

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Leatherman Tool Group, Inc. v. Weijie Xu
Case No. DME2026-0010

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Leatherman Tool Group, Inc., United States of America ("United States or US"), represented by Safenames Ltd, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Weijie Xu, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <leatherman.me> ("Disputed Domain Name") is registered with Dominet (HK) Limited (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 26, 2026. On August 27, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On August 28, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 28, 2026, providing additional 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 1, 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 11, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 1, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Duy Khanh Nguyen as the sole panelist in this matter on October 9, 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, founded in 1983 in the United States, is a manufacturer of multipurpose tools bearing the LEATHERMAN brand. Today, LEATHERMAN tools are sold and used throughout the United States and internationally, and are available through the Complainant's official website, popular marketplaces such as Amazon, and authorized resellers. This extensive exposure of the LEATHERMAN brand and products has earned the Complainant both national and international recognition in the tool market.

The Complainant owns the LEATHERMAN Trademark in numerous other jurisdictions, including in China. Such registrations include US Registration No. 1325473 for the mark LEATHERMAN, registered on March 19, 1985, in respect of goods in class 8 and International Registration No. 1263158 for the mark **LEATHERMAN**, registered on June 4, 2015, in respect of goods in class 8.

The Complainant also registered the domain name <leatherman.com> on October 19, 1995 and operates it as its official website to promote and offer LEATHERMAN products. According to public traffic statistics of June 2026, the website received 1.38 million visitors.

The Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name on June 25, 2026. The evidence submitted by the Complainant shows that the Disputed Domain Name previously redirected to a GoDaddy aftermarket website where the Disputed Domain Name is advertised for sale at a "buy now" price of USD 1,450.

On July 28, 2026 and August 4, 2026, the Complainant sent cease-and-desist letters to the Respondent via the Registrar in relation to the Disputed Domain Name, requesting, among other things, transfer of the Disputed Domain Name. According to the Complainant, the Respondent did not reply to these correspondence.

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 is identical to its LEATHERMAN trademark as it clearly contains the mark in its entirety, without alteration or adornment. The Complainant also contends that the country-codeTop-Level Domain ("ccTLD") ".me" may be disregarded.

Furthermore, the Complainant submits that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name, as it was never licensed or authorized to use domain names featuring the LEATHERMAN trademark. The Complainant also asserts that the Respondent is not known by the Disputed Domain Name. The Complainant further submits that the Respondent's use of the Disputed Domain Name as a listing for sale at a price of USD 1,450 does not constitute legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

Finally, the Complainant asserts that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant argues that its LEATHERMAN Trademark has gained considerable popularity in the multipurpose products sector worldwide, including in China, where the Respondent is located. The Complainant further submits that the Disputed Domain Name reproduces the LEATHERMAN trademark in its entirety, without amendment or addition. Additionally, the Respondent has chosen to ignore the cease-and-

desist notice sent by the Complainant, conduct from which previous panels have inferred bad faith. The Complainant also submits that the Respondent uses the Disputed Domain Name to redirect to the domain aftermarket website at “www.godaddy.com”, where it is listed for sale at a “buy now” price of USD 1,450. The Respondent also advertises the Disputed Domain Name for sale on <sedo.com> at the same price. The Complainant argues that these listings are intended to facilitate the sale of the Disputed Domain Name to the Complainant or its competitors for a sum exceeding the Respondent’s out-of-pocket costs, which constitutes evidence of bad faith use.

The Complainant further notes that the Respondent has a portfolio of domain names that appears to infringe third-party trademarks and has also been subject to a UDRP proceeding involving a similar fact pattern, both of which contribute to the finding of bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 LEATHERMAN trademark is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name without any adjustment. In addition, it is well-established that the ccTLD, here “.me”, is viewed as a standard registration requirement and thus may be disregarded for this purpose. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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 Complainant's LEATHERMAN Trademark has been registered and used for many years preceding the date of the Respondent's registration of the Disputed Domain Name. Besides, the Complainant has never licensed or authorized the Respondent to use domain names featuring the LEATHERMAN trademark.

