ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Arista Networks Inc. v. he jxing
Case No. D2026-2911

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Arista Networks Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by 101domain.com, United States.

The Respondent is he jxing, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <aristasupply.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 2, 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 the named Respondent (Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 10, 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 17, 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 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 12, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 14, 2026.

The Center appointed Willem J. H. Leppink as the sole panelist in this matter on August 18, 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 following facts are undisputed.

The Complainant was founded in 2004 and provides technological products and software solutions for monitoring and network detection and response worldwide. The Complainant has over a dozen offices and delivers its computer networking services to Fortune 500 customers located across six continents.

The Complainant has been operating in the computer networking sector for nearly two decades, building worldwide brand recognition around its trademark ARISTA with an extensive range of network switches and operating system products distinctively promoted under this trademark.

The Complainant owns the following registrations for its ARISTA trademark: European Union Trademark Registration No. 008473721 for the mark ARISTA, registered on February 1, 2010, in classes 9 and 42; and United State Trademark Registration No. 4,893,674 for the mark ARISTA, registered on January 26, 2016, in classes 9, 41 and 42, with a claim of first use date in commerce in 2008.

The Complainant's primary website, at "www.arista.com", provides global access for online customers all over the world and maintains over one hundred domain names consisting of country code Top-Level Domain ("ccTLD") and generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") variations of the trademark ARISTA including <arista.cm>, and<aristastaffing.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 22, 2026, and the Complainant has provided evidence that it resolved to a website which displayed and promoted identical software products and services as the Complainant is known for and includes the ARISTA brand. The "Contact Us" page on this website lists the Complainant's own domain in the email address to purportedly contact the Respondent. After the Complaint was filed and at the time of rendering this Decision, the disputed domain name did not resolve to an active 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 the following.

By merely adding the generic term "supply" to the Complainant's trademark, the Respondent is purposefully attempting to impersonate the Complainant's supply chain and procurement operations for fraudulent means and to cause confusion. The term "supply" is particularly deceptive because it suggests to industry vendors that the disputed domain name is associated with the Complainant's legitimate supply chain activities.

The Complainant has consistently and consecutively used its trademark for over 16 years prior to the disputed domain name's recent registration in April of this year. With its customer base spanning all over the world, the Complainant's corporate brand is devoted to the trademark ARISTA and should be permitted to reflect its trademark accordingly without the confusion of the disputed domain name. . Additionally, the Respondent actively sought to create confusion in the online marketplace by inappropriately displaying and promoting identical software products and services the Complainant's company is renowned for under the ARISTA brand. The Respondent's "Contact Us" page on its website even listed the Complainant's own domain in the email address, namely [….]@arista-networks.com.

This fraudulent misrepresentation not only capitalizes on the Complainant's notorious brand recognition but also demonstrates the Respondent's blatant intention to confuse companies and target unassuming vendors with the disputed domain name.

The Complainant became aware of the Respondent's domain name registration due to the Complainant's proactive brand monitoring and diligence. On April 24, 2026, the Complainant's representative promptly filed an abuse complaint with the Registrar and hosting provider, providing the infringing evidence, to request the disputed domain name's suspension and revocation of email services. The disputed domain name remained active for some time despite the Complainant's multiple follow-ups with the providers, but since May 2026, the disputed domain name seems to have been suspended.

The Respondent fraudulently used the disputed domain name to confuse companies who associate the trademark and the Complainant's corporate name through abusive, cybersquatting tactics.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not 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.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced 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.

Although the addition of other terms, here "supply", 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 disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8.

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 Panel also notes that there is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy. 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed impersonation or other types of fraud, 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.

In the present case, the Panel finds that the Respondent clearly targeted the Complainant and its trademark by operating a website that attempts to impersonate the Complainant. As such, the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed impersonation or other types of fraud, constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4. The current non-use of the disputed domain name does not prevent this finding.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 <aristasupply.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Willem J. H. Leppink/
Willem J. H. Leppink
Sole Panelist
Date: August 24, 2026