

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Mano LLC (d/b/a Sharkbanz) v. hao Chen
Case No. D2026-2889

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Mano LLC (d/b/a Sharkbanz), United States of America, self-represented.

The Respondent is hao Chen, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <sharrkbanz.shop> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 2, 2026. On July 2, 2026, 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 which differed from the named Respondent (See PrivacyGuardian.org) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 6, 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 7, 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 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 Tobias Zuberbühler as the sole panelist in this matter on August 14, 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 producer of wearable shark-deterrent products and related goods established in 2012.

The Complainant owns numerous SHARKBANZ trademarks, including International Trademark No. 1266369 (registered on August 6, 2015).

The disputed domain name was registered on June 23, 2026, and resolves to a website displaying the SHARKBANZ trademark and logo and purporting to offer the Complainant's products for sale.

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.

B. Respondent

The Respondent has not submitted any 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 shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

A domain name is "identical or confusingly similar" to a trademark for the purposes of the Policy when the domain name includes the trademark, or a confusingly similar approximation, regardless of other terms in the domain name (*Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Richard MacLeod d/b/a For Sale*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0662](#)). This includes the addition of the letter "r" in the Complainant's SHARKBANZ trademark, which is considered a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of a trademark (i.e., "typosquatting"). See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9.

The Panel finds that 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 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 that 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 finds that the composition of the disputed domain name incorporating the Complainant's trademark with an additional letter "r", coupled with the use of the disputed domain name to resolve to a website purporting to be affiliated with the Complainant, does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Panel finds that the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Under the circumstances of this case, including the composition and use of the disputed domain name as described above, it can be inferred that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademark when registering the disputed domain name.

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, 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.

Having reviewed the available record and noting the composition of the disputed domain name and the use made thereof, the Panel finds that the use of the disputed domain name creates a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. In particular, the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to present itself as the Complainant, while using the Complainant's trademark and purportedly offering and promoting products under the brand of the Complainant, demonstrates an intention to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark. Therefore, the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 <sharkbanz.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Tobias Zuberbühler/

Tobias Zuberbühler

Sole Panelist

Date: August 28, 2026