ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
LG Energy Solution, Ltd. v. he jxing
Case No. D2026-4252

1. The Parties

The Complainant is LG Energy Solution, Ltd., Republic of Korea, represented by KAI IP Law LLC, Republic of Korea.

The Respondent is he jxing, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lgenergysolutio.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 (Registrant information redacted for privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on the same day, 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 28, 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 25, 2026.

The Center appointed Masato Dogauchi as the sole panelist in this matter on October 28, 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 established under the laws of the Republic of Korea in December 2020. It conducts the research, development, manufacture and sale of batteries and energy solutions for electric vehicles, light electric vehicles, energy storage systems, IT devices and power tools. It is a subsidiary within the LG group headed by a holding company, LG Corp. The holding company is the registered proprietor of the LG ENERGY SOLUTION trademarks, as follows:

- Republic of Korea Trademark Registration No. 40-1838525 for LG ENERGY SOLUTION February 28, 2022;
- Republic of Korea Trademark Registration No. 40-1838527 for LG ENERGY SOLUTION, registered on February 28, 2022; and
- International Registration No. 1571299 for LG ENERGY SOLUTION, registered on November 11, 2020.

The Complainant operates its official global website at “www.lgensol.com”.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 28, 2026. The website resolved by the disputed domain name presents itself as “Lg Energy Solution” and offers battery energy storage systems. The website also states “© 2026 Lg Energy Solution. All rights reserved”.

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.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 15(a), a panel shall decide a case on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable. Since the Respondent has not made any substantive arguments in this case, the following decision is rendered on the basis of the Complainant’s contentions and other evidence submitted by the Complainant.

In accordance with the Policy, paragraph 4(a), in order to qualify for a remedy, the Complainant must prove each of the following:

(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.

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 proprietor of the trademarks is an affiliate of the Complainant in this case. Panels have held that a trademark owner's affiliate such as a subsidiary of a parent or of a holding company, or an exclusive trademark licensee, is considered to have rights in a trademark under the UDRP for purposes of standing to file a complaint. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.4.1. The Panel finds that the Complainant has legitimate and legally protectable rights and interests in the trademarks and has standing to rely on and enforce them under the Policy. Accordingly, the Complainant has rights in respect of a trademark for the purposes of the Policy.

The disputed domain name includes the main part of the trademark, "LG ENERGY", as they are. The only alteration is the deletion of the final letter "n" from "SOLUTION". Such single-letter omission is a classic typographical variation. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.9. The LG ENERGY SOLUTION trademark is clearly recognizable in the disputed domain name. The generic Top-Level Domain ".com" is to be disregarded in the confusing-similarity analysis. WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 1.7 and 1.11.1.

Taken together, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark in which the Complainant has rights. Accordingly, 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 disputed domain name is almost identical to the Complainant's trademark save for the missing last letter, and resolves to a website offering the same or similar goods the Complainant offers. This is not a bona fide use of the disputed domain name.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Complainant has been doing business since 2020 under the LG ENERGY SOLUTION trademark.

The Panel finds it unlikely that the disputed domain name was registered without knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark, given the longstanding reputation of both the Complainant and the trademark, and also considering the subsequent use of the disputed domain name. The Respondent's aim in registering and using the disputed domain name appears to be to attract Internet users to an online location for potential gain by taking unfair advantage of and creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark.

With regard to the requirement that the disputed domain name is being used in bad faith, the Panel notes that, according to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the disputed domain name is being used to impersonate the Complainant and to create the false impression of the official Complainant's website. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for such illegitimate activity by impersonating the Complainant constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4. Finally, the Panel notes that the Respondent has previously been the subject of several UDRP proceedings involving similar use as referred to here. See, e.g., *Trumpf SE + Co. KG v. he jxing*, WIPO Case No. D2026-3432. This is further evidence of bad faith.

Accordingly, the Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 <lgenergysolutio.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Masato Dogauchi/
Masato Dogauchi
Sole Panelist
Date: November 5, 2026