

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Trumpf SE + Co. KG v. he jxing
Case No. D2026-3432

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Trumpf SE + Co. KG, Germany, represented by Eisenführ Speiser Patentanwälte Rechtsanwälte PartGmbB, Germany.

The Respondent is he jxing, China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <trumpfsupply.com> and <trumpfttech.com> are registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 3, 2026. On August 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On August 6, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 6, 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 7, 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 Manoel J. Pereira dos Santos as the sole panelist in this matter on September 10, 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

Pursuant to the information provided in the Complaint, the Complainant is the owner of an international portfolio of registrations for the mark TRUMPF, protected as a word mark and as figurative marks (in colour and in black/white) across the jurisdictions relevant to the disputed domain names, including China, the European Union, and the United States of America (the “U.S”).

The registrations relied upon, which predate the registration of the disputed domain names, are the following:

TRADEMARK	JURISDICTION	REGISTRATION NUMBER	REGISTRATION DATE	IC CLASS (ES)
TRUMPF	China	19148639	September 7, 2018	07
TRUMPF	China	25773566	August 21, 2018	07
TRUMPF	China	289994	June 19, 1987	07
TRUMPF	China	291110	June 29, 1987	07
TRUMPF	China	295850	August 9, 1987	09
TRUMPF	U.S	1365229	October 15, 1985	07
TRUMPF	U.S	3006862	October 18, 2005	12, 42
TRUMPF	U.S	2915566	January 4, 2005	07, 09, 37, 41
TRUMPF	European Union	009335456	April 1, 2011	6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 20, 35, 36, 37, 40, 41, 42

The Complainant asserts that the mark TRUMPF has been used continuously since 1923 and enjoys a substantial reputation in the field of industrial machine tools, laser technology and related products and services. The Complainant also has an online presence through the use of its primary domain name <trumpf.com> which incorporates the mark TRUMPF.

The disputed domain name <trumpftech.com> was registered on February 27, 2026, and the disputed domain name <trumpfsupply.com> was registered on April 24, 2026.

The Respondent appears to be an individual located in China. No other relevant information about the Respondent is available.

The disputed domain names have been used to resolve to websites headed “TRUMPF | Industrial Laser Systems & Solutions...” and “TRUMPF – Industrial Fiber Laser Cutting Systems”, displaying the TRUMPF mark and claiming to have been operated “since 1923”, and purportedly offering industrial machine tools and laser technology tools for sale.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that each disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant’s TRUMPF mark in its entirety as their first, dominant and only distinctive element since the TRUMPF mark is

fully reproduced in both domain names. The addition of the merely descriptive terms “tech” (an abbreviation of “technology”) and “supply” does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity where the relevant trademark is recognizable. In fact, the added terms reinforce an association with the Complainant by evoking the Complainant’s field of activity and thereby heightening rather than dispelling the likelihood of confusion. The generic Top-Level Domain “.com” is a standard registration requirement and is disregarded for the purposes of the confusing-similarity assessment under the first element.

The Complainant further argues that the Respondent has no relationship whatsoever with the Complainant because the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant, is not a licensee of the Complainant, and has never been authorized, permitted or otherwise consented to by the Complainant to register or use the TRUMPF mark or any domain name incorporating it. The Complainant also contends that, before any notice of the dispute, there is no evidence of any use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. On the contrary, the disputed domain names resolve to websites that are represented as an official TRUMPF web presence, creating the false impression of being operated or authorized by the Complainant. The Complainant asserts that the use of a domain name that is confusingly similar to a complainant’s mark to falsely suggest an affiliation with, or endorsement by, the trademark owner cannot confer rights of legitimate interests on a respondent. In addition, the Complainant contends that the Respondent holds no trademark or other rights in the term “Trumpf”.

Finally, the Complainant asserts that the TRUMPF mark is an invented, highly distinctive and well-known designation used continuously since 1923 and that it is inconceivable that the Respondent registered two domain names incorporating the TRUMPF marks entirely combined with the terms describing the Complainant’s field of activity without knowledge of the Complainant. The Complainant argues that registration of a domain name that is confusingly similar to a well-known mark by an unaffiliated party is, in these circumstances, indicative of bad faith. In addition, by using the disputed domain names to host websites that present themselves as an official TRUMPF web presence, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s TRUMPF mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of those websites and of the products or services offered thereon. The Complainant asserts that this impersonation of the Complainant constitutes a paradigm case of bad-faith use.

The Complainant requests that the disputed domain names be transferred to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that a complainant must prove each of the following three elements in order to succeed in its complaint:

- (i) the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and
- (iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

The burden of proof of each element is borne by the Complainant. The Respondent’s default does not by itself mean that the Complainant is deemed to have prevailed. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ([“WIPO Overview 3.1”](#)), section 4.3.

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 names. [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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are 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 the descriptive terms "tech" and "supply", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such descriptive terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names 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 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 names. 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 names 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 notes that the disputed domain names are composed of a term which is identical to the Complainant's trademark with the addition of descriptive terms ("tech" and "supply", respectively). Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is confusingly similar to a well-known trademark, and particularly in the case of coined or fanciful marks, can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

In the present case, taking into account the composition of the disputed domain names, the distinctive reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the use to which the disputed domain names have been put, the Panel is satisfied that the Respondent knew of and targeted the Complainant's trademark when it registered the disputed domain names.

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.

The Panel finds that the Respondent is using the disputed domain names to confuse unsuspecting Internet users looking for the Complainant's products and services, and to mislead Internet users as to the source of the disputed domain name and its website. This demonstrates an intent to capitalize on the fame and goodwill of the Complainant's trademark.

Therefore, having reviewed the record and on the balance of the probabilities, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitute bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

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 names <trumpfsupply.com> and <trumpfttech.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Manoel J. Pereira Dos Santos/

Manoel J. Pereira Dos Santos

Sole Panelist

Date: September 24, 2026