

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Yakima Products, Inc. v. 一含 张, zxdfbdfb
Case No. DCO2026-0068

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Yakima Products, Inc., United States of America ("US"), represented by Buchalter LLP, US.

The Respondent is 一含 张, zxdfbdfb, US.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <yakimastores.co> 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 2, 2026. On September 2, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 3, 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 (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 9, 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 10, 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 15, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 5, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 8, 2026.

The Center appointed Dennis A. Foster 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 Delaware, US corporation with principal place of business in Oregon, US that began doing business in the early 1980s. The Complainant specializes in vehicle accessories that enable a car, van or truck to transport additional equipment such as bicycles and other sports gear on racks and in aerodynamic car roof cases.

The Complainant sells its products through its website at its domain name <yakima.com> (registered on February 10, 1995), and through a network of authorized dealers in the US and worldwide.

In conjunction with its business, the Complainant uses the trademark YAKIMA, which the Complainant has registered in the US per the below.

Registration No. 1509179; registration date October 18, 1988; International class 12 for automobile accessories such as racks for bikes and skis; and

Registration No. 4395411; registration date September 3, 2013; International class 12 per goods above.

In addition, the Complainant has registered its YAKIMA trademark in jurisdictions throughout the world such as Canada, the United Kingdom, and Australia.

The Respondent is an entity that registered the disputed domain name on August 18, 2026. The disputed domain name resolves to a website that is substantially a copy of the Complainant's own website, and that uses the Complainant's website color scheme, trademark, logos and copyrighted photos. The Respondent's website at the disputed domain name purports to offer for sale the same products as the Complainant, albeit at steeply reduced prices. On August 27, 2026, the Complainant ran a test to see if it could actually purchase products from the Respondent, but an error notice would not allow the Complainant to complete the transaction.

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 per the below.

-The disputed domain name consists of the YAKIMA mark and the non-distinctive additions of "stores" and the Top-Level Domain ("TLD") ".co", which tries to evoke an authorized sales outlet for the Complainant's products;

-The Complainant's trademark is the distinctive element of the disputed domain name;

-The Complainant has not licensed or authorized the Respondent to use its trademark in the disputed domain name or in any other way;

-The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant;

- The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name;
- The Respondent runs a scam at the disputed domain name designed to trick consumers into believing it is the Complainant and to coax them to hand over their personal and financial information. This is not a bona fide offering of goods or services;
- The Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in a noncommercial manner;
- The Respondent's purpose also is to disrupt the Complainant's business by misdirecting the Complainant's customers through deceit;
- The Respondent was clearly aware of the Complainant and its prior trademark rights. Accessing the trademark and reputation of the Complainant is instrumental to the Respondent's deceptive scheme; and
- The Respondent's copying the Complainant's website is indicative of bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Pursuant to Policy paragraphs 4(a)(i), (ii), and (iii), the Panel may render a decision for the Complainant and grant a transfer of the disputed domain name, if the Complainant shows that:

The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and

The disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The first burden of proof for the Complainant is to show that it has trademark rights in the disputed domain name that allow it to have standing to bring these proceedings. To this end, the Complainant has shown that it owns a number of US federal YAKIMA trademark registrations. The Panel finds this shows that the Complainant does have trademark rights sufficient to bring these proceedings. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 1.2.1.

The Panel observes that in the disputed domain name the Respondent has added the term "stores" to the Complainant's trademark. The Panel finds the Complainant's trademark still is prominently recognizable within the disputed domain name. Therefore, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.8.

The Panel finds, then, that the Complainant has carried its burden of proof for the first element of the Policy at paragraph 4(a)(i).

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Owing to the difficulty a complainant might have in attempting to prove the negative proposition that a respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name, the prevailing UDRP panels' view is that it is at first sufficient that a complainant makes out a prima facie case. Then the burden of evidence production shifts to the respondent to come forward and show that it does have rights and legitimate interests, although the overall burden of proof remains on the complainant. If the respondent

fails to come forward to rebut the complainant's prima facie case, that case prevails. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

The Complainant in these proceedings contends that the Respondent has no license or authority to use the Complainant's trademark in the disputed domain name. As for the Respondent having rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name via a bona fide offering of goods or services per Policy paragraph 4(c)(i), the Complainant has shown the Respondent in fact has been using the disputed domain name website to impersonate the Complainant and potentially try to collect personal and financial information from Internet users. The latter are likely to confuse the Respondent's website for the Complainant's because the Respondent essentially has copied the Complainant's website. This cannot be considered a bona fide offering of goods or services under the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1. *Hytto Pte. Ltd. v. rocky chen*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-1920](#), finding no rights or legitimate interests as the "[r]espondent has set out to mimic the Complainant's website including by misappropriation of the Complainant's trade mark, images, text, website layout and other content".

As for the Respondent being commonly known by the disputed domain name per Policy paragraph 4(c)(ii), the Complainant contends this is not true, and the Panel does not discern any evidence to the contrary in the case record. Finally, the Complainant contends that the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name for a noncommercial or fair use per Policy paragraph 4(c)(iii) because the Respondent apparently seeks financial gain.

In sum, the Complainant has put forth a convincing prima facie case for which the Panel sees no contrary evidence in the record. The Respondent, being in default, has not come forward to attempt to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

The Panel thus finds, per the above discussion, that the Complainant has carried its burden of proof to show that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name per Policy paragraph 4(a)(ii).

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Complainant's last burden of proof in these proceedings is to show that the disputed domain name was registered and being used in bad faith. In this regard, the Policy at paragraph 4(b) lays out four non-exhaustive circumstances in which a Respondent may be found to have registered and to be using a disputed domain name in bad faith. In the present case, the Panel finds the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in accordance with Policy paragraph 4(b)(iv). That is to say, for financial gain, the Respondent registered a domain name confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark in order to confuse the public into thinking the Respondent's website was the Complainant's website. As the Complainant contends, the Panel finds the Respondent added the word "stores" to the Complainant's trademark and used the country code Top-Level Domain ("ccTLD") ".co", commonly understood to mean company, in the disputed domain name because it wanted to "evoke" the Complainant's well-known online sales business.

But this is not all: the Respondent copied the Complainant's website, including colors, trademark, logos, goods for sale and copyrighted photos. Continuing its miscreance, the Respondent potentially also engaged in phishing as it sought the financial and personal information of the Internet users who arrived at its website in search of the Complainant. The Respondent also passed itself off as the Complainant and the goods it was purportedly selling as those of the Complainant. All of these actions are instances of bad faith under the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Also see *Hachette Filipacchi Presse v. archit kumar*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-4087](#): "Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, in this case, claimed impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud constitutes bad faith."

The Panel thus finds that the Complainant has carried its burden of proof under the third element of the Policy at paragraph 4(a)(iii) to show that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

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 <yakimastores.co> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Dennis A. Foster/

Dennis A. Foster

Sole Panelist

Date: October 26, 2026