. McKinley in respect of the disputed domain name (*Patrick Shawn O'Grady v. sam mckinley / cti ind,inc*, NAF Claim Number: FA1806001790052) (the "Prior proceeding"). On July 22, 2018, the Panel in the Prior proceeding issued a decision denying the complaint filed by Mr. O'Grady.² It follows from the text of this decision that Mr. McKinley was the original registrant of the disputed domain name and remained its registrant at least until July 22, 2018.

The Respondent has not participated in this proceeding and has not provided any information about itself and about the date on which it has acquired the disputed domain name. The Complainant asserts in the Complaint that the Respondent is not related to it or to its prior owners Messrs. McKinley and O'Grady.

The disputed domain name is currently inactive. According to the available Wayback Machine records, in the period 2010 - 2015 it resolved to a website that promoted the Complainant's business and products. The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name has recently resolved to a website that displayed the PK LURES trademark and offered fishing lures. The most recent archived copy³ of the website at the disputed domain name at the Wayback Machine is dated March 12, 2026, and it shows that at that time the website prominently displayed the PK LURES trademark, featured fishing lures, indicated the Complainant's name and contact details, and included the copyright notice "© 2015, PK Lures, Inc. All Rights Reserved." It appears to the Panel that the content of the 2026 version of the website was partially copied from its versions in 2010 - 2015.

¹ <https://assignmentcenter.uspto.gov/ipas/search/api/v2/public/download/trademark/6384/0482>

² <https://www.adrforum.com/domaindecisions/1790052.htm>

³ <https://web.archive.org/web/20260312125237/http://www.pklures.com/about-pk-lures/>

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.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its PK LURES trademark and is being used for a website that suggests an affiliation with the Complainant.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, which, together with the content of the associated website, falsely suggests a connection or relationship between the Respondent and the Complainant. The Complainant submits that it has not authorised the Respondent to register or use the disputed domain name, to use the Complainant's PK LURES trademark, or to provide any goods or services on behalf of the Complainant, and that there is no relationship between the Parties.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent, the new registrant of the disputed domain name, has no affiliation with the Complainant or its prior owners, and that the Respondent "updated its registration of the disputed domain in January 2026...fully knowing that it has no relationship with Complainant and is not authorized to use the disputed domain, the PK LURES name, or the PK LURES trademarks". The Complainant submits that the Respondent is using the PK LURES trademark as a principal identifier of its website and services, and by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's services, the Respondent intentionally attempts to attract visitors to its website for commercial gain.

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 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 provided evidence that Mr. Reeffer is the owner of the PK LURES trademark, and submits that Mr. Reeffer is its owner and has exclusively licensed the trademark to it. As discussed in section 1.4.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), a trademark owner's affiliate such as a subsidiary of a parent or of a holding company, or an exclusive trademark licensee, is considered to have rights in a trademark under the UDRP for purposes of standing to file a complaint. The Panel therefore accepts that the Complainant has shown rights in respect of the PK LURES trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1. The PK LURES trademark contains the textual elements "PK" and "LURES" alongside graphical elements, and the textual element "PK" dominates in the trademark. As already noted in section 4 above, the "LURES" element of the trademark is disclaimed.

The Panel finds that the PK LURES trademark is recognisable within the disputed domain name, because it incorporates the dominant "PK" textual element of the trademark, while its disclaimed "LURES" element is also included. The Panel also notes that the disputed domain name has recently resolved to a website that

prominently displayed the PK LURES trademark, so it appears that the Respondent has sought to target the Complainant and the PK LURES trademark through the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the PK LURES trademark in which the Complainant has rights. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7, 1.10 and 1.15.

The Panel therefore 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 recognised 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 disputed domain name identically reproduces the textual elements of the PK LURES trademark, which creates a high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1. The evidence in the case shows that the Respondent has recently used the disputed domain name for a website that prominently displayed an exact copy of the PK LURES trademark and indicated the Complainant’s name and address as the provider of the website, while offering fishing lures, which are the same products that the Complainant offers under the PK LURES trademark. This supports a conclusion that through the acquisition and use of the disputed domain name, the Respondent has impersonated the Complainant and attempted to exploit the goodwill of the PK LURES trademark for financial gain. Such conduct cannot give rise to rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in the disputed domain name.

The Panel therefore finds that 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 PK LURES trademark was registered in February 2017. This is after the original registration date of the disputed domain name in 2008. However, as noted in section 4 above, a UDRP proceeding involving Mr. McKinley as the then registrant of the disputed domain name was completed on July 22, 2018. This means that the Respondent could not have acquired the disputed domain name prior to that date. As discussed in section 3.9 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), the transfer of a domain name registration from a third party to the respondent is not a renewal, and the date on which the current registrant acquired the domain name is the date a panel will consider in assessing bad faith. The Panel therefore accepts that the Respondent could not have acquired the disputed domain name prior to July 23, 2018, and that in any case this acquisition has

taken place at a date after the registration date of the Complainant's PK LURES trademark and after its assignment to Mr. Reef, recorded on July 18, 2018.

The disputed domain name is identical to the textual elements of the PK LURES trademark. The Complainant has submitted undated evidence showing that the disputed domain name has been used for a website that impersonated it by displaying the PK LURES trademark, the Complainant's name and address, and a copyright notice that included the Complainant's name, and that offered for sale products identical to the Complainant's products. This evidence is confirmed by the Wayback Machine records for the disputed domain name for March 12, 2026. The Respondent has not submitted a response and has not provided any plausible explanation for the registration and use of the disputed domain name or disputed the evidence submitted by the Complainant.

Taking all the above into account, the Panel accepts as more likely than not that the Respondent has acquired the disputed domain name with knowledge of the PK LURES trademark and of the Complainant and in an intentional attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website at the disputed domain name by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant as to the source or affiliation of its website. This supports a finding of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The fact that the disputed domain name is currently inactive does not change the above conclusions.

The Panel therefore 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 <pklures.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Assen Alexiev/

Assen Alexiev

Sole Panelist

Date: August 7, 2026