Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108207

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108207
Time of filing	2025-12-04 16:06:41
Domain names	coolersigloo.com

Case administrator

Organization	Iveta Špiclová (Czech Arbitration Court) (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Igloo Products Corp.

Complainant representative

Organization	Sipara Sweden AB

Respondent

Organization	Boss Cloud Technology (Zhejiang) Co., Ltd. /

OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The Panel is not aware of any other legal proceedings which are pending or decided and which relate to the disputed domain name.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant is the owner of various trademark registrations, including the following:

* European Union trademark No. 009204686 for IGLOO, applied for on 25 June 2010, registered on 2 October 2010;

* International trademark registration number 1283623 for IGLOO (logo), registered on 27 November 2015;

* Chinese trademark No. 45578174 for IGLOO, registered 7 April 2021.

The Complainant owns and operates its primary domain name <igloocoolers.com>, registered on 22 January 1997. The Complainant also owns numerous other domain names comprising the terms “igloo” and “coolers”. The Complainant has Internet presence under the IGLOO mark on Instagram, Facebook and YouTube.

The Respondent is Boss Cloud Technology (Zhejiang) Co., Ltd. of 2wuxingqu xinzhulu 36hao / 361503. The disputed domain name <Coolersigloo.com> was registered on 25 July 2025.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant Igloo Products Corp. (“Complainant” or “Igloo”) is a manufacturer and seller of products for the outdoor, including soft, hard and other types of mobile cooling boxes. The use of the term IGLOO dates to 1946 and has become the Complainant’s company name in 1986. Igloo states that for over seventy-five years and with more than five hundred types of products sold at thousands of retailers around the globe, Igloo is one of the leading cooler manufacturers in the world.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

No administratively compliant Response has been filed.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy).

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the Respondent to have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy).

BAD FAITH

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy).

PROCEDURAL FACTORS

Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. Pursuant to the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules“), paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceedings be English dues to the following: (1) the disputed domain name coolersigloo.com includes a generic English word “coolers”; (2) the Respondent’s website at the Disputed Domain Name is in English; therefore, the Respondent must be familiar with English; (3) requiring the Complainant, who is not familiar with the Chinese language, to translate the Complaint and conduct the proceeding in Chinese would unfairly disadvantage and burden the Complainant and delay the proceeding and adjudication of the matter.

The Respondent did not make any submissions with respect to the language of the proceeding.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties’ ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“WIPO Overview 3.0”), section 4.5.1).

Having considered the circumstances of this case including the neutrality of English as a common language between parties, and the fact that the Complainant has translated the relevant documents into Vietnamese for the Respondent, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English. There does not appear to be any reasons which warrant a delay and additional expense in ordering the Complainant to translate the Complaint.

The Panel is satisfied that all other procedural requirements under UDRP were met and there is no other reason why it would be inappropriate to provide a decision.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy requires a complainant to show that a domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights.

The Complainant has provided evidence that it owns registered trademark rights in the IGLOO mark.

In this case, the disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's IGLOO trademark in its entirety with no alterations in addition to the term coolers. Thus, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks.

As for the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com", it is well established that the gTLD is not relevant to the issue of identity or confusing similarity between the Complainant's trademarks and the domain name in dispute (see WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.11.1).

Consequently, the Panel finds that the Complainant has shown that the disputed domain name is identical to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Once the complainant establishes a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the domain name, the burden of production shifts to the respondent to show that it has rights or legitimate interests in respect to the domain name (see WIPO Overview 3.0, section 2.1).

In the present case, the Complainant has demonstrated a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and the Respondent has failed to assert any such rights or legitimate interests.

The Complainant has provided evidence that it has been the registered owner of the IGLOO mark long before the date that the disputed domain name was registered and that it has not authorised the Respondent to use the Complainant's trademarks. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Respondent did not submit a Response and did not provide any explanation for its choice of the disputed domain name nor evidence to show rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name which would be sufficient to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Complainant must also show that the respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith (see Policy, paragraph 4(a)(iii)). Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides circumstances that may evidence bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

The Complainant's trademarks were being used and registered many years before the registration of the disputed domain name. In addition, the disputed domain name resolves to a website that displays the Complainant's trademarks and sells goods which appear to be competing with the offerings of the Complainant. The goods are also being offered for sale at a steep discount. It is the Panel's view that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its trademarks and is targeting the Complainant and its customers.

Given the circumstances of this case, and the distinctive nature of the Complainant's trademarks, the Panel is persuaded on the evidence that the Respondent was also aware of the Complainant IGLOO trademark at the time of registering the disputed domain name since it was using the Complainant's IGLOO trademark using the same style and design used by Complainant.

The Complainant provided evidence showing that the Respondent copied and was using Complainant's website product pictures and information in the attempt to create a false affiliation with the Complainant and mislead Internet users. This is strong evidence of bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent did not respond to Complainant's letters nor to the Complaint and the Panel draws the appropriate inference.

Accordingly, having regard to the circumstances of this case, the Panel finds that the Complainant has met its burden under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

AND THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME(S) IS (ARE) TO BE

1. **coolersigloo.com** : Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Jonathan Agmon**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-01-18

Publish the Decision