

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Panda Restaurant Group, Inc. v. saaloni gori
Case No. D2026-3122

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Panda Restaurant Group, Inc., United States of America, represented by Marq Vision Inc., United States of America.

The Respondent is saaloni gori, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <pandaexpresssurvey.bond> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 16, 2026. On July 16, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 17, 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 (Unknown Registrant) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 21, 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 23, 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 August 7, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 27, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 3, 2026.

The Center appointed Miguel B. O'Farrell as the sole panelist in this matter on September 15, 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, Panda Restaurant Group, Inc., is a globally recognized company in the restaurant industry, particularly through its flagship brand, Panda Express. Established as a pioneer in Asian-inspired dining, Panda Express operates in thousands of locations across multiple countries, serving millions of customers worldwide, particularly in the United States and Asia.

The Complainant owns several trademark registrations for PANDA EXPRESS in many jurisdictions, including the following.

European Union Trademark Registration No. 000214445 PANDA EXPRESS, registered on September 26, 2002, in classes 29 and 42;

European Union Trademark Registration No. 018129034 PANDA EXPRESS, registered on March 31, 2020, in classes 25, 29, 30, 32, 35 and 43; and

United States of America Trademark Registration No. 4919042 PANDA EXPRESS, registered on March 15, 2016, in classes 29 and 30.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 9, 2025, and resolves to a webpage that at the bottom of the page includes the following statement: "Disclaimer: We are not affiliated with Pandaexpress.com/feedback or Panda Express. References to 'Pandaexpress.com/feedback' are solely to help users understand the Panda Express customer survey". Nevertheless, the website contains links that redirect users to an entirely unrelated third-party website and operates third-party advertisements.

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.

- In particular, the Complainant contends that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name;
- The Respondent has not acquired trademark or service mark rights;
- There is no relationship or affiliation between the Complainant and the Respondent which might give rise to any license, permission, or other right by which the Respondent could own or use any domain name incorporating the Complainant's "PANDA EXPRESS" marks; and
- The Respondent is not engaged in a bona fide offering of goods or services but has used the disputed domain name in connection with a website that misleads consumers into believing that the Respondent is the Complainant and continues to hold the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Therefore, the Complainant requests the Panel to issue a decision ordering the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

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, "survey" 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 will discard the Top-Level Domain ("TLD") ".bond" from its confusing similarity test and 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 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.

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.

The Panel is satisfied that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant's trademark PANDA EXPRESS when it registered the disputed domain name on October 9, 2025. By that time the Complainant had extensively registered and used the trademark PANDA EXPRESS in many jurisdictions.

In accordance with section 3.1.4 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), the Panel considers that the inclusion of the Complainant's widely known PANDA EXPRESS trademark in the disputed domain name, by the Respondent who has no relationship with the Complainant, creates a presumption of bad faith registration. The Respondent, when registering the disputed domain name, targeted the Complainant's business and its trademark PANDA EXPRESS, with the intention to confuse Internet users and capitalize on the fame of the Complainant's trademark for its own benefit.

The Panel considers that the disclaimer at the bottom of the page to which the disputed domain resolves is not sufficient to avoid Internet users confusion and to prevent them from thinking that it is related to or sponsored by the Complainant.

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 <pandaexpresssurvey.bond> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Miguel B. O'Farrell/

Miguel B. O'Farrell

Sole Panelist

Date: September 21, 2026