Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108405

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108405
Time of filing	2026-02-12 09:46:35
Domain names	trade-point-farrowball.com, trade-point-goodhome.com, tradepointshop.com, tradepointstore.com, tradepointus.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	B&Q Limited

Complainant representative

Organization	Convey srl

Respondents

Organization	NIL
Name	Maria Kristensen
Name	Troy R Palmer
Name	Avendano Derek

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 names.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant relies on its registered trademark rights in the mark TRADE POINT in the United Kingdom and the European Union, covering a wide range of products and services. These registrations include UK TM No. UK0002507302A (registered July 31, 2009) and EUIPO TM No. 018300789 (registered May 18, 2022), among others.

These registrations predate the registration of the disputed domain names, which were created between November and December 2025.

The Panel is satisfied that these registrations establish trademark rights in the mark TRADE POINT for the purposes of the Policy.

Further, the Complainant operates its business using the domain names <trade-point.co.uk> (registered July 31, 2008) and <trade-

point.com> (registered July 24, 2012). According to the Complainant, both domains resolve to the Complainant's official website at https://www.diy.com/ and are used in connection with home improvement and DIY services although the Panel notes that both currently resolve to <trade-point.co.uk>. This discrepancy is not material to the discussion or outcome of this case.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Key aspects of the Complainant's contentions are summarized below.

Complainant's Background

The Complainant, B&Q Limited, founded in 1969, is a leading retailer of DIY and home improvement products in Europe. As a subsidiary of Kingfisher plc, it operates over 300 stores in the UK and Ireland. Its "TradePoint" brand, launched in 2010 as a specialized trade membership scheme, is a cornerstone of its commercial identity, accounting for a significant percentage of its total annual sales.

Registration of the Disputed Domain Names

According to the registrar verification included with the Complaint, the disputed domain names were registered on the following dates:

<trade-point-farrowball.com>, registered on December 4, 2025;

<trade-point-goodhome.com>, registered on December 4, 2025;

<tradepointshop.com>, registered on November 22, 2025;

<tradepointstore.com>, registered on November 17, 2025;

<tradepointus.com>, registered on November 23, 2025.

Evidence submitted by the Complainant demonstrates that the disputed domain names resolve to websites selling products identical or highly similar to those of the Complainant. These sites utilize the TRADE POINT mark and the Complainant's proprietary brand imagery to impersonate the Complainant.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT:

The Complainant's contentions may be summarized as follows:

The disputed domain names are under common control, despite several different registrant details.

The disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark TRADE POINT, as the mark is incorporated in its entirety. The addition of generic, geographic or descriptive / industry-related terms such as "farrowball" (a paint brand sold by the Complainant), "goodhome" (a Complainant's private label), as well as the terms "us", "store", and "shop" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Complainant submits that it has established a prima facie case, noting that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names, is not affiliated with the Complainant, and has no authorization to use the TRADE POINT mark. The Complainant further submits that the disputed domain names resolve to online stores selling goods identical to those offered by the Complainant and displaying the Complainant's trademarks, thereby impersonating the Complainant and misleading Internet users into believing that the websites are affiliated with or endorsed by the Complainant.

The disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. The Respondent was clearly aware of the well-known TRADE POINT trademarks. By impersonating the Complainant to divert customers for commercial gain, the Respondent is intentionally exploiting the Complainant's reputation.

RESPONDENT:

No administratively compliant Response has been filed.

RIGHTS

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

PROCEDURAL FACTORS

The Panel is satisfied that all 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

LANGUAGE OF PROCEEDING

According to Rule 11 of the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy, (the "Rules") "...the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the Registration Agreement, subject to the authority of the Panel to determine otherwise, having regard to the circumstances of the administrative proceeding."

The Registrar confirmed that the language of the registration agreement is English. As neither party requested otherwise, the Panel determines that the proceeding shall be conducted in English.

CONSOLIDATION OF MULTIPLE RESPONDENTS

As stated in section 4.11.2 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1") when considering consolidation requests panels should look at whether (i) the domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control, and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all parties. Procedural efficiency underpins such consideration.

The Panel has concluded that consolidation is warranted in this case.

According to the Registrar Verification in the case file, the names and the addresses of the four Respondents are different. However, this difference in registrant details is not dispositive since registrars are not typically required to verify the identity of registrants.

Factors pointing to the disputed domain names being subject to common control include:

1. the similar structure of the disputed domain names, all of which incorporate the Complainant's TRADE POINT trademark together with descriptive, generic, geographic, or industry-related terms such as "farrowball", "goodhome", "shop", "store", and "us";
2. the close temporal proximity of the registration dates, with the disputed domain names having been registered within a short time period between November and December 2025;
3. the fact that two of the disputed domain names (<trade-point-farrowball.com> and <trade-point-goodhome.com>) share identical registrant information, including the same name, email address, physical address, telephone number, and postal code, which constitutes strong evidence of common control;
4. the use of the same registrar, namely Gname.com Pte. Ltd., for all the disputed domain names;
5. the overall targeting of the Complainant's trademark across all disputed domain names, which suggests a coordinated registration strategy aimed at exploiting the Complainant's brand.

The above circumstances, taken together, lead the Panel to conclude that it is more likely than not that the disputed domain names are under common control, and that consolidation of the cases against the Respondents would be fair and equitable to all parties. Given such common control, hereinafter the several Respondents shall be referred to by the singular term "Respondent".

