

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Pitney Bowes Inc. v. Gina Yu
Case No. D2026-3554

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Pitney Bowes Inc., United States of America (or “US”), represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Gina Yu, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <pitneybowes.online> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 11, 2026. On August 11, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 13, 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 amended Complaint on August 14, 2026.

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 of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 26, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 15, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 28, 2026.

The Center appointed Stefan Abel as the sole panelist in this matter on September 30, 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 is a technology mailing company providing, in particular, digital shipping solutions and presort mailing services. Founded in 1920, the Complainant was listed on the New York Stock Exchange (NYSE) in 1950 and nowadays employs thousands of employees in 50 countries all over the globe.

The Complainant has registered its primary domain name <pitneybowes.com> in 1995 serving as its communication platform with its customers. In addition, the Complainant maintains accounts on social media platforms such as Facebook and Twitter under its company name and trademark PITNEY BOWES. Entering the Complainant's trademark into search engines such as Google yields multiple results referencing the Complainant and its business.

Correspondingly, the Complainant owns several trademark registrations for PITNEY BOWES concerning in particular, goods for mailing services and related services such as US trademark No. 899476, registered on September 29, 1970, United Kingdom trademark registration No. UK 00001286553, registered on May 18, 1992 and European Union trade mark registration 00079525 registered on April 15, 1998.

The disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent on April 12, 2026. The site connected to the disputed domain name does not contain any active content. It only displays the notice "This domain is registered. But may still be available." as well as a link, marked "Get this domain" inviting to make a purchase offer.

The Complainant sent by its representatives of this proceeding warning letters to the privacy address indicated in the Registrar's Whois information requesting transfer of the disputed domain name. No response was received.

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 PITNEY BOWES trademarks in which the Complainant has rights. It is standard practice when comparing a disputed domain name to complainant's trademarks, to not take the Top-Level Domain extension into account. The Second-Level Domain of the disputed domain name consists solely of the Complainant's PITNEY BOWES trademark, resulting in a domain name that is identical to the Complainant's PITNEY BOWES trademark. The disputed domain name must therefore be considered confusingly similar, given its visual and phonetical similarity to the Complainant's PITNEY BOWES trademark.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use the Complainant's trademarks in any manner. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name as indicated by the Whois information shielding the identity of the registrant by a privacy service. The lack of rights and legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name is further reflected by the website the disputed domain name directs to, lacking content and only displaying a purchase link.

The Complainant finally contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Considering that the Complainant and its PITNEY BOWES trademarks have been used since as early as 1921 and are known internationally, the composition of the disputed domain name makes it illogical to believe that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without specifically targeting the Complainant. Passively holding a domain name can constitute a factor in finding bad faith registration and use pursuant to the Policy. Further, the Respondent is currently offering to sell the disputed domain name constituting bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy as the Respondent has demonstrated an intent to sell, rent or otherwise transfer the disputed domain name for valuable consideration in excess of its out-of-pocket expenses. According to the Complainant, the employment of a privacy service to hide the identity of the Respondent as well as the Respondent's failure to respond to the cease-and-desist letters sent by the Complainant indicate bad faith registration and use, too.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark PITNEY BOWES and that paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy is satisfied. The Second-Level domain only lacks the space between the word elements PITNEY and BOWES of the Complainant's trademarks and is, apart from that, identical. The disputed domain name is therefore, on its Second-Level, phonetically identical to the Complainant's trademarks and visually nearly identical.

The generic Top-Level Domain ".online" does not affect the finding of confusing similarity as it is viewed as a standard registration requirement.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

There is no indication that the Respondent is licensed or otherwise authorized by the Complainant to use its registered trademarks or register the disputed domain name.

Neither the elements "pitney" and "bowes" of the disputed domain name nor their combination in the disputed domain name do have any apparent generic or descriptive meaning. To the contrary, they appear to be inherently distinctive with no conceptual meaning; in particular, the combination of both inherently distinctive elements is particularly inherently distinctive and does not have any descriptive character. Further, it is not apparent that the Respondent is commonly known under "pitney bowes".

The Panel therefore finds that the Complainant has met the elements of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy. The Complainant has successfully made out a prima facie case. The burden of production of evidence under this element therefore shifts to the Respondent to come forward with appropriate allegations and evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. See, e.g., *Accor v. Eren Atesmen*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-0701](#). The Respondent has failed to do so. Passive holding of a domain name per se does not constitute legitimate, commercial or fair use (*Lennar Pacific Properties Management, Inc., Lennar Corporation v. Badboi ot*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-1419](#)).

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the element of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, and met the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy too, for the following reasons:

The passive holding does a priori not prevent the finding of registration and use in bad faith, according to previous UDRP Panel decisions, such as *Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0003](#); *Intel Corporation v. The Pentium Group*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-0273](#).

PITNEY BOWES does not have any apparent descriptive or generic meaning. It combines two elements that are both inherently distinctive.

The Complainant's trademark PITNEY BOWES is internationally well known. PITNEY BOWES has been extensively used internationally since many decades and, since many years before the registration of the disputed domain name, on the Internet, too.

Considering the non-descriptive and well-known character of the Complainant's trademark and its presence on the Internet as well as the identity of each element of the Complainant's trademark and their nearly identical combination (only the space between the elements is missing, but which in domain names composition is impossible to have anyway) in the disputed domain name, and the high similarity with the Complainant's official domain name <pitneybowes.com>, it is not conceivable to the Panel that the Respondent could have registered the disputed domain name without having the Complainant and its trademark in mind. The Respondent's intention to have the disputed domain name as a reference to the Complainant and its services is obvious to the Panel considering that no rights or legitimate interests in using the disputed domain name are apparent. Any good faith use to which the disputed domain name may be put is implausible.

As the Respondent is soliciting offers for the purchase of the disputed domain name on the website the disputed domain name directs to, the Panel has no doubt that the Respondent seeks to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating the obvious likelihood of confusion of the disputed domain name with the Complainant's well-known trademark.

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 <pitneybowes.online> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Stefan Abel/

Stefan Abel

Sole Panelist

Date: October 13, 2026