ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
AAMP of Florida, Inc. d/b/a Stinger v. henris henris
Case No. D2026-3409

1. The Parties

The Complainant is AAMP of Florida, Inc. d/b/a Stinger, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Fredrikson & Byron, PA, United States.

The Respondent is henris henris, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <pacaudiotech.com> is registered with TuringSign Inc. d/b/a Cosmotown (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 6, 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 (John Doe/Unknown, The RDAP server redacted the value) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 11, 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 11, 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 19, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 8, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 9, 2026.

The Center appointed Joseph Simone as the sole panelist in this matter on September 11, 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, AAMP of Florida, Inc. d/b/a Stinger, is a global supplier of after-market car supplies and the current owner of the PAC brand of car audio equipment. The PAC brand was established in 1976. The Complainant promotes the PAC brand products via its website "www.pac-audio.com" and sells its products via authorized dealers.

The Complainant has the following trade mark registration for PAC, namely:

- United States trade mark Registration No. 4,004,256 (word mark) in Class 9, registered on August 2, 2011.

The Complainant has also used the following PAC logos on its product packaging, website, and other promotional materials:



The disputed domain name was registered on January 22, 2026.

The Complainant has submitted evidence showing that the disputed domain name resolved to a website prominently displaying the Complainant's trademark and logo, purportedly offering the Complainant's products, with the intention to impersonate the Complainant.

At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name resolves to an error page.

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 registered by the Respondent is confusingly similar to the Complainant's PAC mark, and that the addition of descriptive words such as "audio", which appears in the Complainant's own domain name, and "tech", do not help to distinguish the source of the goods.

The Complainant asserts that it has not authorized the Respondent to use the PAC mark, and there is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent has used, or has undertaken any demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Complainant also claims that there is no evidence that the Respondent has any connection to the PAC mark, and that there is no plausible good faith reason for the Respondent to have registered the disputed domain name. The Complainant therefore argues that the registration and any use of the disputed domain name must be in bad faith.

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 trade mark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 1.7.

The Panel acknowledges that the Complainant has established rights in the PAC trade mark. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

Disregarding the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com", the disputed domain name is comprised of the term "pac", which is identical to the Complainant's PAC trade mark. The inclusion of the other terms, here, "audio" and "tech" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 1.7, 1.8, and 1.11.1.

The Panel therefore finds that the Complainant has satisfied the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy in establishing its rights in the PAC trade mark and in showing that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its mark.

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 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.

In this case, the Complainant asserts that it has not authorized the Respondent to use its trade mark and there is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent has used, or undertaken any demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Respondent did not file a response and has therefore failed to assert factors or put forth evidence to establish that it enjoys rights or other legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent is not affiliated or connected with the Complainant in any manner, and the Complainant has not granted the Respondent any license or authorization to use or register a domain name incorporating the Complainant's PAC trade mark. The Respondent did not respond to the Complaint and did not provide any information or factors that could potentially establish prior rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Furthermore, there is no evidence indicating that the

Respondent has engaged in any legitimate noncommercial or bona fide use of the disputed domain name. The Complainant has presented evidence linking the disputed domain name to a website imitating the Complainant, which supports a finding that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel notes that the website to which the disputed domain name resolved displayed the Complainant's PAC mark and logo. The Complainant also claims that the Respondent has used the Complainant's product images on the website, to which the Respondent has not objected. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for impersonation can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1.

Accordingly, based on the Panel's findings, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The third and final element that a complainant must prove is that the respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy states that any of the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, shall be considered as evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith:

(i) circumstances indicating that the respondent registered or acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant (the owner of the trade mark or service mark) or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or

(ii) circumstances indicating that the respondent registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trade mark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) circumstances indicating that the respondent has registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) circumstances indicating that the respondent is using the domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its 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 its website or location.

The examples of bad faith registration and use set forth in paragraph 4(b) of the Policy are not meant to be exhaustive of all circumstances in which bad faith may be found. Other circumstances may also 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.

For reasons discussed under this and the preceding heading, the Panel believes that the Respondent's conduct in this case constitutes bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name. In the present case, the Panel observes that the disputed domain name <pacaudiotech.com>, is composed of the Complainant's PAC trade mark, together with the terms "audio" and "tech", which describes the Complainant's business activities.

Considering the registration of the disputed domain name, which reproduces the Complainant's PAC trade mark, together with additional elements directly related to the Complainant's business, the Panel finds that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's rights in the PAC trade mark and business.

Moreover, the Complainant has provided evidence that the Respondent used the disputed domain name to imitate the Complainant without authorization, including the use of the Complainant's trade mark and logo and product images on the website at the disputed domain name. Panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name for impersonation constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4. Upon review of the record, the Panel finds that both the registration and use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent constitute bad faith under the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(iii) 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 <pacaudiotech.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Joseph Simone/
Joseph Simone
Sole Panelist
Date: September 25, 2026