Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108552

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108552
Time of filing	2026-04-13 22:01:13
Domain names	unitd-arrows.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	UNITED ARROWS LTD.

Complainant representative

Organization	Rodenbaugh Law LLC

Respondent

Organization	Shaanxi Shengyuntong Technology 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 has proved to own the following trademark rights, inter alia:

- Japanese trademark UNITED ARROWS No. 5361355 registered on October 15, 2010, duly renewed and covering goods in classes 9, 14, 18, and 25;
- International trademark UNITED ARROWS No. 1122621 registered on March 26, 2012, duly renewed, covering goods in classes 18 and 25;
- International semi-figurative trademark UNITED ARROWS 1074892 registered on March 31, 2010, duly renewed, covering goods and services in classes 14, 18, 25, and 35;
- International semi-figurative trademark UNITED ARROWS 1810920 registered on July 30, 2024, covering goods in class 25;

- United States semi-figurative trademark UNITED ARROWS 7933344 registered on September 9, 2025 covering goods in class 25.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

UNITED ARROWS is a Japanese fashion retailer founded in 1989 and headquartered in Tokyo, Japan. The Complainant operates hundreds of retail stores throughout Japan and offers clothing, accessories, and fashion-related products through both physical stores and online platforms. The UNITED ARROWS trademark has been used for more than thirty years in Japan and internationally.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name <united-arrows.com> on November 4, 2025.

The Complainant submitted the following documents to prove the abovementioned facts:

- Annex 1: ICANN Lookup for Disputed Domain Name
- Annex 2: Domain Name Service Agreement
- Annex 3: Complainant Website
- Annex 4: Complainant Background
- Annex 5: Complainant Trademark Registrations
- Annex 6: Infringing Website Content
- Annex 7: Contact form users to the Complainant about the disputed domain name

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain name should be transferred to it.

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

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

Identity (paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy)

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name < unitd-arrows.com > is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s UNITED ARROWS trademarks.

Indeed, the Complainant’s UNITED ARROWS trademark is incorporated almost in its entirety within the disputed domain name, with the sole omission of the letter “e” in the word “United,” resulting in the typo-squatted term “unitd.” Such a minor misspelling does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

Thus, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant’s trademarks.

Absence of Rights or Legitimate Interests (paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy)

The Complainant asserted that the Respondent has never been authorized to use the Complainant’s UNITED ARROWS trademarks in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is identified as “Shaanxi Shengyuntong Technology Co., Ltd.” Thus, the Panel finds that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. Moreover, the Panel finds that there is no evidence demonstrating that the Respondent holds any trademark rights related to the disputed domain name. Consequently, the Panel finds that the Respondent lacks any right or legitimate interest in using the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, the disputed domain name resolves to a retail-style website offering clothing and fashion products similar to those sold by the Complainant. The website uses the term “UNITD ARROWS”, which is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademarks, thereby creating a false impression of affiliation or endorsement. In these circumstances, the Panel finds that such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate non-commercial or fair use under the Policy.

Finally, the Respondent had the opportunity to provide its arguments in support of its rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. However, by failing to file a response, the Respondent has missed this opportunity and the Panel is entitled to draw such inferences from the Respondent's failure as it considers appropriate in accordance with Paragraph 14 of the Rules.

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

Bad faith (paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.)

In light of the records, the Complainant showed that the disputed domain name is consequently similar to the well-known UNITED ARROWS trademarks.

The Panel finds that the Respondent cannot reasonably pretend it was intending to develop a legitimate activity through the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name consists of an intentional misspelling of the Complainant's trademarks, namely the omission of the letter “e” in “United”, which constitutes a clear case of typosquatting. Such practice is commonly understood as seeking to take advantage of Internet users’ typographical errors and does not support any good faith registration or use (See National Association of Professional Baseball Leagues, Inc., d/b/a Minor League Baseball v. John Zuccarini, Wipo Case No. D2002-1011).

The Panel also notes that the disputed domain name was registered on November 4, 2025, after the registration of the Complainant’s UNITED ARROWS trademarks.

Therefore, it is clear to the Panel that the Respondent was well aware of the UNITED ARROWS trademarks and has registered the disputed domain name with the intention to refer to the Complainant and to its trademarks.

Furthermore, the disputed domain name resolves to a website offering clothing and fashion-related products similar to those sold by the Complainant and using the term “UNITD ARROWS”. In the Panel’s view, it seems that the Respondent has registered the dispute domain name in bad faith for the sole purpose of attracting Internet users for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s UNITED ARROWS trademarks. Such use is likely to mislead consumers for the Respondent’s benefit and to divert them from the Complainant’s business.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **unitd-arrows.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Nathalie Dreyfus**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-05-22

Publish the Decision