

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fiery, LLC v. abde benh
Case No. D2026-3163

1. The Parties

Complainant is Fiery, LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Squire Patton Boggs (US) LLP, United States.

Respondent is abde benh, United States, self-represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <cadllink.com> is registered with DreamHost, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 17, 2026. On July 20, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 20, 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, Proxy Protection LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on July 21, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on July 22, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 30, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 19, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on August 21, 2026. Subsequently, on the same date, Respondent sent email communications to the Center

The Center appointed Georges Nahitchevansky as the sole panelist in this matter on August 27, 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, Fiery, LLC, is a California, United States based company that specializes in digital front end and workflow solutions for industrial and graphic arts print industries. In 2022, Complainant acquired the CADLINK brand and business from CADlink Technology Corp. The CADLINK name and brand has been used to designate software, printing, digital cutting, engraving and graphics business.

The CADLINK business in turn offers specific software products that have their own names and marks such as DIGITAL FACTORY, ENGRAVELAB, PROFILELAB and SIGNLAB. Complainant also has registered trademark in Canada for CADLINK No. TMA644428 and CAD-LINK No. TMA408612 registered on July 15, 2005, and February 26, 1993, respectively. Complainant currently offers such aforementioned products on its website at <fiery.com>.

Respondent appears to be based in the United States, although Respondent's website at the disputed domain name features an address in Bordeaux, France. Respondent registered the disputed domain name on February 16, 2026. At some point thereafter, Respondent started to use the disputed domain name for a website that featured the CADLINK mark and logo and which offered Complainant's CADLINK DIGITAL FACTORY software product at a substantially reduced price.

On June 3, 2026, Complainant sent Respondent a demand letter regarding the disputed domain name and associated website. Respondent apparently responded to that letter on June 23, 2026, and advised that the disputed domain name would be shut down. However, at some point thereafter, Respondent started to use the disputed domain name as a redirect to a website at <cadlinkdtf.com> that likewise features the CADLINK mark and logo and which offers Complainant's CADLINK DIGITAL FACTORY software product at a substantially reduced price. That redirect from the disputed domain name to the website at <cadlinkdtf.com> continues to this date.

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 maintains that it has rights in the CADLINK mark by virtue of (i) its use, and that of its predecessor in interest, of the CADLINK name and mark in conjunction with its software, printing, digital cutting, engraving and graphics business, and (ii) the trademark registrations it owns for the CADLINK mark.

Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its CADLINK mark as it merely differs with the insertion of an additional letter "l" before the term "link."

Complainant asserts that Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name as Respondent (i) has not been given permission to use the CADLINK mark, and (ii) registered the disputed domain name well after Complainant and its predecessor in interest had established rights in the CADLINK mark.

Lastly, Complainant argues that Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith as the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's CADLINK mark and is being used to attract Internet users to Respondent's website "that offers highly related professional printing software" and has done so by packaging its products "in a highly similar manner as Complainant's products". Complainant further argues that it sent a demand letter on June 3, 2026 and that the owner of the disputed domain name responded on June 23, 2026, and advised that "the domain would be permanently shut down". However, notwithstanding that representation, the disputed domain name has remained active.

Complainant also notes that a copy of its demand letter was sent to an address in Bordeaux, France that appeared on the website at the disputed domain name and that the party who received the letter, a local distributor of CADLINK professional printing software, advised that it "does not own or operate the <cadlink.com> domain name". Finally, Complainant asserts that Respondent's website at the disputed domain name requires users who attempt to buy the software being offered for sale to insert personal information such as name, email, street address and credit card information, and that some consumers who purchased products from Respondent's website did not receive any product.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not formally reply to Complainant's contentions, but sent an email to the Center after the Center had noticed Respondent's default on August 21, 2026. In that email, Respondent advised that after receiving Complainant's demand letter, it voluntarily discontinued the previous use of the disputed domain name and ceased hosting a website at the disputed domain name and, instead, used the disputed domain name as a redirect to a "newly acquired domain name operated by Respondent". Respondent also notes that it had attempted to resolve the matter with Complainant before this proceeding was initiated and that while it had advised that it was willing to transfer the disputed domain name if documented out-of-pocket expenses related to the "domain registration, hosting service, and associated costs were reimbursed", Complainant declined that proposal and proceeded with the UDRP.

