

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Lamps Plus, Inc. v. Isa Dahiru
Case No. D2026-2884

1. The Parties

Complainant is Lamps Plus, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton LLP, United States.

Respondent is Isa Dahiru, Ukraine.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <possini-lighting.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 July 1, 2026. On July 3, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 7, 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 named Respondent ("Undisclosed") and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on July 7, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on July 7, 2026. In response to the Center's notification regarding the Registrar's information, Complainant filed an amended Complaint on July 13, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the Complaint and 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 14, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 3, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on August 12, 2026.

The Center appointed Gabriel F. Leonardos as the sole panelist in this matter on August 19, 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. Further Procedural Considerations

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 proceeding takes place with due expedition.

Since Respondent's mailing address is stated to be in Ukraine, which is subject to an international conflict at the date of this Decision that may impact case notification, it is appropriate for the Panel to consider, in accordance with its discretion under paragraph 10 of the Rules, whether the proceeding should continue.

Having considered all the circumstances of the case, the Panel is of the view that it should. The Panel notes that the Written Notice was sent to Respondent's address in Ukraine by registered mail, while the Complaint was successfully delivered to Respondent's email address provided by the Registrar.

It is moreover noted that, for the reasons set out later in this Decision, the Panel finds that Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name in bad faith, with the apparent intention of attracting Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's mark.

The Panel concludes that the Parties have been given a fair opportunity to present their case, and so that the administrative proceeding takes place with due expedition the Panel will proceed to a Decision accordingly.

5. Factual Background

Complainant is a specialty lighting retailer from the United States, operating an e-commerce business through its website, namely "lampsplus.com", as well as physical stores throughout the country.

Complainant offers a range of lighting products, home furnishings, and décor, and also sells its products through online marketplaces such as Amazon, eBay, and Walmart. Among the brands used by Complainant in connection with its products is the POSSINI trademark.

Complainant owns the following United States trademark registration for POSSINI:

Registration Number	Trademark	International Classes	Registration Date
2627737	POSSINI	11, 20, and 21	October 1, 2002

The disputed domain name was registered on March 28, 2025, and resolves to a website that prominently displays the POSSINI trademark and images of Complainant's products. The website also contains "Check Price" and "Learn More" buttons which redirect Internet users to Amazon listings for the same category of products as those offered by the Complainant.

6. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, Complainant contends that the disputed domain name reproduces the POSSINI trademark in its entirety with the mere addition of the descriptive term "lighting", which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. According to Complainant, the addition of such term actually reinforces the association with Complainant, as its POSSINI trademark is used precisely in connection with lighting products. Therefore, according to Complainant, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's trademark, fulfilling paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

Complainant affirms that Respondent is not known by the disputed domain name, has no business relationship with Complainant, and has not been licensed or otherwise authorized to use the POSSINI trademark or to register any domain name incorporating it. Complainant further argues that Respondent's use of the disputed domain name does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use, particularly considering that the related website prominently displays Complainant's trademark and proprietary images and gives the impression of being affiliated with or authorized by Complainant. Therefore, Complainant states that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, fulfilling paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

Also, Complainant urges that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Complainant argues that Respondent must have been aware of Complainant and its POSSINI trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name, considering that the website related to the disputed domain name reproduces the POSSINI trademark and Complainant's copyrighted product images. Respondent intentionally seeks to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's trademark. In particular, "Check Price" and "Learn More" buttons on the website redirect Internet users to Amazon listings through an affiliate advertising program.

Complainant further contends that the website creates the false impression that it is operated by, affiliated with, or otherwise authorized by Complainant, while diverting Internet users for Respondent's own commercial benefit. Thus, according to Complainant, the requirements for the finding of bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name have been fulfilled, pursuant to paragraphs 4(a)(iii) and 4(b) of the Policy.

Accordingly, Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to Complainant.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

7. Discussion and Findings

To succeed in a UDRP complaint, Complainant must demonstrate that all the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been satisfied, as following:

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

Respondent had 20 days to submit a response in accordance with paragraph 5(a) of the Rules and failed to do so. Paragraph 5(f) of the Rules establishes that if a respondent does not respond to the complaint, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the panel's decision shall be based upon the complaint.

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 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.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 POSSINI trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. Although the addition of the term "lighting" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that such addition does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8. Also, in this sense, see *BODUM Intercompany AG and Pi-Design AG v. huai jun zhang, zhanghuai jun*, Case No. [D2024-2051](#); and *Ansell Healthcare Products Inc. v. Australian Therapeutics Supplies Pty, Ltd.*, Case No. [D2001-0110](#).

Therefore, based on the available record, 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 Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on Complainant, panels have recognized that proving 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 respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name, although the burden of proof always remains on complainant. If respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent has not rebutted 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 available record, Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and has not been authorized by Complainant to use the POSSINI trademark. There is also no evidence of any business or other relationship between the Parties that would justify Respondent's registration or use of the disputed domain name.

Moreover, the disputed domain name resolves to a website that prominently displays Complainant's POSSINI trademark and copyrighted product images and gives the impression of being affiliated with or authorized by Complainant. The website also contains links redirecting Internet users to Amazon listings through an affiliate advertising program. Such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

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

Moreover, the additional term "lighting" in the disputed domain name is descriptive of the products offered by Complainant under the POSSINI trademark. Therefore, the Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

In light of these circumstances, the Panel finds that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, 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 Respondent registered the disputed domain name incorporating Complainant's POSSINI trademark in its entirety, together with the term "lighting", which directly relates to the products offered by Complainant under the mark. Furthermore, based on the available record, Respondent has no affiliation with Complainant and has not been authorized or licensed to use the POSSINI trademark.

Respondent evidently knew or should have known of Complainant and its prior trademark rights at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. In particular, the website associated with the disputed domain name prominently displays the POSSINI trademark and reproduces Complainant's copyrighted product images. The website also contains references to Lamps Plus (Complainant) as a retailer and to the proprietary nature of Complainant's products, which further demonstrates Respondent's awareness of Complainant and its business.

Considering Complainant's activities, the composition of the disputed domain name, and the manner in which it has been used, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and has been used with the intention of taking advantage of Complainant's POSSINI trademark and attracting Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website at the disputed domain name.

In similar circumstances involving same Complainant and its POSSINI trademarks, a previous panel found bad faith where the respondent reproduced Complainant's trademarks and copyrighted product images on the website associated with the domain name in order to mislead Internet users and derive financial advantage. See *Lamps Plus, Inc. v. Ivanov Roman*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-0786](#).

As stated in the Complaint and shown in its annexes, the website related to the disputed domain name displays Complainant's POSSINI trademark and product images and contains "Check Price" and "Learn More" buttons redirecting Internet users to Amazon listings through an affiliate advertising program. Such use supports a finding that Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's trademark, within the bad faith meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Therefore, based on the available record, the Panel finds that Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

8. 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 <possini-lighting.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Gabriel F. Leonardos/

Gabriel F. Leonardos

Sole Panelist

Date: September 2, 2026