

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Caterpillar Inc. v. Wei Zhang  
Case No. DCO2025-0074

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Caterpillar Inc., Colombia, represented by Baker & McKenzie S.A.S., Colombia.

The Respondent is wei Zhang, China.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <catfootwear.co> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 5, 2025. On September 5, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 8, 2025, 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 of catfootwear.co (identity unknown due to privacy protection)) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 15, 2025, 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 18, 2025.

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, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 8, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 13, 2025.

The Center appointed Pablo A. Palazzi as the sole panelist in this matter on October 20, 2025. 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 an American corporation which designs, develops, engineers, manufactures, markets and sells machinery, engine and other products, as well as financial, retail and rental services.

The Complainant holds a portfolio of registrations for the well-known trade marks CATERPILLAR and CAT and variations of these in numerous countries and categories. The Complainant is the owner of several trademark registrations for CAT in Colombia, including the following, as per trademark certificates submitted to the Complaint:

CAT 321883 registered on September 8, 2006, in classes 7, 9, 12, 37. Used for heavy machinery and vehicles.

CAT 350415 registered on February 19, 2008, in class 14. Used for jewelry and watches.

The Complainant is also the owner of the domain name <caterpillar.com>, which was registered on March 17, 1995 and is used by the Complainant to promote its machinery and services under the trademarks CATERPILLAR and CAT on the correspondent website “www.caterpillar.com”. The Complainant is also the owner of the domain name <cat.com> which is the address of its main website that offers, amongst other functions, online shopping for parts, products, and branded merchandise.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 14, 2024 and is pointed to a website displaying pay per click ads related to the Complainant competitors products.

#### **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. The Complainant also submits that it “is widely known for its branded work boots and footwear products”.

##### **B. Respondent**

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

#### **6. Discussion and Findings**

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that a complainant must prove each of the following elements with respect to each disputed domain name:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (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 burden of proof of each element is borne by the Complainant. The Respondent's default does not by itself mean that the Complainant is deemed to have prevailed. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.3.

#### **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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms like the term "footwear" (which is a generic and descriptive word referring to shoes and boots) may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 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 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 3.0](#), 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 Respondent was clearly aware of the Complainant's well-known CAT trademark and acted in bad faith by registering the disputed domain name, seeking to exploit the association with the Complainant's brand by combining it with generic terms directly related to the Complainant's products.

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 Respondent registered the disputed domain name in 2024, which is significantly later than the Complainant's first use and registration of its domain name dating back to at least 1995;
- the Complainant's trademarks are very well known around the world. They have been registered and used in relation to construction equipment for many years (*Caterpillar Inc. v. Digitalus and H. van Zuylen Materieel* WIPO Case No. [D2011-2105](#);
- the disputed domain name is composed of the Complainant's registered trademark combined with the generic and descriptive term "footwear", which refers broadly to a product related to the Complainant's brand.

The Panel conducted a visit to the disputed domain name and verified that it includes hyperlinks redirecting users to websites marketing goods in direct competition with the Complainant's trademarked products.

The Respondent was clearly aware of the Complainant's well-known CAT trademark and acted in bad faith by registering the disputed domain name, seeking to exploit the association with the Complainant's brand by combining it with generic terms directly related to the Complainant's products.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under 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 <catfootwear.co> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Pablo A. Palazzi/*

**Pablo A. Palazzi**

Sole Panelist

Date: November 9, 2025