ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Shaw Industries Group, Inc. v. he jxing
Case No. D2026-4091

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Shaw Industries Group, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Iverson IP, United States.

The Respondent is he jxing, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <coretecus.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 11, 2026. On September 14, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 15, 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 (The following information was obtained from WHOIS records: Dynadot Privacy Service) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 15, 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 17, 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 18, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 8, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 9, 2026.

The Center appointed Benoit Van Asbroeck 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 operates in the sector of premium waterproof flooring and construction related goods.

The Complainant is the owner of several CORETEC-formative trademarks, including:

- United States trademark No. 4974257 for the word mark CORETEC, registered on June 7, 2016, covering, inter alia, goods and services in International Class 19;

- United States trademark No. 4327997 for the word mark CORETEC PLUS, registered on April 30, 2013, covering goods and services in International Class 19; and

- United States trademark No. 7026521 for the word mark CORETEC WALL, registered on April 11, 2023, covering goods and services in International Class 19.

The Complainant operates several domain names incorporating the CORETEC trademarks, including <coretecfloors.com> and <coretecplus.com>.

The disputed domain name <coretecus.com> was registered on March 24, 2026. The disputed domain name resolved to a website with information primarily about “CoreTec Flooring” and inviting website visitors to submit a form and request a quote. The website also included references to unrelated products and services, such as thermostats and a guide on “how to register to vote”. The website also displayed some of the content of the authentic Complainant’s website, Terms of Service and Privacy Policy of the Complainant and included the latter’s corporate email and mailing address.

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 claims that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its CORETEC trademarks, as the disputed domain name incorporates the CORETEC trademark in its entirety, adding the letters “us”. That addition may reinforce the misleading impression that the disputed domain name identifies an official United States website of, or an entity affiliated with, the Complainant. This is frequently applied to website titles, subdomains and subpages and does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

Moreover, the Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. In this regard, the Complainant asserts that it has never authorised the Respondent to use its CORETEC trademarks or to register any domain name incorporating that mark. It further submits that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, does not possess any trademark rights in it, and has neither used nor made demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Complainant alleges that the Respondent should have been aware of the Complainant’s rights at the time of registration, and that registration of a domain name incorporating that mark in full,

demonstrates clear attempts to create confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the disputed domain name. The Complainant also states that the Respondent's conduct and misuse of CORETEC trademarks establish a pattern of bad faith conduct within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy.

The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, in order to succeed in this proceeding, the Complainant must prove each of the following three elements:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
(ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and;
(iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel will proceed to analyze whether the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are satisfied in the present case.

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 trademarks for the purposes of the Policy, supported by three United States trademark registrations for the CORETEC and CORETEC-formative trademarks. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Indeed, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name incorporates the CORETEC trademark in its entirety, followed by the letters "us" – which could be understood as serving as a geographic term (for the United States, the market of origin of the Complainant). The CORETEC trademark is clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name (WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 1.7 and 1.8). The addition of the term "us" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the CORETEC trademarks.

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 Complainant asserts that it has never authorised the Respondent to use its CORETEC trademarks or to register any domain name incorporating that mark. It further submits that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, does not possess any trademark rights in it, and has neither used nor made demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. 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.

Furthermore, it seems that the website associated with the disputed domain name did not appear to offer any means of purchasing goods or services directly. Instead, it provides product descriptions, general information about the company, and an inquiry facility through which visitors may request samples or quotations. The Respondent does not appear to intend to use the CORETEC trademarks in connection with a legitimate offering of goods or services. Further, the Panel observes that the Respondent used the disputed domain name to operate a website that impersonated the Complainant's website by displaying a substantially similar version of the CORETEC trademarks and purportedly advertising the same products as the Complainant, well as unrelated third party products and services. The website also contained the Complainant's corporate email and mailing address on its Terms of Service and Privacy Policy pages. In these circumstances, the Panel infers that the website was intended to collect information from prospective customers under the misleading impression that they were interacting with the Complainant. Such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, such as passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. 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.

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.

The Respondent is using the disputed domain name to intentionally attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the CORETEC trademarks regarding the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of that website.

By registering and using the disputed domain name, which incorporates the CORETEC trademarks entirely, it appears that the Respondent attempts to mislead consumers as regards the identity of the disputed domain name holder. This finding is reinforced by the content of the website at the disputed domain name, which displayed content of the Complainant's website, including its trademarks and mimicking amongst others the Terms of Business and Privacy Policy of the Complainant including the latter's corporate email and mailing address. Panels have found that mimicking a complainant's website supports a finding that a respondent intentionally sought to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's trademark. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.4. Here, the composition of

the disputed domain name and the content of the associated website appear designed to lead visitors to believe that the website was operated or authorised by the Complainant.

Furthermore, the disputed domain name prompted visitors to submit their contact information via an inquiry form, which could represent a risk for the Complainant's image, as it could be used to harvest information from customers thinking they were contacting the Complainant. Panels have in the past recognised that there is a bad faith in the use of the disputed domain name when it has been used to obtain sensitive or confidential information from prospective customers. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here passing off, further supports a finding of bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4.

The Panel notes that the Respondent has previously been the subject of several UDRP proceedings, including cases where the domain name composition and use were similar to the current proceedings (see, e.g., *Leviton Manufacturing Co., Inc. v. he jxing*, WIPO Case No. D2026-3389, concerning <levitonus.com>). Under these circumstances, the Respondent's apparent use of a privacy service to register the disputed domain name, presumably to conceal its true identity, may lend some support to a finding of bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.6.

The Panel infers from the foregoing that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name 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 <coretecus.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Benoit Van Asbroeck/
Benoit Van Asbroeck
Sole Panelist
Date: October 26, 2026