Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108979

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108979
Time of filing	2026-09-09 09:02:39
Domain names	yetithailand.com, yeti-suomi.com, yeti-israel.com, yeticuppe.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	YETI COOLERS, LLC.

Complainant representative

Organization	Convey srl

Respondents

Name	ming dian
Organization	HaoRan Chen

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 has submitted evidence, which the Panel accepts, showing that it is the registered owner of trademark “YETI”, inter alia, the following:

- European Union trademark “YETI” no. 001565472, registered on June 6, 2001;
- International trademark “YETI” no. 1301612, registered on April 26, 2016.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

FACTS ASSERTED BY THE COMPLAINANT AND NOT CONTESTED BY THE RESPONDENT:

The Complainant, YETI COOLERS, LLC., is a manufacturer and supplier of premium outdoor products, including high-performance coolers, drinkware, bags, and related accessories, established in 2006. In recent years, YETI has been included among the Best Brands for Social Impact, ranking #54 in the Food Storage Containers/Coolers category in 2026 and #53 in the Home Goods category in 2025. The company was also recognized among the Best Brands for Value in the Home & Furnishings sector in 2025,

ranked #261, and was featured among Forbes' Best Mid-Cap Companies, ranking #33 in 2025 and #32 in 2022. Moreover, YETI was included in Forbes' Customer Experience All-Stars ranking in the Food Storage Containers/Coolers category in 2024.

The disputed domain names <yetithailand.com>, <yeti-suomi.com>, <yeti-israel.com> were registered on August 19, 2024, and the disputed domain name < yeticuppe.com> was registered on October 31, 2025. They are all inactive at the time of this decision.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT:

The Complainant requests the acceptance of the consolidated Complaint filed against multiple Respondents, because it is in their view equitable and procedurally efficient to permit the consolidation, and the Respondents are engaged in a common conduct that has affected the Complainant in a similar fashion.

THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAMES ARE CONFUSINGLY SIMILAR

The Complainant states that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark "YETI". The addition of the generic geographic terms "THAILAND", "-SUOMI", "-ISRAEL", and "CUPPE", which is composed by "cup", i.e. one of the most sold items of YETI, and "pe", i.e., the ccTLD of Peru, does not preclude a finding of confusing similarity; on the contrary, it reinforces the association with the Complainant's products, creating the impression of a direct impersonation.

The Complainant also states that the top level ".com" does not change the overall impression and does not prevent likelihood of confusion.

Consequently, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark.

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS IN RESPECT OF THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAMES

The Complainant states that the Respondent is neither a licensee nor an authorized distributor of the Complainant and has received no permission—express or implied—to use the Complainant's "YETI" trademarks or to register domain names incorporating them. The Complainant has not granted the Respondent any rights to operate domain names identical or confusingly similar to its trademarks.

The Complainant claims that the Respondent uses the disputed domain names to impersonate "YETI" brand and provided screenshots of the websites that are resolved by the disputed domain names. Such use is claimed to clearly target the Complainant's products and is inherently illegitimate, as it is based on the unauthorized distribution and exploitation of the Complainant's brand.

It is referred that the past panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (e.g. phishing, scams, unauthorized account access/hacking, impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent (WIPO Overview 3.0, section 2.13.1.).

Consequently, the Complainant argues that the Respondent is not using the disputed domain names in connection with bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate non-commercial or fair use.

THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAMES WERE REGISTERED AND ARE USED IN BAD FAITH

The Complainant submits that in light of its trademark filings and the widespread use of the "YETI" trademarks, it is inconceivable that the Respondents were unaware of the Complainant's rights when registering the disputed domain names. On the contrary, in light of the content of the websites, it is claimed that the Respondents have, from the outset, intentionally sought to exploit the Complainant's trademarks and reputation in order to derive an illicit commercial benefit. Notably, the disputed domain names are alleged to resolve to websites on which the Complainant's trademarks are prominently and unduly displayed as provided in the annexes, further demonstrating that the Respondent was fully aware of the Complainant's brand and deliberately sought to associate its own offerings with it. Such conduct constitutes clear evidence of bad-faith registration and use under the Policy.

