# Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108358

| | |
|---|---|
| Case number | CAC-UDRP-108358 |
| Time of filing | 2026-03-03 10:25:07 |
| Domain names | workprouk.com |

## Case administrator

| | |
|---|---|
| Name | Olga Slanařová (Case admin) |

## Complainant

| | |
|---|---|
| Organization | HangZhou Great Star Industrial Co., Ltd. |

## Complainant representative

| | |
|---|---|
| Organization | Chofn Intellectual Property |

## Respondent

| | |
|---|---|
| Name | Qiang ZHANG |

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 asserts rights in the WORKPRO trademark based on the following registrations:

- UK trademark No. UK00003656621 registered on June 17, 2021;
- EU trademark No. 018494851, registered on October 15, 2021;
- International Registration No. 1689952 under the Madrid System, registered on September 19, 2022.

The disputed domain name <workprouk.com> was registered on November 9, 2023.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a Chinese company established in 1993 and active in the tools and storage industry. Its product portfolio encompasses hand tools, power tools, laser measurement instruments, and power stations, serving application areas including home maintenance, construction, vehicle maintenance, and home energy management. The Complainant represents the leading tools and storage company in Asia and ranks among the top six globally in its sector.

The Complainant's WORKPRO brand, launched in 2009, is described as a comprehensive private-label tool brand comprising more than twenty product categories. The Complainant supplies major retail chains in the United States, Europe, and Canada, including Home Depot, Walmart, Lowes, Kingfisher, and CTC. In addition to traditional retail distribution, the Complainant has developed

significant cross-border e-commerce operations. In 2021, global WORKPRO brand sales exceeded 100 million units. According to the Complainant's annual report for the financial year 2022, the Complainant achieved operating revenues exceeding RMB 12.6 billion, with own-brand revenues — including the WORKPRO, DURATECH, SWISSTECH, and Prexiso brands — accounting for more than 40% of total revenues for the first time. The Complainant further states that it maintains production, sales, and service operations across 21 sites worldwide and supplies in excess of 20,000 hardware and building materials retail outlets globally.

The Complainant describes ongoing investment in research and development, having invested CNY 319 million during the 2022 reporting period, resulting in the design of 2,105 new products and the filing and grant of more than 300 patents each. The WORKPRO brand received industry recognition, including the PTIA 2021 Pneumatic Tools and Nailers Awards and the PTIA 2021 Accessories Awards. The Complainant further references active participation in international trade exhibitions between 2021 and 2023.

---

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no trademark rights, no authorization from the Complainant, and no legitimate association with the WORKPRO brand.

The Complainant submits that all of the WORKPRO trademark registrations predate the registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant additionally contends that, through extensive commercial use and international promotion over many years, the WORKPRO mark has acquired a high degree of distinctiveness and global recognition, and that a unique association has developed between the mark and the Complainant in the perception of consumers.

**Identity or Confusing Similarity**

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the WORKPRO trademark. In its analysis, the Complainant argues that the generic top-level domain suffix ".com" should be disregarded as it lacks any distinguishing capacity and is therefore irrelevant to the comparison under the first element of the UDRP Policy.

The Complainant further submits that the element "uk", which constitutes the only addition to the WORKPRO mark is a widely recognized geographical abbreviation for the United Kingdom and serves no distinctive function. On this basis, the Complainant contends that "uk" should likewise be disregarded for the purposes of the comparison.

The Complainant concludes that the principal identifying element of the disputed domain name is "workpro", which is identical to its registered WORKPRO trademark. Given that the disputed domain name wholly incorporates the Complainant's mark, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is identical or, at a minimum, confusingly similar to the WORKPRO trademark, and that this satisfies the requirements under Rule 4(a)(i) of the UDRP Policy.

**Rights or Legitimate Interests of the Respondent**

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. In support of this position, the Complainant advances the following arguments:

First, the Respondent operates a shopping website through the disputed domain name whose content is closely related to the Complainant's core business activities. The website does not disclose any affiliation with or authorization from the Complainant, and the Complainant submits that the website falsely creates an impression of sponsorship, endorsement, or approval by the trademark owner. The Complainant therefore argues that such use cannot constitute bona fide or fair use within the meaning of the UDRP Policy.

Second, searches conducted in multiple national and regional trademark databases have revealed no trademark registrations held by the Respondent in the WORKPRO name.

Third, the Respondent is not, and has never been, a distributor, licensee, or authorized partner of the Complainant, and has not received any form of direct or indirect authorization to use the WORKPRO trademark or a corresponding domain name.

Fourth, the Complainant asserts that there is no evidence that the Respondent has made any legitimate preparations for good faith use of the disputed domain name in connection with a genuine and independent commercial activity unrelated to the Complainant.

