

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

YKK Corporation v. Shiv Sharma

Case No. D2026-2953

1. The Parties

The Complainant is YKK Corporation, Japan, represented by Com Laude Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Shiv Sharma, United Arab Emirates.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ykk-me.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 6, 2026. On July 6, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 8, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 9, 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 9, 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 20, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 9, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 12, 2026.

The Center appointed William A. Van Caenegem 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, YKK Corporation, is a Japanese company headquartered in Tokyo, Japan. It is one of the world's largest manufacturers of zippers, and also produces plastic hardware, architectural products and industrial machinery. It was founded in 1934 and is active in 70 countries with 142 affiliates and 818 business locations. The Complainant's group employs 56,000 people, the majority in Japan. For the fiscal year ended March 31, 2026, the Complainant reported consolidated net sales of approx. USD 6.2 billion.

The Complainant has an extensive global trademark portfolio which includes Reg. No. 0375275 for YKK in Japan, registered on April 28, 1949 in class 26; Reg. No. 865610 for YKK in the United States of America ("United States") registered on March 4, 1969 in class 26; Reg. No. 000110163 for YKK in the European Union, registered on August 26, 1998 in classes 6, 7, 18, 19, 26, and 42; and Reg. No. 941376 for YKK in the United Kingdom registered on April 18, 1969 in class 26.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 9, 2025, and resolves to an active website that reproduces the Complainant's YKK trademark, logo, and tagline "Little Parts. Big Difference". throughout, and presents itself under the heading "About the YKK Brand".

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 comprised entirely of its YKK trademark with the addition of a single hyphen and the adornment "me", which might be intended to allude to the "Middle East". The Complainant adds that the addition of this geographical adornment does not sufficiently distinguish the disputed domain name from the Complainant's trademark. No dictionary meaning can be ascribed to "ykk", and therefore the requirements of the first element have been met, the Complainant maintains.

The Complainant says that it has found no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known as "ykk" or "ykk me" prior to or after the registration of the disputed domain name, and it has found no evidence that the Respondent owns any trademark rights in "ykk" or "ykk me", nor that the Respondent has ever legitimately traded under the business name "ykk" or "ykk me". The Respondent is not authorized, licensed, affiliated or in any other way permitted to use the YKK brand or name, the Complainant confirms.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent's website reproduces the Complainant's YKK trademark, logo, and tagline throughout, and holds itself out under the name "YKK Middle East", including in the website's copyright notice, without the Respondent having any right to assume the Complainant's trademark or trading style. The disputed domain name is therefore not used in connection with the bona fide offering of goods or services, the Complainant says. The Complainant adds that this use of its own genuine material by the Respondent serves only to reinforce the false impression of affiliation created by the latter's website. The Respondent also solicits Internet users' personal data by way of a contact form, by impersonating the Complainant, which cannot be a bona fide activity, the latter asserts. By adopting many distinctive elements of the Complainant's marks and names, presenting links to the Complainant's genuine catalogs, and soliciting Internet users' information, all in the absence of a disclaimer, the Respondent misleads and

confuses Internet users, the Complainant says, which cannot equate to a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Further, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is in and of itself confusing for Internet users, and that seeing the disputed domain name in search engine results, such users would reasonably assume that the corresponding website was operated by the Complainant. That confusion would be reinforced for Internet users who arrive at the website, due to its above described similarity to the Complainant's web presence and the unauthorized adoption of its distinctive brand elements. The relevant website lacks any disclaimer that would dispel the confusion of Internet users, the Complainant says. It further contends that the Respondent has intentionally sought to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion. The Complainant adds that given the use of the disputed domain name it is inconceivable that the Respondent did not have the Complainant firmly in mind when it registered the disputed domain name.

The Complainant then concludes that on balance, in all the above mentioned circumstances, taken singly or cumulatively, it is more likely than not that the disputed domain name was registered and used in bad faith in terms of the Policy.

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 YKK trademark of the Complainant is recognizable within the disputed domain name.

Although the addition of other terms here the acronym "me" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term here 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 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 an illegitimate activity, here, claimed as the establishment of a copycat site including the Complainant's brand, tag lines, and links to its legitimate catalog 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 notes that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark. The Respondent chose to register a domain name that incorporates the very distinctive YKK trademark of the Complainant, which had been long in use around the globe by that time. The Respondent also added the acronym "me" for Middle East, and established a connected website that replicates distinctive brand elements, slogans, and links to the Complainant's genuine catalogs, all without any disclaimer of a legitimate connection with the Complainant, and including further false suggestion that the website represents the presence of the Complainant in the Middle East. The attempt by the Respondent to set up the website to which the disputed domain name resolves as an instrument for collecting confidential data from Internet users, is a further indication of bad faith use. The Panel concludes that 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 <ykk-me.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/William A. Van Caenegem/

William A. Van Caenegem

Sole Panelist

Date: August 28, 2026