Moreover, considering that the disputed domain names incorporate the Complainant's trademarks in their entirety, it is claimed that the Respondents could not be unaware that it was making unauthorized use of the Complainant's mark in both the domain names and the associated websites' content. Despite this, the Respondents never sought authorization from YETI COOLERS, LLC. to use the trademark within the disputed domain names. On the contrary, the Respondent sought to exploit the mark's notoriety without permission and subsequently failed to respond when contacted by the Complainant in an effort to explore an amicable resolution.

With reference to the above, the Complainant highlights that it has been stated in various decisions that the registration of a domain name with the knowledge of the complainant's trademarks is evidence of bad faith, i.e. in Belstaff S.R.L. v. jiangzheng ying Case No. D2012-0793, "the Panel notices that the word "belstaff" is distinctive and the Complainant had expended substantial efforts to create and maintain the reputation of the mark BELSTAFF. Use of the Domain Names by the Respondent took place only long after the trademark BELSTAFF had become well known in the relevant public sector. Therefore, the Respondent should have been aware of the mark BELSTAFF when it applied to register the Domain Names. In this Panel's view, the Respondent's reproduction of the

Complainant's trademark BELSTAFF (both word and device trademarks) on the Websites, as well as its offering of purported Belstaff products is sufficient to show that it knew of the BELSTAFF mark when registering the Domain Names. Incorporation of the BELSTAFF mark in the Domain Names without any reasonable justification is sufficient evidence of bad faith by the Respondent".

The Complainant states that in its decisions, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (e.g., the sale of counterfeit goods or illegal pharmaceuticals, phishing, distributing malware, unauthorized account access/hacking, impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud) constitutes bad faith (see WIPO Overview 3.0, section 3.4.).

When the Complainant became aware of the registration and use of the disputed domain names by the Respondent, the Respondents were served with cease and desist notice in order to formally notify the Respondent of the infringement of the Complainant's trademark rights, requesting the immediate cease of any use, and the transfer of the disputed domain names to the Complainant, however, the Respondent did not reply.

This absence of cooperation, combined with the Respondent's refusal to respond to official communications, the Complainant emphasizes its bad-faith intent and its failure to demonstrate any bona fide basis for the registration or use of the disputed domain names.

As a further indication of bad faith, it is noted that some disputed domain names resolved to inactive webpages (<yetithailand.com>; <yeti-suomi.com>; <yeticuppe.com>) at the time of the Complaint and displayed no genuine content, while "yeti-israel.com" was only accessible through VPN ISRAEL. In the circumstances of this case, the passive holding of the disputed domain names further supports the conclusion that the Respondent was fully aware of the Complainant's rights and registered the disputed domain names in bad faith, without any legitimate purpose or bona fide use. This conclusion is reinforced by the fact that one of the four corresponding websites – www.yeti-israel.com - is accessible only through an Israeli VPN. Such circumstances demonstrate a deliberate attempt to target Internet users in that specific jurisdiction and to capitalize on the Complainant's trademark reputation in the Israeli market.

As a further indication of the Respondent's bad faith, the Complainant notes that, following the registrant data disclosure on September 8, 2026, it was possible to ascertain that the contact details provided by the Respondent at the time of registration are associated with over five hundreds of additional domain names. This evidence demonstrates a clear pattern of bad-faith registrations involving domain names incorporating well-known trademarks, with the evident purpose of exploiting the goodwill and reputation associated with such marks for commercial gain.

Moreover, the registrant, identified as "Ming Diang," has been the subject of several prior UDRP proceedings in which he was found to have acted in bad faith by registering domain names incorporating famous or well-known trademarks. In those cases, the panels ordered the transfer of the disputed domain names after concluding that the respondent had engaged in bad-faith registration and use. Such prior adverse findings are claimed to further reinforce the conclusion that the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of cybersquatting conduct and 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.

