

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Senoret Chemical Company v. 杨勇波 (yongbo), 博思云科技 (浙江) 有限公司 (Boss Cloud Technology (Zhejiang) Co., Ltd.)

Case No. D2026-2822

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Senoret Chemical Company, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Barley Snyder LLP, United States.

The Respondent is 杨勇波 (yongbo), 博思云科技 (浙江) 有限公司 (Boss Cloud Technology (Zhejiang) Co., Ltd.), China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <hometerro.com> is registered with Xin Net Technology Corp. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 30, 2026. On the same day, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 2, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name that differed from the named Respondent (unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on the same day, 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 in English to the Complaint on July 7, 2026.

On July 2, 2026, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. The Complainant had requested in the Complaint that English be the language of the proceeding and made no further comment on the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant's submission.

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 in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 8, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 28, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 29, 2026.

The Center appointed Matthew Kennedy as the sole panelist in this matter on July 30, 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 produces poison for ants and insects, liquid roach killer, and insect-eradicating chemicals. It is based in the United States and holds the following United States trademark registrations:

- number 283605 for a stylized TERRO mark, registered on June 2, 1931, with a claim of first use in commerce on August 1, 1920, specifying goods in international class 5; and
- number 7398546 for TERRO, registered on May 28, 2024, with a claim of first use in commerce on August 1, 1920, specifying goods in international class 5.

The Respondent is an individual and a company based in China.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 30, 2025. At the time when the Complaint was filed, it resolved to a website in English that prominently displayed the TERRO mark and images of the Complainant's TERRO products, purportedly offering for sale products for ant control, spiders, crawling insects, and flying insects. Prices were discounted and displayed in USD. The "About Us" tab presented the operator as an (unnamed) wholesaler in business since 1998. Shipping was offered to anywhere in the world. At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name no longer resolves to any active website; rather, it is passively held.

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 disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its TERRO mark.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The associated website makes prominent and unauthorized use of the TERRO mark.

The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent's sole reason for registering and maintaining the disputed domain name is to falsely and deceptively present itself as the Complainant, or as an affiliate of the Complainant, in an effort to mislead consumers and damage the Complainant's business.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Preliminary Issue: Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint and amendment to the Complaint were filed in English. The Complainant requests that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including the fact that the disputed domain name is in English, the associated website is in English, and proceeding in Chinese would create an undue financial and administrative burden for the Complainant.

The Respondent's website is in English, from which it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent is proficient in that language. Further, despite the Center having sent an email regarding the language of the proceeding, and the written notification of the Complaint, in both Chinese and English, the Respondent did not comment on the language of the proceeding or express any interest in otherwise participating in this proceeding.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.5.1.

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English. The Panel would have accepted a Response in Chinese, but none was filed.

6.2 Substantive Issues

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that the Complainant must prove each of the following elements:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (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.

The burden of proof of each element is borne by the Complainant.

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. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a TERRO trademark for the purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Despite the addition of the word "home", the mark is clearly recognizable in the disputed domain name. The only other element in the disputed domain name is a generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") extension (".com") which, as a standard requirement of domain name registration, may be disregarded in the assessment of confusing similarity for

the purposes of the first element of the Policy. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7, 1.8, and 1.11.1.

Therefore, 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. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

In the present case, the disputed domain name formerly resolved to a website that prominently displayed the TERRO mark and offered for sale what purported to be the Complainant’s products, giving the impression that the website was operated by, or affiliated with, the Complainant. However, the Complainant submits that the Respondent is not authorized to use its mark. Whether the goods offered for sale were genuine or counterfeit, the website did not identify the operator or display any disclaimer clarifying its lack of relationship with the Complainant. At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name is passively held. These circumstances indicate that the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services, nor is it making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Further, the Registrar confirmed that the Respondent’s name, as an individual, is “杨勇波 (yongbo)” and, as an organization, is “博思云科技（浙江）有限公司 (Boss Cloud Technology (Zhejiang) Co., Ltd.)”, neither of which resembles the disputed domain name. Nothing on the record indicates that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

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.

Based on the record, 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 fourth circumstance is as follows:

“(iv) by using the [disputed] domain name, [the respondent has] intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [the respondent’s] website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of [the respondent’s] website or location or of a product or service on [the respondent’s] web site or location.”

In the present case, the disputed domain name was registered in 2025, after the registration of the Complainant's trademarks. The disputed domain name incorporates the entirety of the TERRO mark, adding the descriptive word "home". The associated website prominently displays the TERRO mark and images of the Complainant's products. In view of these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent knew of the Complainant and its TERRO mark at the time when it registered the disputed domain name.

As regards use, the disputed domain name resolves to a website that prominently displays the TERRO mark and offers for sale what purport to be the Complainant's products, giving the false impression that the website is operated by, or affiliated with, the Complainant. Given the findings in Section 6.2B above, the Panel finds that, by using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source or affiliation of the Respondent's website or of the products on that website, within the terms of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Therefore, 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 <hometerro.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Matthew Kennedy/

Matthew Kennedy

Sole Panelist

Date: August 4, 2026