

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

U.S. Merchants Financial Group, Inc. v. Martin Welland
Case No. D2026-3871

1. The Parties

The Complainant is U.S. Merchants Financial Group, Inc., United States of America, represented by Thompson Hine LLP, United States of America.

The Respondent is Martin Welland, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <greenmadeco.com> is registered with TuringSign Inc. d/b/a Cosmotown (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 28, 2026. On August 31, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 2, 2026, the Registrar emailed the Center its verification response, disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name (Unknown) that differed from the named Respondent and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 3, 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 September 4, 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 September 8, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 28, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent of its default on September 29, 2026.

The Center appointed Ada L. Redondo Aguilera as the sole panelist in this matter on October 12, 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 corporation organized under the laws of California, United States of America. It owns United States trademark registrations for GREENMADE, including Registration No. 5,167,072, registered on March 21, 2017, for goods in International Class 20.

The Complainant's GREENMADE trademark enjoys widespread recognition and goodwill. The Complainant operates its official website at "www.usmerchants.com/greenmade" through which it promotes and sells its products, notably containers for storage or transport.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on December 11, 2025. According to the Registrar's information, the Respondent is located in the United Kingdom.

The evidence submitted with the Complaint shows that the disputed domain name resolves to a website prominently displaying the GREENMADE trademark and images of GREENMADE products. The website also promotes at least one product bearing a third-party brand and contains product links directing Internet users to Amazon listings. These links include the affiliate identifier "greenmadecoa-20". The website states that it participates in the Amazon Services LLC Associates Program, through which participating websites may earn advertising fees by linking to Amazon.

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 incorporates its GREENMADE trademark in its entirety, followed by the letters "co", and is confusingly similar to that trademark. The Complainant's mark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests regarding the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant, the Respondent has not made any legitimate or fair use of the disputed domain name. The Complainant further alleges that the Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to it.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1. Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established rights in the GREENMADE trademark.

The Panel finds that the GREENMADE trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, which incorporates the trademark in its entirety followed by the letters "co". The addition of these letters does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.8.

Regarding the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" in the disputed domain name, it is well established that a gTLD does not affect the assessment for the purpose of determining identity or confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

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.

The Complainant asserts that it has not authorized or licensed the Respondent to use the GREENMADE trademark or to register a domain name incorporating that trademark. The disclosed registrant information identifies the Respondent as Martin Welland, and no evidence shows that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The absence of authorization does not, by itself, exclude the possibility of a bona fide offering or fair use. In the present case, however, the website prominently uses the GREENMADE trademark and presents itself as “GreenMade”, without accurately and prominently explaining its relationship with the Complainant. It also promotes at least one product bearing a third-party brand alongside GREENMADE products.

Even assessed against the principles applicable to resellers and distributors, the Respondent’s use does not satisfy the requirements of a bona fide offering. In particular, the website does not limit its promotion to the Complainant’s trademarked goods and does not accurately and prominently disclose the absence of a relationship with the trademark holder. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.8.

The website’s statement that it participates in the Amazon Services LLC Associates Program discloses an affiliate advertising arrangement with Amazon. It does not clarify that the website is independent of, and is not operated or endorsed by, the Complainant. In the context of the website’s overall presentation, that statement alone does not dispel the misleading impression of affiliation with the Complainant.

The product links containing an affiliate identifier, together with the website’s express statement concerning its participation in Amazon’s affiliate program, support the conclusion that the website is intended to generate commercial benefit. Its misleading presentation therefore does not constitute legitimate noncommercial or fair use under paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that 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 that case or provided evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests.

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.

The Complainant’s registered rights in the GREENMADE trademark predate the registration of the disputed domain name by several years. The composition of the disputed domain name and the associated website’s specific focus on GREENMADE products support the inference that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its trademark when registering the disputed domain name. On the balance of probabilities, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name to exploit the association with the Complainant’s trademark.

As to use, the website presents itself as “GreenMade” and promotes GREENMADE products alongside at least one product bearing a third-party brand. Its product links direct Internet users to Amazon listings and contain an affiliate identifier. The website also expressly states that it participates in Amazon’s affiliate advertising program. These circumstances support a finding that the Respondent intended to obtain commercial benefit from Internet users attracted to the website.

The disclosure of participation in Amazon’s affiliate program does not disclose the absence of any affiliation with the Complainant and does not dispel the misleading impression created by the website’s overall presentation.

Taken together, the evidence establishes that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and the products promoted on it. This conduct falls within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 <greenmadeco.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ada L. Redondo Aguilera/

Ada L. Redondo Aguilera

Sole Panelist

Date: October 16, 2026