The Complainant further highlights the Respondent's bad faith from the inaccurate and incomplete contact details provided at the time of registration. Following the disclosure of the underlying registrant data, the Respondent's address was revealed as "honglianxili, xiamen, fujian, 361000, CN". However, such address does not correspond to any complete, identifiable, or independently mappable postal address.

Accordingly, the Complainant alleges that the disputed domain names were registered and is being used in bad faith.

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

It must be noted that the Complainant requested a consolidation regarding multiple respondents. According to WIPO Overview 3.0. under 4.11., it is possible and the final decision is on the panel. In that regard, where a complaint is filed against multiple respondents, panels should look at whether the domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control, and the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all parties. Procedural efficiency would also be taken into account.

Panels have considered a range of factors, typically present in some combination, as useful to determining whether such consolidation is appropriate, such as similarities in or relevant aspects of (i) the registrants' identity(ies) including pseudonyms, (ii) the registrants' contact information including e-mail address(es), postal address(es), or phone number(s), including any pattern of irregularities, (iii) relevant IP addresses, name servers, or webhost(s), (iv) the content or layout of websites corresponding to the disputed domain names, (v) the nature of the marks at issue (e.g., where a registrant targets a specific sector), (vi) any naming patterns in the disputed domain names (e.g., <mark-country> or <mark-goods>), (vii) the relevant language/scripts of the disputed domain names particularly where they are the same as the mark(s) at issue, (viii) any changes by the respondent relating to any of the above items following communications regarding the disputed domain name(s), (ix) any evidence of respondent affiliation with respect to the ability to control the disputed domain name(s), (x) any (prior) pattern of similar respondent behavior, or (xi) other arguments made by the complainant and/or disclosures by the respondent(s).

The Panel has examined the case details and the evidence for signs of commonality between any of the Respondents. Apparently the four disputed domain names were registered, three of them belonging to the same Respondent at the same date but the other in the name of the other Respondent in another date, through different registrars, to different persons in different addresses and different communications details. No convincing point of commonality has been drawn to the attention of the Panel. From the provided information, the Panel could not establish a clear link between the two Respondents or any similarities or pattern that could justify a consolidation. It seems that the disputed domain names <yetithailand.com> and <yeti-israel.com> include the same/highly similar content and they seem to be related, or controlled by the same person/entity, whereas there is no information that the disputed domain name <yeticuppe.com> is of the same or that it is in fact a combination of "YETI" and a geographical place as the others. The latter is inactive and the information on the Respondent does not match with the other. Considering that none of the above criteria were met and there is no established common control of the websites or domain names, the Panel considers that the consolidation request is not acceptable. Consequently, the Panel will proceed to hear the Complaint against the cited first Respondent ming dian in respect of the disputed domain names <yetithailand.com>, <yeti-suomi.com>, <yeti-israel.com>. This is without prejudice to the right of the Complainant to seek to refile the remaining Complaint (Valeant Pharmaceuticals International, Inc. / iNova Pharmaceuticals (Australia) Pty Limited v. Luca Radu / Fundacion Private WhoIs / Maxim Conovalov / Vasju Pere, WIPO Case No. D2013-1918).

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

Paragraph 15 of the Rules provides that the Panel is to decide the Complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

In this context, the Panel also notes that the burden of proof is on the Complainant to make out its case and past UDRP panels have consistently said that a Complainant must show that all three elements of the Policy have been made out before any order can be made to transfer a domain name.

For the Complainant to succeed it must prove, within the meaning of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, that:

- the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;

- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and

- the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

The Panel will therefore deal with each of these requirements in turn.

