



**URS | DETERMINATION**  
(URS Procedure 9, URS Rules 13)

**URS DISPUTE NO. 67930D6B**

Determination DEFAULT

**I. PARTIES**

Complainant: Kikkoman Corporation (Japan)  
Complainant's authorized representative: IP Twins

Respondent: Privacy Protect, LLC (PrivacyProtect.org) (United States)

**II. THE DOMAIN NAME, REGISTRY OPERATOR AND REGISTRAR**

Domain Name: superstorekikkoman.shop  
Registry Operator: GMO Registry, Inc.  
Registrar: PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com

**III. PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

Complaint submitted: 29 July 2025  
Lock of the domain name: 31 July 2025  
Notice of Complaint: 3 August 2025  
Default Date: 17 August 2025  
Notice of Default: 19 August 2025  
Panel Appointed: 22 August 2025  
Default Determination issued: 22 August 2025

**IV. EXAMINER**

Examiner's Name: Guido Maffei

The Examiner certifies that he has acted independently and impartially and to the best of his knowledge has no known conflict in serving as the Examiner in this administrative proceeding.

**V. RELIEF SOUGHT**

The Complainant requests that the domain name be suspended for the balance of the registration period.

The Respondent has not submitted a Response.

## **VI. STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Clear and convincing evidence.

## **VII. DISCUSSIONS AND FINDINGS**

### **A. Complainant:**

The Complainant is the Japanese company Kikkoman Corporation. Founded in 1917, the Complainant informs to be a global food manufacturer. Its main products and services include soy sauce, food seasoning and flavoring, mirin, and sake, juice and other beverages, biochemical products, and restaurant management services. The Complainant also affirms that Kikkoman Corporation, as of 2002, was the world's largest producer of soy sauce.

The Complainant is the owner of the following trademark registrations for KIKKOMAN:

- International mark “KIKKOMAN” no. 919542 registered on November 15, 2006, and duly renewed for classes 1, 5, 9, 29, 30, 32 and 33.
- Japanese mark “KIKKOMAN” no. 5032970 registered on March 16, 2007, and duly renewed for classes 29, 30 and 32.

The Complainant contends that the above trademarks were registered well before the registration of the domain name in dispute.

According to the Complainant's view, the domain name in dispute is highly and confusingly similar to the prior rights owned by the Complainant on KIKKOMAN. This, especially in consideration of the fact that <superstorekikkoman.shop> fully includes the Complainant's mark KIKKOMAN and the addition of the term SUPERSTORE, which is merely descriptive, does nothing to diminish the likelihood of confusion.

Furthermore, the Complainant states that the Respondent is not known, as an individual or an organization, by the domain and holds no trademark in KIKKOMAN. The Complainant also notes that the disputed domain name is used in connection with a website which includes a KIKKOMAN logo, albeit different from the official logo of the Complainant, and uses the earlier KIKKOMAN trademark of the Complainant to designate non-Kikkoman products and that, accordingly, the disputed domain name is not used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

In addition, in the Complainant's view, the Respondent knew, or should have known, the existence of the Complainant when registering the domain name in dispute; this, in particular in view of the current use of the same domain name made by the Respondent.

Finally, it is the Complainant's view that the registration and use of <superstorekikkoman.shop> is in bad faith since it resolves to an active website reproducing the trademark and copyright material of the Complainant and offering food products for sale, including some of Complainant's branded products.



## **B. Respondent:**

The Respondent did not submit a Response.

## **C. Procedural findings:**

Having reviewed the communications records, the Examiner finds that MFSD has discharged its responsibility under the URS Procedure paragraphs 3 and 4 and URS Rules paragraph 4.

In accordance with URS Rules Paragraph 9(d), in absence of a Response, the language of the Determination shall be English.

## **D. Findings of fact:**

The disputed domain name was registered on August 7, 2024.

The Complainant has demonstrated to be the owner of the following trademark registrations for KIKKOMAN:

- International mark “KIKKOMAN” no. 919542 registered on November 15, 2006, and duly renewed for classes 1, 5, 9, 29, 30, 32 and 33.
- Japanese mark “KIKKOMAN” no. 5032970 registered on March 16, 2007, and duly renewed for classes 29, 30 and 32.

## **E. Reasoning:**

### **1. The domain name(s) is(are) identical or confusingly similar to a word mark**

The Complainant has established to have registered rights in the distinctive term KIKKOMAN at least since 2006. The Complainant trademarks, therefore, were registered well before the registration of the disputed domain name (August 7, 2024). The disputed domain name reproduces, in its entirety, the KIKKOMAN mark, with the mere addition of the word “superstore”. In this regard, the Panel considers that the addition of the word “superstore” in this case does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity with the Complainant’s KIKKOMAN mark (see, between many others, Koninklijke Philips N.V. v. Martin Johnson, WIPO Case No. D2019-2398). Additionally, the Panel reiterates that the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.shop” may be disregarded by the Panel in order to establish identity or confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant’s trademark. Therefore, the Examiner finds that the requirement set forth under Paragraph 1.2.6.1. of the URS Procedure has been satisfied.

### **2. Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests to the domain name(s)**

The Complainant provided prima facie evidence that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name as (i) it is not known, as an individual or an organization, by the domain, (ii) it does not hold any trademark registrations for KIKKOMAN and (iii) it is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and/or services. The Respondent, in the absence of any response, has not shown any facts or element to justify prior rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Based on the above, the Examiner finds that the Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain names as per the requirement set forth under Paragraph 1.2.6.2. of the URS Procedure.

### **3. The domain name(s) was(were) registered and is(are) being used in bad faith**

The Respondent registered the disputed domain names years after the use and registration of KIKKOMAN by the Complainant. In consideration of the reputation achieved by KIKKOMAN, the Respondent was surely aware of the Complainant and of its trademark KIKKOMAN when he registered the domain name in dispute. Moreover, the Respondent appears to have attempted to benefit commercially from the appropriation of the KIKKOMAN mark in the disputed domain name. The use made by Respondent of the mark KIKKOMAN, which is well-known for food products, clearly indicates that the disputed domain name was chosen by the Respondent to take advantage of the Complainant's mark reputation. This finding leads to the obvious conclusion that the disputed domain name has been registered in bad faith (Research In Motion Limited v. Privacy Locked LLC/Nat Collicot - WIPO Case No. D2009-0320; The Gap, Inc. v. Deng Youqian - WIPO Case No. D2009-0113; AXA S.A. v. P.A. van der Wees - WIPO Case No. D2009-0206; BHP Billiton Innovation v. Ravindra Bala - WIPO Case No. D2008-1059). The Examiner also finds that, by using the mark KIKKOMAN in its website as well as copyright material of the Complainant and by offering food products for sale, including food products bearing the KIKKOMAN trademark, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain, by causing a likelihood of confusion with the trademark KIKKOMAN as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of its website and the products promoted therein. This is a clear use in bad faith of the domain name in dispute. Therefore, the Examiner finds that the requirement set forth under Paragraph 1.2.6.3. of the URS Procedure has been satisfied by the Complainant.

### **4. Abusive Complaint**

The Examiner finds that the Complaint was neither abusive nor contained material falsehoods.

## **VIII. DETERMINATION**

### **A. Demonstration of URS elements**

Demonstrated

### **B. Complaint and remedy**

Complaint: Accepts



Domain Name: SUPERSTOREKIKKOMAN.SHOP

Suspends for the balance of the registration period.

C. Abuse of proceedings

Finding of abuse of proceedings: Not finds

D. Publication

Publication: Publish the Determination

## **SIGNATURE**

Name: Guido

Surname: Maffei

Date: 2024-08-22