ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
P&P Imports LLC v. 杨勇波 (yongbo), 博思云科技（浙江）有限公司 (Boss Cloud Technology (Zhejiang) Co., Ltd.); 蒋伍珍 (jiangwuzhen)
Case No. D2026-3500

1. The Parties

The Complainant is P&P Imports LLC, United States of America ("United States"), internally represented.

The Respondents are 杨勇波 (yongbo), 博思云科技（浙江）有限公司 (Boss Cloud Technology (Zhejiang) Co., Ltd.), and 蒋伍珍(jiangwuzhen), China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <gosportsindoorgames.com> and <gosportsgood.com> are registered with Xin Net Technology Corp. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 7, 2026. On August 7, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name <gosportsindoorgames.com>. 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 <gosportsindoorgames.com> which differed from the named Respondent (redacted) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 17, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar for the disputed domain name <gosportsindoorgames.com>, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint in English on August 25, 2026.

On August 17, 2026, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. The Complainant did not submit any further comment regarding its request that English be the language of the proceeding provided in the Complaint. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant's submission.

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 in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 28, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 17, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 24, 2026.

The Center appointed Hong Yang as the sole panelist in this matter on October 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.

On October 12, 2026, the Center received an enquiry from the Complainant regarding the addition of the disputed domain name <gosportsgood.com>.

Under the instruction of the Panel, on October 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name <gosportsgood.com>. On October 13, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name <gosportsgood.com> and confirmed the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name <gosportsgood.com> is in Chinese.

On October 15, 2026, the Panel issued Procedural Order No. 1 in Chinese and English, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar for the disputed domain name <gosportsgood.com>, giving the Complainant until October 20, 2026, to amend the Complaint by adding the disputed domain name <gosportsgood.com> and providing any further arguments in view thereof including a request for consolidation of multiple Respondents, and giving the Respondents until October 27, 2026, to respond to the Complainant's submission. The Complainant submitted an amended Complaint in English in response to Procedural Order No. 1 on October 16, 2026. Due to an apparent issue with the notification, the Center forwarded Procedural Order No. 1 to the email address of the Respondent for the disputed domain name <gosportsgood.com> on October 21, 2026. The Respondents did not respond to Procedural Order No. 1.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is an American company that develops, markets, and sells sporting goods, games, recreational products, pool products, pet products, and related consumer goods under its "GoSports", "GoSports Outdoors" and numerous product-specific brands. The Complainant promotes its business online through various domain names, including <playgosports.com> and <gosportsoutdoors.com>.

The Complainant owns trademark registrations containing the term "Gosports", including the following:

- United States Registration No. 4802471 for GOSPORTS (word), registered on September 1, 2015; and

- United States Registration No. 5865310 for GOSPORTS (word), registered on September 24, 2019.

The disputed domain names <gosportsindoorgames.com> and <gosportsgood.com> were respectively registered on October 13, 2025 and on September 2, 2026. Both disputed domain names have resolved to websites purporting to offer for sale the Complainant's various GOSPORTS products, as well as products under other marks registered by the Complainant, most of which have been offered at discounted prices. Both websites have prominently featured the Complainant's GOSPORTS mark, with their footer sections displaying "© GoSports" and "© 2026 GoSports", respectively. On the website under the disputed domain name <gosportsindoorgames.com>, some of the Complainant's product images and promotional pictures

have been used. On the website under the disputed domain name <gosportsgood.com>, the top banner has featured the statement "Up to 60% off", with the "About Us" section prominently displaying "Welcome to GoSports" as its main title.

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. In particular, the Complainant asserts that one of the Respondents have been found in bad faith in other UDRP proceedings, including *Hershey Chocolate & Confectionery LLC v. 杨勇波 (yongbo), 博思云科技（浙江）有限公司 (Boss Cloud Technology (Zhejiang) Co., Ltd.)*, WIPO Case No. D2026-0512 and *Alani Nutrition LLC v. 杨勇波 (yongbo), 博思云科技（浙江）有限公司 (Boss Cloud Technology (Zhejiang) Co., Ltd.)*, WIPO Case No. D2026-1625.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Procedural Issues

A. Addition of the Domain Name

The Complainant requested the addition of a second disputed domain name following Complaint notification. While such requests are generally not encouraged post-notification, here the Panel finds it appropriate to consider the Complainant's request, noting that the disputed domain name <gosportsgood.com> was registered shortly after formal commencement of the proceeding, its similar use compared with that of <gosportsindoorgames.com>, and the Panel's discussion under the consolidation section below. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.12.2.

B. Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder. In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 4.11.2. As regards common control, the Panel notes the following:

- Both websites have been used for offering GOSPORTS products for sale, covering overlapping product categories, with numerous products displayed at discounted prices.

- Both disputed domain names have shared a similar composition style with the mark GOSPORTS at the beginning followed by a descriptive term or terms, and both websites have similarly presented the GOSPORTS mark prominently in the header area.

- Both websites shared certain unusual or erroneous wording, together with identical pricing schemes. For example, (1) both websites used the specific inconsistent designation “Blue(White)” in the title of the “GoSports Splash Hoop Classic Swimming Pool Basketball Game”, displaying the same discounted price of USD 47.99 against an original price of USD 79.99 in crossed-out format; (2) catalogs on both websites preserved the unusual wording “Indoor(-) our(-)Outdoor Use” in the title of the GoSports Freestanding Volleyball Training Net; (3) catalogs on both websites used certain identical unusual common title formatting, including “5 ftx4 ftPRO” for a GOSPORTS golf practice hitting mat.

- Common features in registration procedures: (1) chronology: the additional disputed domain name <gosportsgood.com> was registered on September 2, 2026, five calendar days after the Notification of Complaint and Commencement of Administrative Proceeding for the disputed domain name <gosportsindoorgames.com>, dated on August 28, 2026; (2) Registrar: both disputed domain names were registered through the same registrar, and both used Cloudflare DNS services associated with Cloudflare's AS13335 network.

The Panel therefore considers it more likely than not that the disputed domain names are under common control.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party, especially considering the fact that no responses have been submitted and given the evidence of targeting discussed below.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as “the Respondent”) in a single proceeding.

C. Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreements for the disputed domain names is Chinese. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint and amended Complaint were filed in English. The Complainant has requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including the fact that: (1) both disputed domain names use English words; (2) both of the associated websites present product descriptions and promotion content in the English language, apparently targeted at English-speaking Internet users; and (3) conducting the matter in English is fair and efficient.

The Respondent has, moreover, been notified by the Center, in both Chinese and English, of the commencement of the proceeding, including information regarding the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not make any submissions with respect to the language of the proceeding, nor did the Respondent file any Response in Chinese or English.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties’ ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (WIPO Overview 3.1, section 4.5.1).

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

6.2 Substantive Issues

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, "indoorgames" or "good" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such 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 notes that the available record shows that the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant or otherwise authorized to use the GOSPORTS mark. There is no evidence indicating that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain names.

Both disputed domain names have resolved to websites purportedly offering for sale the Complainant's products, mostly at discounted prices, with some discounts as high as 60% off. Both websites have prominently displayed the GOSPORTS mark in their top banners, without any accurate and prominent disclaimer regarding the relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent, and instead have used identity-related statements such as "© GoSports" and "© 2026 GoSports", respectively. Moreover, the website under the disputed domain name <gosportsindoorgames.com> has used the Complainant's product images and promotional pictures, while the other website under the disputed domain name <gosportsgood.com> has prominently displayed the terms "Welcome to GoSports" as the main title in its

"About Us" section. The Panel considers that such use of the disputed domain names shows the Respondent's intention to impersonate the Complainant, giving the misleading impression that the websites are affiliated with or authorized by the Complainant, and thereby trading off the Complainant's GOSPORTS mark. Thus, the Respondent's use of the disputed domain names cannot constitute any bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names. 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 has used the Complainant's GOSPORTS mark in full in the disputed domain names without any authorization, merely adding the terms of "indoorgames" or "good". The Complainant's trademark is widely used in its industry, and the Complainant's registration and use of its mark predate the Respondent's registrations of the disputed domain names by years. The websites under the disputed domain names have purportedly offered for sale the Complainant's products with its GOSPORTS mark prominently displayed in the top banners. Thus, the Panel considers that the Respondent knew or should have known of the Complainant's mark at the time of registering the disputed domain names. These circumstances signal the Respondent's intention to target the Complainant and capitalize on its GOSPORTS mark.

Further, considering the use of the disputed domain names analyzed in section 6.2B. above, the Panel finds that 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 mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's websites. The disputed domain names were thus registered and are being used in bad faith, according to 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 <gosportsindoorgames.com> and <gosportsgood.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Hong Yang/
Hong Yang
Sole Panelist
Date: November 1, 2026