

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

AWI Licensing LLC v. Madden Farmer
Case No. D2026-3604

1. The Parties

Complainant is AWI Licensing LLC, United States of America, represented by The Belles Group, P.C., United States of America.

Respondent is Madden Farmer, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <armstrongceilingsstore.shop> (the “Disputed Domain”) is registered with Dynadot LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 13, 2026. On August 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain. On August 14, 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 (GDPR Masked) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on August 27, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on August 27, 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 Respondent 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. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on September 28, 2026.

The Center appointed William Zac Duffy as the sole panelist in this matter on October 1, 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

Complainant, AWI Licensing LLC, is a subsidiary of Armstrong World Industries, Inc. (“AWI”), a global leader in the design and manufacture of innovative commercial and residential ceiling, wall, and suspension system solutions.

Complainant owns the following trademark registrations that are relevant to this proceeding:

Mark	Reg. No.	Date of Registration	Jurisdiction	
	0523396	April 4, 1950	United States of America	
	1055367	January 4, 1977	United States of America	
	1686011	May 12, 1992	United States of America	
	2227937	March 2, 1999	United States of America	
	2803128	January 6, 2004	United States of America	
ARMSTRONG	3122456	August 1, 2006	United States of America	
ARMSTRONG	3396822	March 18, 2008	United States of America	

Complainant's Websites

Complainant has operated its websites at the domain names <armstrongworldindustries.com> and <armstrongceilings.com> since at least 1999.

The Disputed Domain

The Disputed Domain <armstrongceilingsstore.shop> was registered by Respondent Madden Farmer on May 17, 2026. Respondent's website operated at the Disputed Domain is highly similar to Complainant's website. It includes a logo for “Armstrong World Industries” in the same location and font that is identical to the one on Complainant's website, and offers the same ceiling and floor solution products identified in Complainant's trademark registrations.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that the Disputed Domain is confusingly similar to its ARMSTRONG mark because it wholly incorporates Complainant's ARMSTRONG mark combined with the terms “ceilings” and “store” and the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.shop”. Complainant further contends that the Disputed Domain closely imitates Complainant's ARMSTRONG CEILINGS trade name and <armstrongceilings.com> domain name.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Complainant is required to prove each of the following three elements to obtain the remedy it has requested: (i) the Disputed Domain is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights; (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain; and (iii) the Disputed Domain has been registered and is being used in bad faith. Policy, paragraph 4(a).

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 Complainant's trademark and the Disputed Domain. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

Complainant has shown it owns registrations in the ARMSTRONG marks and therefore has established 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 notes that the Disputed Domain incorporates the entirety of Complainant's ARMSTRONG mark together with the descriptive terms "ceiling" and "store". The gTLD "shop" is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Panel also concludes that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain.

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 Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain. Respondent has not rebutted Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Policy contains a non-exhaustive list of circumstances that may demonstrate when a respondent has rights or legitimate interests in the use of a domain name. The list includes using the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services. Policy, paragraphs 4(c)(i) – (iii).

Complainant contends that Respondent is using the Disputed Domain and website to deceive consumers into believing they are dealing with Complainant, thereby attracting Internet users for Respondent's commercial gain and exposing consumers to potential fraud and identity theft. The Panel was unable to determine if Respondent is defrauding customers or "merely" using the Disputed Domain to take advantage of Complainant's reputation and goodwill to increase sales of its products. Regardless, selling products on a website in a way that infringes on Complainant's trademark rights is not a bona fide offering of goods or services. See, e.g., *Nara Aziza Smith v. Vanessa Clarke*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-1839](#). Either Respondent is using the Disputed Domain and website to defraud consumers or it is selling real products but doing so in a manner that clearly infringes Complainant's marks. Neither use of the Disputed Domain is legitimate.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

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.

Respondent registered the Disputed Domain in the knowledge of Complainant's marks, as evidenced by the fact that Complainant's marks are included on Respondent's website, in the same font, to sell the same products. The Panel finds that Respondent is targeting Complainant in order to leverage the reputation and goodwill in Complainant's marks to encourage Internet users to visit its website and purchase products, likely under the false belief that they are purchasing products from Complainant. Consequently, the Panel finds that Respondent has registered and used the Disputed Domain in bad faith by intentionally attempting to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's marks. Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv); see *Mercado Libre, Inc. et al. v. Ruslan Kovalenko*, WIPO Case No. [D2025- 0045](#).

The Panel finds that 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 <armstrongceilingsstore.shop> be transferred to Complainant.

/William Zac Duffy/

William Zac Duffy

Sole Panelist

Date: October 15, 2026