1. IDENTICAL OR CONFUSINGLY SIMILAR

The Policy simply requires the Complainant to demonstrate that the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights. The Panel is satisfied that the Complainant is the owner of registration of "YETI" trademarks.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's "YETI" trademark and the addition of the geographical terms "THAILAND" or "ISRAEL" or "SUOMI" is not sufficient to vanish the similarity.

Moreover, the addition of the gTLD ".COM" is not enough to abolish the similarity.

The Panel is of the opinion that the Internet users will easily fall into false impression that the disputed domain names are official domain names of the Complainant. The Panel recognizes the Complainant's rights and concludes that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar with the Complainant's trademark. Therefore, the Panel concludes that the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy is provided.

2. NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

Under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, the complainant has the burden of establishing that the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name.

It is open to a respondent to establish its rights or legitimate interests in a domain name, among other circumstances, by showing any of the following elements:

(i) before any notice to the respondent of the dispute, the use or making 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; or

(ii) the respondent of the dispute (as an individual, business, or other organization) has been commonly known by the domain name, even if it has acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or

(iii) the respondent of the dispute is making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the domain name, without an intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

Thus, if the respondent proves any of these elements or indeed anything else that shows that it has a right or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name, the complainant will have failed to discharge its burden of proof and the complaint will fail. The burden is on the complainant to demonstrate a prima facie case that the respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Once the complainant has made out a prima facie case, then the respondent may, inter alia, by showing one of the above circumstances, demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has nothing to do with the Complainant or not related in any way and given no authorization for any use of the trademark "YETI". Moreover, the disputed domain names have no relation with the Respondent, and the Respondent is not commonly known as the disputed domain names.

In the absence of a response, the Panel accepts the Complainant's allegations as true that the Respondent has no authorization to use the Complainant's trademark in the disputed domain names.

Hence, as the Complainant has made out its prima facie case, and as the Respondent has not demonstrated any rights or legitimate interests as illustrated under paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, nor has the Panel found any other basis for finding any rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in the disputed domain dames, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has satisfied the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

3. BAD FAITH

The Panel concludes that the Complainant's "YETI" trademark is of distinctive character and is well-known in its sector. Therefore, the Panel is of the opinion that due to the earlier rights of the Complainant in well-known "YETI" trademark, the Respondent, was aware of the Complainant and its trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain names (see e.g., Ebay Inc. v. Wangming, WIPO Case No. D2006-1107). Referring to Parfums Christian Dior v. Javier Garcia Quintas and Christiandior.net, WIPO Case No. D2000-0226, the Panel believes that the awareness of the Complainant's trademark at the time of the registration of the disputed domain names is to be considered an inference of bad faith registration.

Moreover, the disputed domain names are currently inactive but, in the Complaint, it was explained that it was incorporating elements of the Complainant's branding and the same overall look, showing the same products. It can deceit the consumers into thinking the Respondent is affiliated with the Complainant and into buying products through or by way of the websites of the disputed domain names. The Panel considers that this may be evaluated under (iv) of paragraph 4(b), which is as follows: by using the domain name, the respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the respondent's website or location or of a product or service on the respondent's website or location. In any case, as previously held by various panellists many times before, the current inactive status of the disputed domain name also does not prevent the finding of bad faith.

All the circumstances of the case must be examined to determine whether the Respondent is acting in bad faith. The cumulative circumstances for an indication of bad faith include the Complainant having a well-known trademark, no proper response having been filed, and the registrant's provision of false/incomplete address, as well as the previous deceptive uses and no response to previous attempts at solving the matter amicably, which all happened in this case.

Therefore, in light of the above-mentioned circumstances in the present case, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith and that the Complainant has established the third element under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Partially Accepted/Partially Rejected

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

1. **yetithailand.com**: Transferred
2. **yeti-suomi.com**: Transferred
3. **yeti-israel.com**: Transferred
4. **yeticuppe.com**: Terminated (consolidation not granted)

PANELLISTS

Name	**Mrs Selma Ünlü**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-10-20

Publish the Decision