

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Cabrio International Inc. and iSpring Water Systems, LLC v. 郭洪山 (guo hong shan)

Case No. D2026-3514

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Cabrio International Inc., Marshall Islands, and iSpring Water Systems, LLC, United States of America, represented by Noblitt & Newson, PLLC, United States of America.

The Respondent is 郭洪山 (guo hong shan), China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ispringofficial.com> is registered with Alibaba Cloud Computing Ltd. d/b/a HiChina (www.net.cn) (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 10, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 11, 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 (Unknown Respondent, The RDAP server redacted the value) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on August 16, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainants to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainants filed an amended Complaint in English on August 18, 2026.

On August 16, 2026, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. On August 18, 2026, the Complainants confirmed their request that English be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainants' submission.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended 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 21, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 10, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 12, 2026.

The Center appointed Linda Chang as the sole panelist in this matter on September 18, 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 Complaint was filed by two Complainants. The First Complainant is Cabrio International Inc., and the Second Complainant is iSpring Water Systems, LLC (collectively, the "Complainants"). The Second Complainant is the authorized licensee of the First Complainant.

The First Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for ISPRING trademark, including:

- The United States of America Trademark  Registration No. 5999442, registered on March 3, 2020, in class 11;
- The United States of America Trademark ISPRING Registration No. 6004783, registered on March 10, 2020, in class 11; and
- The United States of America Trademark ISPRING Registration No. 7171157, registered on September 19, 2023, in class 37.

The Complainants state that they have been using the ISPRING trademark in the fields of water treatment and water purification.

The Complainants own the domain name <ispringfilter.com>, which incorporates their ISPRING trademark. The domain name was registered on February 13, 2007, and has been used as the Complainants' official website for promoting their products and business.

The Respondent is reportedly based in China. The disputed domain name was registered on May 15, 2026, and resolves to a website displaying the Complainants' ISPRING trademark, the logo "  " which is almost identical to the Complainants'  trademark, and images copied from the Complainants' official website. The website purportedly offers the Complainants' water treatment and water purification products and includes links that redirect Internet users to webpages on the Amazon e-commerce platform where the Complainants' products are offered.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainants

The Complainants contend that they have satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainants contend that:

- the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainants' ISPRING trademark. The disputed domain name consists of the Complainants' ISPRING trademark, the generic term "official", and the generic

Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.com”. The additional term “official” and the gTLD “.com” do not distinguish the disputed domain name from the ISPRING trademark. The content on the website associated with the disputed domain name can also affirm a finding of confusing similarity;

- the Respondent has no connection with the Complainants. The Complainants have not authorized the Respondent to use the ISPRING trademark;

- the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name is attempting to trade on the goodwill and reputation of the Complainants and the ISPRING trademark to create confusion to Internet users, thereby misleading them into believing that the disputed domain name and the associated website are connected with, or otherwise affiliated with the Complainants;

- the content on the website associated with the disputed domain name indicates that the Respondent had actual knowledge of the Complainants and their ISPRING trademark when registering the disputed domain name. Moreover, as the Complainants’ ISPRING trademark was registered predating the registration of the disputed domain name, and the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainants’ ISPRING trademark, the Respondent should have known the Complainants and their ISPRING trademark at the time of registering the disputed domain name; and

- the disputed domain name resolves to a website that imitates the Complainants by using the ISPRING trademark and images copied from the Complainants’ official website. Such use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainants’ contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Procedural Issue - Language of the Proceedings

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name 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 was filed in English. The Complainants requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including the fact that 1) the disputed domain name consists of English words; 2) the content on the website associated with the disputed domain name is in English, which indicates that the Respondent is able to understand English; and 3) there are no foreseeable circumstances indicating that the use of English as the language of the proceeding would result in unfairness or prejudice.

The Respondent did not make any submissions with respect to the language of the proceeding.

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 of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ([“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 Complainants' trademark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainants have shown rights in respect of the ISPRING trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The gTLD “.com” as a standard registration requirement may be disregarded in the assessment of confusing similarity under the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

The entirety of the Complainants' ISPRING trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. While the term “official” is included, the Complainants' ISPRING trademark remains clearly recognizable in the disputed domain name. The Panel finds that the addition of the term “official” does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the ISPRING trademark. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the ISPRING trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 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.

The information in the case file shows that:

- the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainants and has not been authorized to use the Complainants' ISPRING trademark in any form;
- there is no evidence proving that the Respondent holds any trademark rights corresponding to the disputed domain name, or has been commonly known by the disputed domain name;
- the disputed domain name resolves to a website displaying the Complainants' ISPRING trademark, the logo “ ” which is almost identical to the Complainants'  trademark, and images copied from the Complainants' official website. The website purportedly offers the Complainants' water treatment and water purification products, without prominently and accurately disclosing the absence of relationship between the Parties and includes links that redirect Internet users to webpages on the Amazon e-commerce platform where the Complainants' products are offered. Such use of the disputed domain name indicates the Respondent's intention to divert Internet traffic to the website associated with the disputed domain name by misleading Internet users into believing that the website associated with the disputed domain name is

operated or endorsed by the Complainants, which cannot be deemed as a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use;

- the composition of the disputed domain name, incorporating the Complainants' ISPRING trademark, together with the term "official" which could suggest that the disputed domain name and the associated website are connected with the Complainants' official website, when considered alongside the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name, supports a finding of the Respondent's intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainants' trademark as to the origin or affiliation of the website associated with the disputed domain name; and
- no other factors demonstrate any rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in the disputed domain name.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainants have established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainants' 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.

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 Complainants obtained the trademark registration for ISPRING as early as March 3, 2020, which predates the registration date of the disputed domain name (May 15, 2026). According to the Complainants' evidence and the Panel's own search¹, the Panel accepts that the Complainants and their ISPRING trademark have gained a certain degree of reputation and recognition in the fields of water treatment and water purification. As stated under section 6.2 B, the Respondent not only registered the disputed domain name that fully incorporates the Complainants' ISPRING trademark, but also make it resolve to a website that is displaying the Complainants' ISPRING trademark, the logo "  " which is almost identical to the Complainants'  trademark, as well as images that are copied from the Complainants' official website. The website purportedly offers the Complainants' water treatment and water purification products and includes links that redirect Internet users to webpages on the Amazon e-commerce platform where the Complainants' products are offered. In view of these circumstances, the Panel determines that the Respondent had actual knowledge of the Complainants and the ISPRING trademark when registering the disputed domain name, and bad faith is found.

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.

In view of the content presented on the website associated with the disputed domain name, as described above, the Panel finds that the Respondent, by selecting a domain name that is confusingly similar to the Complainants' ISPRING trademark and using it as reflected on the website, clearly intended to attract Internet users to the disputed domain name and associated website for commercial gain. This was achieved by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainants' ISPRING trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website. Such conduct constitutes bad faith registration and

¹ *Noting the general powers of a panel articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the UDRP Rules, panels may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record if they would consider such information useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.8.

use within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The Panel finds that the Complainants have 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 <ispringofficial.com> be transferred to the Complainants.

/Linda Chang/

Linda Chang

Sole Panelist

Date: October 2, 2026