On these grounds, the Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

**Bad Faith Registration and Use**

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was both registered and is being used in bad faith, in accordance with Rule 4(a)(iii) and Rule 4(b) of the UDRP Policy.

Regarding bad faith registration, the Complainant contends that the WORKPRO brand had already achieved a high degree of international recognition and a significant presence in the e-commerce sector prior to the registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant argues that the Respondent, who is located in China — the same country as the Complainant — must have been aware of the WORKPRO trademark at the time of registration. The Complainant submits that the deliberate incorporation of the Complainant's distinctive mark into the disputed domain name, combined with knowledge of that mark, constitutes evidence of bad

faith registration.

Regarding bad faith use, the Complainant submits that the Respondent has pointed the disputed domain name to a website whose content closely mirrors that of the Complainant's business operations, and which prominently features the WORKPRO trademark on multiple occasions. The Complainant argues that this conduct falls within the circumstances described in Rule 4(b)(iv) of the UDRP Policy, namely intentional use of the disputed domain name in an attempt to attract Internet users to the Respondent's website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of that website or the products offered thereon.

The Complainant further submits that the deliberate and calculated nature of the use of the disputed domain name to imitate the Complainant's WORKPRO brand, together with the absence of any plausible legitimate explanation for the choice of domain name, supports a finding of bad faith at the time of registration. The Complainant concludes that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith within the meaning of the UDRP Policy.

NO ADMINISTRATIVELY COMPLIANT RESPONSE HAS BEEN FILED.

## RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark 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

The Complaint was filed with the Czech Arbitration Court Arbitration Center for Internet Disputes (the "Center") on February 28, 2026. The Center verified that the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Policy"), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Rules"), and the Center's Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Supplemental Rules").

In accordance with the Rules, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint and the proceedings commenced on March 10,2026. The Respondent was given the opportunity to submit a Response within 20 days. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 31, 2026.

The Center appointed Mr. Petr Hostaš as the sole Panelist in this matter on March 31, 2026. The Panelist has submitted a Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center.

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

Pursuant to Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, in order to obtain the transfer of the disputed domain name, the Complainant must demonstrate that each of the following three elements is present:

1. the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
2. the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
3. the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panelist addresses each element in turn below.

## I. The domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights

The first element of the Policy requires the Complainant to establish (i) that it holds rights in a trademark or service mark, and (ii) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to that mark.

### i. Complainant's Trademark Rights

The Complainant has demonstrated ownership of registered trademark rights in the mark WORKPRO in the United Kingdom and the European Union, and an international registration under the Madrid System. All three registrations predate the registration of the disputed domain name. Additionally, the Complainant has adduced evidence of extensive commercial use of the WORKPRO mark internationally since 2009, establishing acquired distinctiveness in the mark well beyond what the registrations themselves confer.

The Panelist is accordingly satisfied that the Complainant holds rights in the trademark WORKPRO for the purposes of Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

### ii. Confusing Similarity

The disputed domain name consists of the string "workprouk.com". The applicable test under Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy requires a straightforward comparison between the disputed domain name and the trademark. In accordance with well-established UDRP practice, the generic top-level domain suffix ".com" is disregarded as a standard technical registration requirement devoid of any distinctive character.

The second-level portion of the disputed domain name is "workprouk", which is composed of two elements: (a) the string "workpro", which is identical to the Complainant's WORKPRO trademark; and (b) the string "uk", which is a universally recognized geographical abbreviation for the United Kingdom. It is well established under the Policy that the addition of a generic or descriptive term – including a geographical indicator – to a complainant's trademark does not serve to distinguish the resulting domain name from the trademark. Such additions are generally insufficient to negate a finding of confusing similarity and may, in circumstances such as those present here, reinforce the association with the trademark owner by suggesting a territorial nexus with the trademark holder's operations in that market.

The disputed domain name wholly incorporates the Complainant's WORKPRO trademark as its dominant and distinctive element. The sole addition of the geographical abbreviation "uk" does not mitigate the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark. Accordingly, the Panelist finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark WORKPRO.

The Panelist finds that the Complainant has satisfied the requirements of Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

## II. The respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name

Paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy requires the Complainant to establish that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. While the burden of proof rests with the Complainant under all three elements of Paragraph 4(a), it is well established under the Policy that once the Complainant makes out a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production shifts to the Respondent to come forward with evidence demonstrating such rights or interests.

In the present case, the Respondent has failed to file any Response and has thus not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie case. While failure to respond does not per se demonstrate that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests, it allows the Panel to draw such inferences as it considers appropriate, see paragraph 14(b) of the Rules and CAC-UDRP-101284 or CAC-UDRP-106228 “A respondent is not obliged to participate in a proceeding under the Policy, but if it fails to do so, reasonable inferences may be drawn from the information provided by the complainant”.

