

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

JPW Industries Inc. v. liu jun

Case No. D2026-3445

1. The Parties

The Complainant is JPW Industries Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Holland & Knight LLP, United States.

The Respondent is liu jun, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <thebaileighindustrial.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 4, 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 (Respondent Information Hidden By Privacy Service) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 7, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint.

On August 10, 2026, the Center sent an email communication to the Complainant and Respondent advising that the registration of the disputed domain name expired on July 10, 2026, and noting ICANN's policy that if a domain name registration expires during a proceeding under the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Policy" or "UDRP"), the Complainant or Registrant is permitted the opportunity to renew or restore the registration to prevent deletion. The Complainant responded by email on August 10, 2026 that the Complainant was in the process of renewing the registration of the disputed domain name. On August 13, 2026, the Registrar confirmed by email that the registration of the disputed domain name had been restored. On August 25, 2026, the Center sent an email communication to the Registrar asking for confirmation that the registrant details for the disputed domain name had not changed upon restoration. The Registrar sent an email communication to the Center on August 26, 2026 confirming that the registrant details had not changed.

The Center verified that the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the 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 September 2, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 22, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 23, 2026.

The Center appointed Michelle Brownlee as the sole panelist in this matter on September 29, 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 was incorporated in Washington, United States, and, since 1999, has operated a retail business specializing in designing, manufacturing, importing, supplying, or otherwise providing industrial metalworking machinery under the BAILEIGH and BAILEIGH INDUSTRIAL marks.

The Complainant owns registrations for the BAILEIGH INDUSTRIAL word mark and for a stylized logo that incorporates the words BAILEIGH INDUSTRIAL in the United States and other countries, including the following registrations:

United States Registration Number 3429714, registered on May 20, 2008, for the mark BAILEIGH INDUSTRIAL for goods in international classes 7 and 8;

United States Registration Number 4314032, registered on April 2, 2013, for the mark BAILEIGH INDUSTRIAL for goods in international class 7; and

United States Registration Number 7171271, registered on September 19, 2023, for the mark BAILEIGH INDUSTRIAL and design (see below) for goods in international classes 7 and 8.



The Complainant owns the domain name <baileigh.com>, which it uses to operate an online marketplace for its products.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on July 10, 2025. The disputed domain name resolved to a web site that displays the Complainant’s logo and states: “Discover Baileigh Industrial’s premium metalworking and woodworking machinery. From lathes and presses to saws and benders, Baileigh offers precision, durability and innovation, for professionals and businesses seeking top-tier fabrication solutions.”

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 the Complainant's BAILEIGH INDUSTRIAL trademarks, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in respect of the disputed domain name, and the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Complainant argues that the Respondent's web site is designed to create the false impression that the web site is the Complainant's official web site for the purpose of enticing site visitors into making purchases of products from the Respondent's site that are never delivered.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

As a preliminary matter, the Panel notes that the Complainant did not amend the Complaint to reflect the name of the registrant after being informed by the Center of the name and contact information provided by the Registrar. While the Center encourages complainants to amend their complaints when the original complaint names a proxy service and the registrant's name is subsequently provided by the registrar, the Center does not treat the lack of an amendment in such cases as a deficiency. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.4.1. The Panel finds that the Respondent in this matter is "Liu Jun".

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. [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 entirety of the mark 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 other terms, here, "the", 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 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 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed passing off as the Complainant's web site to entice users to enter financial information to make purchase orders that are not fulfilled, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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 the Respondent is using the disputed domain name in connection with a web site that uses the Complainant's trademark and logo for the apparent purpose of deceiving site visitors into believing they are making purchases from the Complainant. The Complainant has demonstrated bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy in that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed passing off as the Complainant's web site to entice users to enter financial information to make purchase orders that are not fulfilled constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under 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 name <thebaileighindustrial.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Michelle Brownlee/

Michelle Brownlee

Sole Panelist

Date: October 12, 2026