

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

mSupply, Inc. v. Mansur Uba
Case No. D2026-4250

1. The Parties

The Complainant is mSupply, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Husch Blackwell LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Mansur Uba, Ukraine.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <wolverine-brass.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 22, 2026. On September 22, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 23, 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 (Dynadot Privacy Service, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 23, 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 29, 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 29, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 19, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Zoltán Takács as the sole panelist in this matter on October 22, 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 in this administrative proceeding is the owner of the United States Trademark Registration No. 2455061 for the word mark WOLVERINE BRASS registered on May 29, 2001 and which has been used in connection with various plumbing goods.

The Complainant sells its products to professional customers through its own website and through exclusive professional plumbing and contractor networks.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 29, 2025, and has been resolving to a website that displays descriptions of the Complainant's Wolverine Brass branded products together with "check price" links that redirect to a third party search results page listing unrelated and competing third-party products. The website at the disputed domain name provides the following statement at the bottom of the webpage: "Wolverine Brass (wolverine-brass.com) is a participant in the Amazon Services LLC Associates Program, an affiliate advertising program designed to provide a means for sites to earn advertising fees by advertising and linking to amazon.com".

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 which consists of the Complainant's mark with the addition of a hyphen is confusingly similar to the mark;
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name since it is unable to rely on any of the circumstances set out in paragraphs 4(c)(i), (ii), or (iii) of the Policy; and
- the Respondent reproduces the Complainant's mark in the disputed domain name and it is not plausible that the Respondent selected the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant's mark and without intent to attract for commercial gain Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website.

The Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred from the Respondent to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Procedural Issue: Location of the Respondent

Under paragraph 10 of the Rules, the Panel is required to ensure that the Parties are treated with equality and that each Party is given a fair opportunity to present its case, and also that the administrative proceedings take place with due expedition.

The location of the registrant of the disputed domain name disclosed by the Registrar appears to be in Ukraine, which is subject to an international conflict at the date of this Decision that may impact case notification. It is therefore appropriate for the Panel to consider, in accordance with its discretion under paragraph 10 of the Rules, whether the proceedings should continue.

Having considered all the circumstances of the case, the Panel is of the view that it should.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent during the above-referenced international conflict. The Panel has no doubts – for the reasons set out later in this Decision – that the Respondent registered and has been using the disputed domain name in bad faith. These facts and circumstances suggest that the Respondent maintained access to the Internet and has control over the disputed domain name.

The Panel also notes that the Center sent the Notification of Complaint by email to the Respondent at its email address as registered with the Registrar and to a postmaster email address as specified by the Rules. There is no indication that the email sent to the Respondent's email address was not delivered. Thus, it is fair for the Panel to assume that the Complaint reached the Respondent.

Having considered all the circumstances of the case, the Panel concludes that the Respondent who is allegedly located in Ukraine has been given a fair opportunity to present its case and, to ensure that the administrative proceeding takes place with the due expedition, the Panel will proceed to a Decision accordingly.

6.2 Substantive Issues

A complainant must evidence each of the three elements required by paragraph 4(a) of the Policy in order to succeed in the complaint, namely that:

- (i) the 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 domain name; and
- (iii) the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name with the addition of a hyphen.

The mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name and the addition of the hyphen does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark 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.

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.

There appears to be no relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent, nor is there any evidence that the Respondent has been authorized to use the Complainant's mark. Also, there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or that the Respondent is making any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name in accordance with paragraphs 4(c)(ii) and 4(c)(iii) of the Policy.

As mentioned above the disputed domain name has been used to resolve to a website that displays the Complainant's mark and descriptions of its Wolverine Brass branded products while redirecting to a webpage listing unrelated and competing third-party products under the Amazon Services LLC Associates Program designed to provide a means for sites to earn advertising fees by advertising and linking to a third party website.

The Respondent appears to be obtaining commercial benefit from its unauthorized use of the Complainant's mark in the disputed domain name and on its website. The Panel finds that such use of the disputed domain name does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods and services in accordance with paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and that 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 disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's mark only with the addition of a hyphen.

The Panel also notes that the Complainant's mark is inherently distinctive and its registration predates the date of registration of the disputed domain name.

According to the available record the disputed domain name has been resolving to a website that displays the Complainant's mark and descriptions of its Wolverine Brass branded products while redirecting to a webpage listing unrelated and competing third-party products under the Amazon Services LLC Associates Program designed to provide a means for sites to earn advertising fees by advertising and linking to a third party website. The overall impression of the Respondent's website is that it is operated by or affiliated with the Complainant.

In these circumstances the Panel infers:

- that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of and targeting the Complainant and its trademark rights; and
- that the Respondent has been using the disputed domain name in order to generate affiliate commission revenue through the Amazon Services LLC Associates Program based on the unauthorized use of the Complainant's mark.

Accordingly, the Panel finds 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 mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website in bad faith, paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

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 <wolverine-brass.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Zoltán Takács/

Zoltán Takács

Sole Panelist

Date: October 28, 2026