Further, the Panel finds no indication that the Respondent is commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name. The Whois information identifies the registrant as "Weijie Xu", which does not correspond to the Disputed Domain Name.

The Panel also considers the Complainant's submission that the Respondent's use of the Disputed Domain Name does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or legitimate noncommercial or fair use. According to the materials submitted to the Panel, the Respondent uses the Disputed Domain Name to redirect to a GoDaddy aftermarket website, where the Disputed Domain Name is advertised for sale at a "buy now" price of USD 1,450. No other content has been observed on the Disputed Domain Name since its registration by the Respondent. Additionally, the Respondent has a history of registering domain names containing well-known trademarks, suggesting an intention to benefit financially from those trademarks. The Respondent was also the subject of a domain name dispute arising from one of these registrations, which resulted in the transfer of the domain name (see *ALGECO v. Weijie Xu, Weijie Xu*, WIPO Case No. [DME2026-0007](#)). Although the Panel notes that the Disputed Domain Name could be perceived as being comprised of dictionary terms which could give rise to an assertion of rights or legitimate interests, the overall circumstances of this case support the Panel's conclusion that the Respondent's primary purpose in registering the Disputed Domain Name was to generate undue profit from its value as a trademark and as such, prevent a finding of rights or legitimate interests on behalf of the Respondent.

In the absence of any evidence to the contrary from the Respondent, this is sufficient to establish a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

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.

In this case, the Panel notes the overall circumstances of the case, namely: that the Disputed Domain Name was registered on June 25, 2026, long after the Complainant registered the LEATHERMAN Trademark; the well-known character of the LEATHERMAN Trademark; that the Disputed Domain Name incorporates the LEATHERMAN Trademark in its entirety, without amendment or addition; the chosen ccTLD, ".me" is associated with Montenegro, a country in which the Complainant operates; the use of the Disputed Domain Name solely to redirect users to GoDaddy aftermarket website where it is being offered for sale; and the absence of an explanation from the Respondent as to the registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name, and the Panel finds that the Respondent, more likely than not, registered the Disputed Domain Name to intentionally target the Complainant's brand.

In addition, the Panel notes that the Respondent has chosen to ignore the cease-and-desist notice sent by the Complainant on July 28, 2026 and again on August 4, 2026, which were intended to put the Respondent on notice of the Complainant's trademarks and rights. Such lack of reply to a cease-and-desist notice prior to commencing the proceedings has been found by previous panels to support an inference of bad faith behavior (see *Facebook, Inc. and Instagram, LLC v. C W / c w, c w*, WIPO Case No. D2018-1159).

The Panel considers the Complainant's evidence that, at the time of filing the Complaint, the Respondent uses the Disputed Domain Name to redirect to the domain aftermarket website on "www.godaddy.com", where the Disputed Domain Name is listed for sale at "a:buy now" price of USD 1,450. Moreover, the Respondent also advertises the Disputed Domain Name for sale on the platform <sedo.com> for the same price (USD 1,450). This supports a finding that the Respondent primarily registered the Disputed Domain Name with the view of selling it to the Complainant or its competitors for a sum likely in excess of the Respondent's out-of-pocket costs.

Additionally, the Respondent has a history of registering domain names which contain well-known trademark registrations, suggesting an intention to benefit financially from such. The Respondent was also the subject of a domain name dispute arising from one of these registrations, resulting in the transfer of that domain (see *ALGECO v. Weijie Xu, Weijie Xu*, WIPO Case No. DME2026-0007). The Panel thus finds that the Respondent has engaged in an pattern of bad faith..

The Panel therefore finds the Respondent has registered and used the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(i) 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 <leatherman.me> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Duy Khanh Nguyen/

Duy Khanh Nguyen

Sole Panelist

Date: October 22, 2026