Pursuant to Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, a respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a domain name by establishing any of the following circumstances: (i) use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the domain name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services prior to any notice of the dispute; (ii) that the respondent has been commonly known by the domain name; or (iii) legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain or to misleadingly divert consumers or or to tarnish the trademark or service mark.

### i. Absence of Authorization

The Complainant has represented, without contradiction, that the Respondent is not a licensee, authorized distributor, or business partner of the Complainant, and has not at any time been granted any right to use the WORKPRO trademark or to register any domain name incorporating that mark. There is no evidence before the Panelist suggesting any relationship between the parties that could give rise to a legitimate interest on the Respondent's part.

### ii. No Trademark Rights

Searches conducted by the Complainant in multiple national and regional trademark databases have revealed no trademark registrations held by the Respondent in the name WORKPRO or any similar designation. Accordingly, the Respondent cannot

establish rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name on the basis of independent trademark rights.

**iii. Nature of Use**

The disputed domain name resolves to a shopping website whose content is closely related to the Complainant's core commercial activities in the tool products sector, and which displays the WORKPRO trademark on multiple occasions without any indication of the website's independence from, or lack of affiliation with, the Complainant. The Panelist finds that such use – exploiting a domain name incorporating the Complainant's mark to operate a commercial website offering closely related goods – cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of Paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy. Such use is more consistent with an attempt to mislead internet users as to the source or sponsorship of the website and its content.

**iv. No Legitimate Non-Commercial or Fair Use**

There is no evidence before the Panelist that the Respondent has made, or has made demonstrable preparations to make, any legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Similarly, there is no evidence that the Respondent is or has been commonly known by the disputed domain name or by any designation that is identical or similar to it.

On the basis of the above findings, the Panelist concludes that the Complainant has established a prima facie case under Paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, which the Respondent has not rebutted. The Panelist accordingly finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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

The third element of the Policy requires the Complainant to demonstrate that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Both conditions must be satisfied cumulatively.

**i. Bad Faith Registration**

The WORKPRO brand was established by the Complainant in 2009 (and registered as a trademark from 2021) and had, by the time of the registration of the disputed domain name, achieved substantial commercial recognition in the international tools and storage market through extensive retail distribution, e-commerce activity, trade exhibition participation, and prominent placement on major online retail platforms. The Complainant holds registered trademark rights in WORKPRO, all registered prior to the date of the disputed domain name's registration.

The Respondent is identified as being located in China – the same country in which the Complainant is established and operates. In circumstances where the WORKPRO mark had acquired a high degree of recognition in the international marketplace, and particularly given the Complainant's status as a leading Chinese exporter in the global tools and storage sector, it is not credible that the Respondent was unaware of the existence of the WORKPRO trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. Knowledge of the Complainant's mark at the time of registration is further evidenced, a contrario, by the fact that the Respondent proceeded to construct a commercial website whose content replicates the Complainant's product offering and displays the WORKPRO mark without authorization.

It is well established under the Policy that knowledge – whether actual or constructive – of a well-known third-party mark at the time of registration of a confusingly similar domain name constitutes evidence of bad faith registration (WIPO Case No. D2014-1693). The Panelist is satisfied, on the evidence before it, that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant's prior trademark rights and deliberately chose to register the disputed domain name in order to exploit the reputation and goodwill associated with the WORKPRO mark. Such conduct constitutes registration in bad faith.

**ii. Bad Faith Use**

The disputed domain name resolves to an active commercial website offering products closely related to the Complainant's business and prominently featuring the WORKPRO trademark. The website does not contain any disclaimer of affiliation with, or independence from, the Complainant. The Panelist finds that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to intentionally attract internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's WORKPRO mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and the goods offered thereon, for the purpose of commercial gain.

This conduct falls squarely within the circumstances described in Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy as constitutive of bad faith use. Furthermore, the deliberate replication of the Complainant's brand identity and product content on the Respondent's website reinforces the inference of intentional exploitation of the Complainant's goodwill, and is inconsistent with any good faith purpose.

**iii. Conclusion on Bad Faith**

Having regard to all the circumstances of the case, including: (a) the registration of a domain name that wholly incorporates the Complainant's distinctive and commercially well-established WORKPRO trademark; (b) the addition of a geographical element that reinforces rather than dissipates the association with the Complainant; (c) the Respondent's location in the same jurisdiction as the Complainant; (d) the Respondent's operation of a commercial website mimicking the Complainant's business activities and displaying the Complainant's mark without authorization; and (e) the Respondent's failure to provide any explanation or evidence in response to the Complaint; the Panelist finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith within the meaning of Paragraph 4(a)(iii) and Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **workprouk.com**: Transferred

## PANELLISTS

| Name | **Petr Hostaš** |
|---|---|

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-04-07

Publish the Decision