THREE ELEMENTS THE COMPLAINANT MUST ESTABLISH UNDER THE POLICY

According to Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove each of the following three elements to obtain an order that a disputed domain name should be transferred or cancelled:

(i) the 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 domain name; and

(iii) the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel has examined the evidence available and concludes as follows:

(A) THE COMPLAINANT'S RIGHTS AND CONFUSING SIMILARITY OF THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAMES TO THE COMPLAINANT'S RIGHTS

The Complainant has demonstrated rights in the registered trademark TRADE POINT, which predate the registration of the disputed domain names.

Each of the disputed domain names reproduces the Complainant's mark in its entirety. The addition of descriptive, generic, or geographic terms such as "farrowball", "goodhome", "us", "store", and "shop" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. In fact, the terms "farrowball" and "goodhome" are directly associated with the Complainant's goods, which may increase

the likelihood of confusion rather than diminishing it.

As noted in WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8, where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) does not create confusing similarity. The generic Top-Level Domain (gTLD) ".com" is disregarded under section 1.11.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's TRADE POINT trademark.

(B) THE RESPONDENT'S LACK OF RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS IN THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAMES

The second element of the Policy requires the Complainant to establish that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

The Complainant confirms the Respondent is not a licensee and has no relationship or authority to represent the Complainant.

The disputed domain names resolve to websites prominently displaying the Complainant's trademark and offering the same or similar goods. Applying the reasoning in Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc. (WIPO Case No. D2001-0903), the Respondent fails to meet the criteria for a bona fide offering, in particular by failing to disclose its lack of relationship with the Complainant.

This lack of disclaimers creates a false impression of affiliation and cannot constitute bona fide use. As noted in WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1, illegal activity such as impersonation cannot confer rights or legitimate interests.

Additionally, there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain names.

Nor is there evidence of legitimate non-commercial use. The use is clearly commercial and intended to exploit the Complainant's reputation.

Due to the above factors, the Complainant has established a prima facie case. The burden of production therefore shifts to the Respondent (WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1).

The Respondent has not rebutted this case.

Accordingly, the Panel finds the Complainant has satisfied the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

(C) BAD FAITH REGISTRATION AND USE OF THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAMES

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a non-exhaustive list of circumstances which may be evidence of registration and use in bad faith, including (ii) registering the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; and (iv) by using the domain name, the respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement.

The Panel has considered these circumstances and the totality of the evidence in the record.

The Panel notes that the Complainant's TRADE POINT trademark predates the registration of the disputed domain names and is associated with the Complainant's home improvement and DIY business. Given the nature of the Complainant's "TradePoint" scheme and the Respondent's registration of five domain names incorporating the mark, the Panel finds it improbable that the

Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's rights at the time of registration.

This finding is further reinforced by the Respondent's use of industry-specific terms and the Complainant's own brands, such as "farrowball" (a brand partner) and "goodhome" (the Complainant's exclusive private label), within the domain strings themselves. Such a selection of terms demonstrates a clear intent to target the Complainant.

Regarding use in bad faith, the Panel notes that four of the five disputed domain names resolve to websites designed to impersonate the Complainant. Four of the websites prominently display the Complainant's TRADE POINT trademark and branding and purport to offer products similar to those offered by the Complainant. The fifth website, which resolves from the disputed domain name <tradepointus.com> appears to be a sham site. It purports to promote or sell paint and associated products, yet the "About Us" page contains nonsensical text noting, "Our Present: Crafting fashion with function
Considered design and renowned quality are the reasons that women still shop with Home Paint Store today. We source our signature leather materials from only top-grade environmental suppliers and use them inside and outside our shoes to maximise comfort and the feeling of step-in luxury." Considering the incoherent content, the Panel concludes that this site also reflects bad faith use.

By creating websites that pass themselves off as official or authorized "Trade Point" stores, or otherwise benefit from the TRADE POINT mark, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source or affiliation of the site. This falls squarely within the bad faith criteria set forth in paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. As noted in Prada S.A. v. Chen Minjie (WIPO Case No. D2015-1466), the creation of a website intended to pass off as the authentic or official site of a complainant is an "obvious sign of bad faith registration and use." WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.4 further affirms that the use of a domain name for such impersonation is manifest evidence of bad faith.

Furthermore, the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of bad faith registration. The registration of five separate domain names, all targeting the Complainant's TRADE POINT mark within a narrow timeframe, constitutes a pattern of conduct intended to prevent the Complainant from reflecting its mark in corresponding domain names, as contemplated by paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy and WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.2.

The Panel also notes that the Respondent failed to reply to the Complainant's cease-and-desist efforts and has remained silent throughout these administrative proceedings. While failure to respond does not in itself establish bad faith, in the context of this case - where the evidence of targeting and impersonation is compelling, it allows the Panel to draw a negative inference.

In light of the above, the Panel concludes that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain names in bad faith. The Complainant has thus satisfied the requirements under paragraph 4(a)(iii) and 4(b) of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **trade-point-farrowball.com**: Transferred
2. **trade-point-goodhome.com**: Transferred
3. **tradepointshop.com**: Transferred
4. **tradepointstore.com**: Transferred
5. **tradepointus.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Claire Kowarsky**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-03-18

Publish the Decision