

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Sealy Technology LLC v. wu sheng
Case No. D2026-2956

1. The Parties

Complainant is Sealy Technology LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Vice Cox & Townsend PLLC, United States.

Respondent is wu sheng, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <sealyposturepedicmattress.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 6, 2026. On July 7, 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 (Dynadot Privacy Service, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on July 13, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on July 14, 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 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. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on August 11, 2026.

The Center appointed Georges Nahitchevansky 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. Factual Background

Complainant, Sealy Technology LLC, manufactures and markets visco-elastic foam mattresses, cushions, pillows, sofas furniture and other comfort products and accessories. Complainant owns and uses the marks SEALY and SEALY POSTUREPEDIC in connection with its products and owns trademark registrations for such in the United States. These include, inter alia, registrations for (i) SEALY as word mark (Registration Nos. 1,733,089, 2,271,114, and 2,953,348, which issued to registration on November 17, 1992, August 17, 1999 and May 17, 2005 respectively), and (ii) SEALY POSTUREPEDIC as a word mark (Registration No. 6,936,508, which issued to registration on December 27, 2022). Complainant also owns and uses the domain name <sealy.com> for a website that provides information concerning Complainant and its products.

Respondent appears to be based in the United States. Respondent registered the disputed domain name on December 11, 2025. At some point thereafter, Respondent began using the disputed domain name for a website that features Complainant's SEALY mark and logo, copies images of Complainant's mattress products and text regarding such, and which purports to offer Complainant's mattress products for purchase through Amazon. According to the evidence on record, the website indicated "Sealy® Official Site." That website remains currently accessible at the disputed domain name.

5. 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.

Complainant asserts that its SEALY and SEALY POSTUREPEDIC marks are well known on account of the widespread and continuous use of those marks, particularly the SEALY mark, since 1889. Complainant also asserts that it has strong rights in its SEALY and SEALY POSTUREPEDIC marks on account of the trademark registrations it holds for such.

Complainant maintains that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its SEALY and SEALY POSTUREPEDIC marks as each of these marks are fully incorporated in the disputed domain name with the non-distinguishing word "mattress."

Complainant contends that Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name as Respondent (i) did not obtain any authorization or license from Complainant to use its SEALY and SEALY POSTUREPEDIC marks in the disputed domain name, (ii) is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and (iii) is using such for a "copy-cat website of Complainant's websites" for purposes of making sales through Amazon.com.

Lastly, Complainant argues that Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith given that Respondent was likely aware of Complainant's rights in its well-known SEALY and SEALY POSTUREPEDIC marks when it registered the disputed domain name and then used such to attract and redirect Internet users to Respondent's website. In that regard, Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name which includes the SEALY mark with the word "mattress", a term specifically associated with Complainant's products, creates a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of Respondent's website.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed Complainant must satisfy the Panel that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights;
- (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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. See section 1.7, Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)).

Complainant has shown rights in its SEALY and SEALY POSTUREPEDIC marks for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1. Here, both the SEALY and SEALY POSTUREPEDIC marks are fully incorporated and clearly visible in the disputed domain name. Although the addition of the term "mattress" may bear on the 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 Complainant's marks for 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 a 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 Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent, who has chosen not to appear in this proceeding, 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

Here, the disputed domain name fully incorporates Complainant's exact SEALY and SEALY POSTUREPEDIC marks with the common word "mattress," a product that Complainant is known for. As such, the disputed domain name is likely to be mistakenly seen by consumers as related to or associated with Complainant and/or its products and services. Additionally, the disputed domain name resolves to a website that essentially impersonates Complainant and purports to offer for sale Complainant's mattress products through Amazon. The website, for example, prominently features Complainant's SEALY logo, copies images and text from Complainant's website, and displays Complainant's products without any disclaimer or explanation regarding the lack of connection between Respondent and Complainant. On the contrary, it indicates that it is the "official" site.

Although it is not clear from the evidence submitted and the Panel's own review¹ whether Respondent's website actually sells genuine or counterfeit versions of Complainant's mattress products through Amazon, as none of the links to "Buy on Amazon" are currently active, the evidence before the Panel suggests that the website was created to imply an official channel of Complainant for its products, which is not the case. Respondent's lack of legitimacy is further underscored by the fact that Respondent has failed to come forward with any evidence justifying its actions of using a domain name that conjures up Complainant for a website that passes itself off as connected to Complainant.

In all, the evidence before the Panel makes it more likely than not that Respondent has used the disputed domain name and associated website to attract and mislead consumers into believing there is a connection with Complainant when none exists. Such use of the disputed domain name for the profit of Respondent is not a legitimate interest. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) at section 2.5.3.

The Panel thus 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 view of Respondent's actions, and failure to appear in this proceeding, it appears more likely than not that Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name, which is clearly based on Complainant's SEALY and SEALY POSTUREPEDIC marks, has been done opportunistically and in bad faith for the benefit or profit of Respondent. The disputed domain name and associated website essentially impersonate Complainant, was registered well after Complainant had established rights in its SEALY and SEALY POSTUREPEDIC marks, and appears to have been used as part of a scheme for Respondent's benefit. Such use of the disputed domain name to attract unsuspecting consumers for profit, and possibly an illicit scheme, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 3.1.4.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

¹ Noting in particular the general powers of a panel articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, it has been accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.8.

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 <sealyposturepedicmattress.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Georges Nahitchevansky/

Georges Nahitchevansky

Sole Panelist

Date: September 2, 2026