

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Pure Fishing Inc. v. Vladimir Veselovskiy

Case No. D2026-2832

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Pure Fishing Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Neal & McDevitt, United States.

The Respondent is Vladimir Veselovskiy, Ukraine.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <thestren.com> (the "Domain Name") is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 29, 2026. On June 30, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On July 1, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 1, 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 July 2, 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 7, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 27, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 28, 2026.

The Center appointed Ana María Pacón as the sole panelist in this matter on August 5, 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 company organized under the laws of the United States. Founded more than 90 years ago, the Complainant manufactures and markets fishing line, leaders, fishing equipment, and related products. The Complainant has used the trademark STREN in connection with fishing line since at least 1958 and has developed substantial goodwill and recognition in the fishing industry.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for STREN and STREN-formative marks. Among others, the Complainant owns the following United States trademark registrations:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 678,371 for STREN, registered on May 12, 1959, covering goods in class 28;
- United States Trademark Registration No. 4,470,575 for STREN, registered on January 21, 2014, covering goods in class 28; and
- United States Trademark Registration No. 3,286,136 for STREN ORIGINAL, registered on August 28, 2007, covering goods in class 28.

The Complainant also owns the domain name <stren.com>, which was registered on July 9, 1997, and uses it to direct Internet users to its official website.

The Domain Name <thestren.com> was registered on April 15, 2024.

According to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the Domain Name resolved to a website prominently displaying the Complainant's STREN trademark and offering STREN-branded fishing products. The website reproduced content from the Complainant's official websites, including the Complainant's address and a video originating from the Complainant's official YouTube channel, thereby creating the appearance of an official STREN website. At the time of this Decision, the Domain Name continues to resolve to the same website.

The Registrar disclosed the underlying registrant as Vladimir Veselovskiy, Ukraine. Prior to such disclosure, the Respondent had concealed its identity through a privacy service.

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 Domain Name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to its STREN trademark because it incorporates the trademark in its entirety, merely adding the definite article "the", which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The Complainant further submits that the Domain Name closely resembles its own domain name <stren.com>.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. According to the Complainant, the Respondent has never been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted to use the STREN trademark, is not commonly known by the Domain Name, and is not making a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name.

Finally, the Complainant submits that the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant contends that the STREN trademark has been used continuously since 1958 and has acquired substantial goodwill and recognition in the fishing industry. According to the Complainant, the Respondent was clearly aware of the Complainant and its STREN trademark when registering the Domain Name, which incorporates the trademark in its entirety. The Complainant further contends that the Domain Name has been used in connection with a website deliberately designed to impersonate the Complainant by reproducing the Complainant's STREN trademark, product images, website content, contact address, and an embedded YouTube video, thereby creating the false impression that the website is an official STREN website. The Complainant submits that the Respondent intentionally sought to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and the products offered thereon. The Complainant also relies on the Respondent's use of a privacy service and its failure to submit a Response as additional circumstances supporting a finding of bad faith.

The Complainant requests the transfer of the Domain Name.

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 is 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 considers that it should. The Panel notes that the Center transmitted the Notification of Complaint to the Respondent's disclosed email address and that there is no indication that such notification was unsuccessful. The Panel further notes that the Domain Name was registered on April 15, 2024, during the ongoing international conflict, indicating that the Respondent was able to register and maintain control of the Domain Name despite the prevailing circumstances.

Having determined that the Respondent was afforded a fair opportunity to present its case, the Panel considers that there is no procedural impediment to rendering a decision in this proceeding.

6.2. Substantive Issues

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 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 entirety of the mark is reproduced within the Domain Name. Accordingly, the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here "the" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

Then there is the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD"), here ".com". As is generally accepted, the addition of a gTLD such as ".com" is merely a technical registration requirement and as such is typically disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1, and *Accenture Global Services Limited v. Fan zhi*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-0285](#).

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 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 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 Domain Name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Complainant states that it has not authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the STREN trademark or to register any domain name incorporating that trademark. There is also no evidence in the record that the Respondent is commonly known by the Domain Name.

According to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the Domain Name resolved to a website displaying the Complainant's STREN trademark, reproducing content from the Complainant's official website, including the Complainant's contact address and an official YouTube video, and purporting to offer STREN-branded products. Such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1; see also *The Ritz Hotel, Limited v. Damir Kruzicevic*, WIPO Case No. [D2005-1137](#).

The Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent was more likely than not aware of the Complainant and its STREN trademark when registering the Domain Name. The Complainant has used the STREN trademark since at least 1958, and the evidence on record shows that the trademark has acquired a substantial goodwill and recognition in connection with fishing line and related products. The Domain Name wholly incorporates the Complainant's STREN trademark, merely adding the definite article "the", which does not dispel the impression that the Domain Name is associated with the Complainant.

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.

The evidence submitted by the Complainant shows that the Domain Name resolved to a website prominently displaying the Complainant's STREN trademark, reproducing content from the Complainant's official website, including the Complainant's contact address and an official YouTube video, and purporting to offer STREN-branded products. In the Panel's view, such use was clearly intended to create the false impression that the website was operated by, or affiliated with, the Complainant.

The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and the products offered thereon, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

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

The Respondent initially concealed its identity through a privacy service and failed to participate in this proceeding. While neither circumstance is conclusive in itself, both reinforce the Panel's finding of bad faith in the circumstances of this case. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.6.

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 Domain Name <thestren.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ana María Pacón/

Ana María Pacón

Sole Panelist

Date: August 19, 2026