

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Bob's Discount Furniture, LLC v. jiao fan
Case No. D2026-2714

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Bob's Discount Furniture, LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Holland & Knight, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is jiao fan, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <bobs-furniture.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 22, 2026. On June 23, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 25, 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 (Redacted for Privacy, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 29, 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 July 1, 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 3, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 23, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 27, 2026.

The Center appointed Fabrizio Bedarida as the sole panelist in this matter on August 3, 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 leading furniture retailer in the United States, operating retail stores across the United States and maintaining a major e-commerce presence.

Since at least as early as 1991, the Complainant has used its BOB'S DISCOUNT FURNITURE and related BOB'S-formative marks in connection with furniture, home furnishings, retail furniture services, and related goods and services.

The Complainant is a publicly traded company that owns and operates over 200 retail furniture stores in 27 states across the United States, maintaining a significant e-commerce presence through its official website at "www.mybobs.com".

Since at least as early as 1999, the Complainant has operated its official and longstanding website at "www.mybobs.com". Additionally, the Complainant owns several domain names featuring the term "bob's". The Complainant is, inter alia, the owner of:

- United States Trademark Registration number 2023414 for the BOB'S DISCOUNT FURNITURE (word) trademark, registered on December 17, 1996;
- United States Trademark Registration number 4432651 for the BOB'S DISCOUNT FURNITURE (device) trademark, registered on November 12, 2013;
- United States Trademark Registration number 4432652 for the BOB'S DISCOUNT FURNITURE (device) trademark, registered on November 12, 2013;
- United States Trademark Registration number 4503285 for the BOB'S SLEEP CENTER (device) trademark, registered on March 25, 2014; and
- United States Trademark Registration number 7778514 for the GOOF PROOF (word) trademark, registered on April 29, 2025.

The Complainant has also submitted a list of over 50 domain names containing the "bob's" term, including <bobsfurniture.com>, <bobsfurnitures.com>, <bobsfurniture.net>, and <bobsfurniture.us>.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 8, 2025. It is currently inactive. Based on the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the disputed domain name previously resolved to a website reproducing the Complainant's registered logo and containing links to the Amazon.com platform through the Amazon Services LLC Associates Program. In addition, product descriptions and images taken directly from the Complainant's legitimate website- as well as the Complainant's other registered trademarks, including BOB-O-PEDIC (United States Trademark Registration No. 4483900), TREASURE (United States Trademark Registration No. 6859975), and GOOF PROOF (United States Registration No. 7778514)- were displayed on the Respondent's website.

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 Respondent is attempting to trade off the Complainant's established reputation and goodwill. By purporting to offer furniture and retail services identical to those of the Complainant- while using a domain name and trademarks confusingly similar to the Complainant's protected marks- the Respondent's actions are calculated to cause consumer confusion and infringe upon the Complainant's rights.

Furthermore, the Complainant points out that the Respondent is attempting to impersonate the Complainant and divert consumers to third-party retail sites through affiliate links to generate revenue for itself while offering no products of its own.

In brief, the Complainant claims that the Respondent, in bad faith and cloaked in anonymity, has registered and is using the disputed domain name to run a spoof website with the apparent intent of committing fraud upon the Complainant's consumers and potential consumers.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In order for the Complainant to obtain a transfer of the disputed domain name, paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that the Complainant must demonstrate, cumulatively, to the Panel that:

- (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.

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 Panel finds the dominant part of the BOB'S DISCOUNT FURNITURE mark is incorporated and 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.

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 notes that the disputed domain name incorporates the dominant “bob’s” element of the Complainant’s BOB’S DISCOUNT FURNITURE trademark, together with the descriptive term “furniture” (for a website allegedly offering the Complainant’s goods, namely furniture, which also forms part of the Complainant’s trademark). This composition affirms the risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant and the Respondent’s intention to take unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion with the Complainant as to the origin or affiliation of the website, and as such, the use of the disputed domain name cannot qualify as fair use nor a bona fide offering of goods and services.

In fact, the Respondent has no connection or affiliation with the Complainant, and the Complainant has not licensed or otherwise authorized the Respondent to use or register any domain names incorporating the Complainant’s trademark. The Respondent does not appear to be commonly known by the disputed domain name, or by a similar name. The Respondent does not appear to make any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, nor any use in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Respondent offers for sale what appears to be the Complainant’s products while failing to disclose the lack of any relationship or affiliation between the Complainant and the Respondent.

Previous panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here claimed as passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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.

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 Panel notes that, as discussed below, it is highly likely that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant’s trademark registrations and rights to the BOB’S DISCOUNT FURNITURE trademark when it registered the disputed domain name.

Indeed, it is evident from the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name that the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name with the intention to attract Internet users to its website, for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website or location or of a product or service on its website or location, which constitutes registration and use in bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

This is further supported by the Respondent's use of the Complainant's official product images and of the Complainant's registered logo.

Noting also the composition of the disputed domain name- which incorporates the Complainant's dominant "bob's" trademark element along with the term "furniture", which also forms part of the Complainant's trademark- combined with the fact that the Respondent's website also displays other registered trademarks belonging to the Complainant, and purportedly offers for sale the Complainant's products, with links to the Amazon.com platform, it is more likely than not that the Respondent, when registering the disputed domain name, had knowledge of the Complainant's prior rights to the BOB'S DISCOUNT FURNITURE trademark. The Panel is therefore satisfied that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Furthermore, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here claimed as passing off, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

Therefore, by using the disputed domain name in the aforesaid manner, the Panel finds that 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 trademark. Such use constitutes bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Finally, the bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name are further supported by the fact that the Respondent has not come forward to deny the assertions of bad faith made by the Complainant in these proceedings.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute bad faith under 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 <bobs-furniture.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Fabrizio Bedarida/

Fabrizio Bedarida

Sole Panelist

Date: August 14, 2026