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 the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. See section 1.7, WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)").

Complainant has shown rights in its CADLINK mark for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

Here, the disputed domain name is nothing more than a typo version of the CADLINK mark that merely adds an extra letter "l" before the word "link". Such addition of one letter in the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity as the disputed domain name is nothing more than an intentional misspelling of the CADLINK mark. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's CADLINK mark for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.9.

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 Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent 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, there is no evidence that Respondent has been licensed or otherwise authorized to use Complainant’s CADLINK mark or to register a domain name incorporating the CADLINK mark and/or that Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. Respondent has not provided anything that would show otherwise.

In addition, Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name belies any claim that Respondent has a legitimate interest in the disputed domain name or is making a bona fide offering of goods and services as contemplated in such cases as *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#). First, Respondent registered the disputed domain name that, on its face, carries a risk of implied affiliation with Complainant and its CADLINK software products. Second, the website that Respondent posted at the disputed domain name, and to which the disputed domain name currently redirects to, prominently features the CADLINK mark and logo and includes text and images that suggests that the website is connected to Complainant’s CADLINK business. For instance, the website includes an “About Us” page that states the following: “Welcome to Cadlink, your trusted source for digital printing software solutions”. The website also claims to offer an “official license” and “lifetime license” for the software being sold and includes an address in Bordeaux, France that it unconnected to Respondent, but which is an address for an authorized distributor of Complainant’s CADLINK software. Third, the website has a glaring absence of any disclosure regarding the operator of the website or Respondent’s lack of affiliation with or authorization from Complainant. In their totality, the disputed domain name and Respondent’s website are designed to heighten the likelihood that a consumer would believe Respondent’s website is affiliated with, authorized by, or otherwise connected to Complainant, when such is not the case.

Lastly, it is not altogether clear whether or not the CADLINK software products offered on Respondent’s website are legitimate. Respondent’s offerings copy Complainant’s own depictions of its products and prominently include the CADLINK mark along with the product name of the specific CADLINK product, such as DIGITAL FACTORY, but offers them at steeply discounted prices. Moreover, when a user attempts to make a purchase the user must provide much personal information and credit card information. Given that Respondent chose not to respond to Complainant’s assertion that some consumers who purchased products from Respondent’s website did not receive any product, such assertion in combination with the elements noted above does create a cloud as to whether the products being sold are legitimate or illicit copies, or if the website is being used for some illicit purpose.

In all, the disputed domain name and its associated website are likely to be mistakenly seen by consumers as related to Complainant and its CADLINK mark for the benefit of Respondent. To be sure, Respondent is not operating on the level of a legitimate reseller. As such, the Panel finds it more likely than not that Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

[WIPO Overview 3.1](#) at sections 2.5. and 2.8.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that, for 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 the questionable legitimacy of the CADLINK software products being sold by Respondent, it appears that Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name, which is clearly based on Complainant's CADLINK mark, has been done opportunistically and in bad faith for the benefit or profit of Respondent. The disputed domain name on its face suggests a connection to Complainant and its CADLINK products and was registered well after Complainant had established rights in its CADLINK mark. Respondent's bad faith is also underscored by Respondent's registration of a typo version of the CADLINK mark.

Additionally, Respondent's bad faith is further established by Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to attract and redirect web users to Respondent's website to sell purported CADLINK software products at discounted prices for Respondent's profit. That Respondent is using the disputed domain name in bad faith is heightened by the likelihood that the appearance and content of the website to which the disputed domain name resolves to, as already noted, may be seen as authorized by, affiliated with or controlled by Complainant, when such is not the case. Further underscoring Respondent's bad faith is the fact that Respondent even after receiving a demand letter from Complainant made no changes to its website and simply reposted such at a new domain name that is also based on the CADLINK name and mark and continued to use the disputed domain name as a redirect to that new domain name and website.

In all, Respondent's actions make it quite evident that Respondent was fully aware of Complainant and its CADLINK name and mark when Respondent opportunistically registered the disputed domain name for the benefit of Respondent.

The Panel thus finds that 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 <cadllink.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Georges Nahitchevansky/

Georges Nahitchevansky

Sole Panelist

Date: September 10, 2026