

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Boise Cascade Company v. he jxing
Case No. D2026-3395

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Boise Cascade Company, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Hawley Troxell Ennis & Hawley LLP, United States.

The Respondent is he jxing, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <boisecascadeus.com> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) 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 31, 2026. On August 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On August 10, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 10, 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 August 10, 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 11, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 31, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 1, 2026.

The Center appointed Marilena Comanescu as the sole panelist in this matter on September 9, 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, established in Delaware, United States, is a manufacturer of wood products and wholesale building materials distributor.

The Complainant holds trademark rights for BOISE CASCADE, such as the following:

- the United States Trademark Registration number 3983005 for BOISE CASCADE (word), filed on December 17, 2009, registered on June 28, 2011, covering goods in International classes 9 and 19; and
- the United States Trademark Registration number 4171883 for BOISE CASCADE (word), filed on December 17, 2009, registered on July 10, 2012, covering goods and services in International classes 6 and 35.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on March 24, 2026, and, at the time of filing the Complaint, it was used in relation to a commercial website displaying the Complainant's trademark, prominently presenting on the home page "Boise Cascade Engineered Wood Products" and promoting similar goods and services to those of the Complainant. Such website also claims copyright protection and lists the Complainant's official headquarters address in Idaho, United States.

The Respondent has been the subject of multiple prior UDRP proceedings in which panels ordered the transfer of domain names incorporating third-party trademarks and most of them used to mimic the official websites of the trademark owners¹. See for example *Arista Networks Inc. v. he jxing*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-2911](#); *Munters AB v. he jxing*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-2930](#); and *AGFA-GEVAERT N.V. v. he jxing*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-2333](#), and cases cited therein.

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 confusingly similar to its BOISE CASCADE trademark since it incorporates the mark in its entirety. The addition of the geographic term "us" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy;
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name particularly because: (i) the Respondent is not a licensed nor authorized user of the Complainant's mark, there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name or that the Respondent operates any legitimate business or organization under the Disputed Domain Name; (ii) the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name 48 years after the Complainant established rights in its BOISE CASCADE trademark; and (iii) the website under the Disputed Domain Name offers goods and services that are

¹ See Panel's powers to conduct limited searches. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.8.

identical to and compete with the Complainant's goods and services. By diverting traffic to its own website, the Respondent is using the Complainant's trademark for its own commercial purposes, that is, to attract business from the Complainant, misleadingly divert members of the public, and/or damage the reputation and business of the Complainant;

- the Respondent's registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name is in bad faith for the following main arguments: (i) the nature of the Disputed Domain Name, which incorporates the Complainant's well-known trademark in its entirety plus the descriptive geographic term "us," corresponding directly to the Complainant's area of activity in the United States; (ii) the content of the website to which the Disputed Domain Name resolves, which closely mimics the Complainant's official online presence (at the domain name <bc.com>) by reproducing identical products and services and listing the Complainant's Boise, Idaho headquarters address; (iii) a clear absence of any rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent's part, coupled with no credible explanation for the choice of this particular disputed domain name; and (iv) other indicia of targeting, including the comprehensive impersonation of the Complainant's branding, goodwill, and commercial offerings.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove on the balance of probabilities that:

- (i) the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Disputed Domain Name has been 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 [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](#), sections 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable 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.

While the addition of other terms, here "us", 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 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 the 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 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.

According to the evidence, the Respondent has used the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a website promoting goods and services identical to those of the Complainant, displaying the Complainant’s trademark and headquarters’ address, presenting itself as being “Boise Cascade Engineered Wood Products”, without providing any disclaimer regarding the relationship (in fact the lack thereof) between the Respondent and the Complainant. UDRP panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (such as claimed impersonation, and passing off) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel also notes that the composition of the Disputed Domain Name itself carries a risk of implied affiliation given that the Complainant’s trademark has been reproduced in the Disputed Domain Name, together with the term “us”, which can be understood as an abbreviation for the United States, where the Complainant is established at and provides its goods and services.

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 finds that the Disputed Domain Name was registered in bad faith, with knowledge of the BOISE CASCADE trademark and the Complainant, because it fully incorporates the mark which predates the registration of the Disputed Domain Name by about 40 years, together with the geographical term “us”, directly related to the Complainant’s location and where the Complainant provides its goods and services. Further, the use of the Disputed Domain Name reinforces such finding.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent’s registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy provides that the use of a domain name to intentionally attempt “to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [the respondent’s] website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of [the respondent’s] website or location or of a product or service on [the respondent’s] website or location” is evidence of registration and use in bad faith.

By creating a website comprised of the BOISE CASCADE mark, displaying the Complainant's trademark, address, offering identical goods and services to those offered by the Complainant, presenting itself as "Boise Cascade Engineered Wood Products", indicates, in this Panel's view, that the Respondent has intentionally sought to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark to access the website at the Disputed Domain Name and to believe that the website is held, controlled by, or somehow affiliated or related to the Complainant, for its commercial gain.

The use of a domain name for illegal activity such as claimed impersonation, and passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent and it is considered evidence of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

The Panel further notes the involvement of the Respondent in numerous past UDRP proceedings, as detailed under section 4 above, reinforces such finding. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.2.

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

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, <boisecascadeus.com>, be transferred to the Complainant.

/Marilena Comanescu/

Marilena Comanescu

Sole Panelist

Date: September 22, 2026