ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
LF, LLC v. Shan Arain
Case No. D2026-3263

1. The Parties

Complainant is LF, LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Markmonitor Limited, United Kingdom.

Respondent is Shan Arain, Pakistan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <kobalttoolsbox.com> 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 23, 2026. On July 24, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 24, 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 named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on July 28, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on July 31, 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 August 6, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 26, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 28, 2026.

The Center appointed Gabriel F. Leonardos as the sole panelist in this matter on September 2, 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 is a wholly owned subsidiary of Lowe’s Companies, Inc. (“Lowe’s”), on whose behalf it owns and manages intellectual property rights, including the trademarks relevant to the present proceeding.

Lowe’s is a United States company and, according to Complainant, a Fortune 100 home improvement company, being the world’s second largest home improvement retailer. Together with its subsidiaries, Lowe’s employs approximately 300,000 associates and operates more than 1,750 home improvement stores, 540 branches, and 120 distribution centers.

Among the brands used by Lowe’s is the KOBALT trademark, which is associated with power tools, outdoor power equipment, and tool storage products. Lowe’s maintains a dedicated online storefront for KOBALT products, and the domain name <kobalt.com> redirects Internet users to such storefront.

Complainant owns the following trademark registrations for KOBALT:

Registration Number	Jurisdiction	Trademark	International Classes	Registration Date
119064	Dominican Republic	KOBALT	2, 8 and 9	April 15, 2001
2695975	United States	KOBALT	6, 7, 8, 11 and 20	March 11, 2003
833855	International Trademark	KOBALT	6, 7, 8, 9, 11 and 20	December 22, 2003
UK00903536232	United Kingdom	KOBALT	6, 7, 8, 9, 11 and 20	March 22, 2005

The disputed domain name was registered on May 13, 2025. Complainant has provided evidence that the disputed domain name resolved to a website displaying Complainant’s KOBALT-branded product and marketing images and giving the appearance of a website associated with the KOBALT brand displaying “KOBALT Tools Box ® Official Website”. The website contained links redirecting Internet users to Amazon and displayed a notice indicating participation in Amazon’s affiliate advertising program. At the moment of this Decision, the disputed domain name is inactive.

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.

Notably, Complainant contends that the disputed domain name incorporates the KOBALT trademark in its entirety, with the mere addition of the terms “tools” and “box”, which are directly related to the products offered under Complainant’s trademark. Therefore, according to Complainant, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant’s trademark, fulfilling paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

Complainant affirms that Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, owns no trademark rights over the “kobalt” term, and has not been licensed or otherwise authorized to use Complainant’s trademark.

Complainant further argues that Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use, particularly considering that the website previously associated with the disputed domain name displayed Complainant's KOBALT trademark and copyrighted product and marketing images, while redirecting Internet users to a third-party online marketplace through an affiliate advertising program.

Therefore, Complainant states that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, fulfilling paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

Also, Complainant urges that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. According to Complainant, Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's KOBALT trademark. In particular, the website gave the appearance of being associated with Complainant, did not contain any disclaimer clarifying the lack of relationship between the Parties, and redirected Internet users to Amazon through an affiliate advertising program from which Respondent likely benefited financially.

Complainant further contends that Respondent has been involved in several previous UDRP proceedings concerning trademark-abusive domain name registrations, including prior cases involving Complainant and its KOBALT trademark, all of which resulted in the transfer of the respective domain names. According to Complainant, such circumstances further support a finding of a pattern of bad faith conduct by Respondent. Complainant also notes that, following takedown measures, the disputed domain name ceased resolving to an active website and is currently being passively held.

Thus, according to Complainant, the requirements for the finding of bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name have been fulfilled, pursuant to paragraphs 4(a)(iii) and 4(b) of the Policy. Accordingly, Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to Complainant.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed in a UDRP complaint, Complainant must demonstrate that all the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied, as following:

(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 has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The burden of proving these elements is upon Complainant.

Respondent had 20 days to submit a response in accordance with paragraph 5(a) of the Rules and failed to do so. Paragraph 5(f) of the Rules establishes that if a respondent does not respond to the complaint, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the panel's decision shall be based upon the complaint.

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. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds that 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 KOBALT trademark 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 the terms "tools" and "box" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that the addition of such terms do 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. Also, in this sense, see *BODUM Intercompany AG and Pi-Design AG v. huai jun zhang, zhanghuai jun*, WIPO Case No. D2024-2051; and *Ansell Healthcare Products Inc. v. Australian Therapeutics Supplies Pty, Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. D2001-0110.

Therefore, based on the available record, 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 Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on 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 respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name, although the burden of proof always remains on complainant. If respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, 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.

Based on the available record, Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and has not been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted by Complainant to use the KOBALT trademark. There is also no evidence of any business or other relationship between the Parties that would justify Respondent's registration or use of the disputed domain name.

Moreover, the disputed domain name was used in connection with a website that displayed Complainant's KOBALT trademark, product and marketing images, and even Lowe's customer service email address, thereby giving the impression of being affiliated with or authorized by Complainant, and effectively misrepresented to be an official website for Complainant's products and redirected users to third-party offerings. Such conduct exceeds any potential claim of a bona fide reseller or distributor use and instead amounts to impersonation of Complainant. In these circumstances, the requirements of the Oki Data test (See *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. D2001-0903) are not met, and Respondent is found to have no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 2.13.1 and 2.8.1. The Panel further notes that the composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation, as it combines Complainant's KOBALT trademark with terms directly related to Complainant's products. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.1.

In light of these circumstances, the Panel finds that no rights or legitimate interests can be found on behalf of Respondent.

Accordingly, 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 Respondent registered the disputed domain name incorporating Complainant's KOBALT trademark in its entirety, together with the terms "tools" and "box", which are directly related to the products offered by Complainant under the mark. Furthermore, based on the available record, Respondent has no affiliation with Complainant and has not been authorized or licensed to use the KOBALT trademark.

Respondent evidently knew or should have known of Complainant and its prior trademark rights at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. In particular, the website previously associated with the disputed domain name prominently displayed the KOBALT trademark, reproduced Complainant's product and marketing images, and even displayed Lowe's customer service email address and misrepresented to be an official store for the Complainant's products. These circumstances demonstrate Respondent's awareness of Complainant, its trademark, and its business at the time the disputed domain name was registered and used.

Considering Complainant's activities, the composition of the disputed domain name, and the manner in which it has been used, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and used with the intention of taking advantage of Complainant's KOBALT trademark and attracting Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website.

As stated in the Complaint and shown in its annexes, the website related to the disputed domain name displayed Complainant's trademark and copyrighted material, while containing links redirecting Internet users to Amazon through an affiliate advertising program from which Respondent could derive commercial benefit. Such circumstances support a finding that Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's trademark. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.4. See *DNV AS v. Andrade Neves*, WIPO Case No. D2025-5198.

Furthermore, the record shows that Respondent has been involved in previous UDRP proceedings concerning trademark-abusive domain name registrations, including previous proceedings involving Complainant's KOBALT trademark, which resulted in the transfer of the disputed domain names. In the view of the Panel, such conduct demonstrates a pattern of abusive domain name registrations and further supports a finding of bad faith. Previous panels have held that establishing a pattern of bad faith conduct requires more than one, but as few as two instances of abusive domain name registration. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.2.

Finally, the fact that the disputed domain name no longer resolves to an active website does not prevent a finding of bad faith.

Therefore, based on the available record, the Panel 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 <kobalttoolsbox.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Gabriel F. Leonardos/
Gabriel F. Leonardos
Sole Panelist
Date: September 23, 2026