



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

URS DISPUTE NO. 48B04FC2

Determination DEFAULT

I. PARTIES

Complainant: Kabushiki Kaisha Yaskawa Denki (YASKAWA Electric Corporation) (Japan)
Complainant's authorized representative: IP Twins (France)

Respondent: Sergei Balikin (Russia)

II. THE DOMAIN NAME, REGISTRY OPERATOR AND REGISTRAR

Domain Name: yaskawa.tech
Registry Operator: Radix Technologies Inc.
Registrar: Registrar of Domain Names REG.RU LLC

III. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Complaint submitted: 23 December 2025
Lock of the domain name: 12 January 2026
Notice of Complaint: 16 January 2026
Default Date: 31 January 2026
Notice of Default: 2 February 2026
Panel Appointed: 6 February 2026
Default Determination issued: 7 February 2026

IV. EXAMINER

Examiner's Name: Mr. Nicholas Smith

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 a Japanese company, founded in 1915 which is involved in manufacturing various electrical equipment under the trademark YASKAWA, which it has registered in a number of jurisdictions.

The Complainant contends that:

- 1) The Domain Name is identical to the Complainant's distinctive YASKAWA mark, merely adding the ".tech" gTLD.
- 2) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name. The Respondent has not been authorized by the Complainant to use the YASKAWA mark or register any domain name incorporating the YASKAWA mark or any similar mark. The Domain Name resolves to a webpage where Respondent reproduces various trademark and copyrighted material of the Complainant.
- 3) As the Domain Name is strictly identical to Complainant's trademark, it is clear that a likelihood of confusion is presumed, and such confusion will inevitably result in the diversion of Internet traffic from Complainant's site to Respondent's active website. By using the Domain Name, Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to Respondent's web site or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of Respondent's web site or location or of a product or service on Respondent's web site or location.

Complainant submits that it has made a prima facie case that the three elements of URS Procedure 1.2.6 are satisfied.

B. Respondent:

The Respondent did not file a Response within the required deadline.

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 facts asserted by the Complainant regarding registration and use of the Domain Name in bad faith have not been supported by clear and convincing evidence and hence the Complainant has not demonstrated all 3 elements of the URS by a standard of clear and convincing evidence.

E. Reasoning:

According to Paragraph 13 of the URS Rules, the Examiner shall make a Determination of a Complaint in accordance with the URS Procedure, the URS Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions. However, a Respondent's failure to address the contentions does not automatically result in a decision in favor of the Complainant. The URS Procedure requires the Complainant to succeed in establishing that each of the three following conditions under Paragraph 1.2.6 of the URS Procedure are satisfied:

- That the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a word mark;
- That the Respondent has no legitimate right or interest to the Domain Name;
- That the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

1. The domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a word mark

The Complainant is owner of an international trade mark registration for the word mark YASKAWA designating jurisdictions including Japan, Korea and Turkey (No. 1188789 registered on 14 June 20213 for goods and services in classes 3, 9, 10, 12, 35, 37 and 42).

The Domain Name consists of the YASKAWA mark and the gTLD “.tech”. Disregarding the gTLD for the purposes of comparison the Domain Name is identical to the mark.

The Examiner finds that the Complaint meets the requirement of the URS 1.2.6.1.

2. Respondent has no legitimate right or interest to the domain name

The Examiner does not address this element given the findings it has made in respect of the third element (URS 1.2.6.3).

3. The domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith

First, the Examiner notes that the URS Procedure provides that the burden of proof shall be clear and convincing evidence (see paragraph 8.2 of URS Procedure) and that the Complainant must present evidence that the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Under paragraph 8.6 of URS Procedure if the Examiner finds that all three standards are satisfied by clear and convincing evidence and that there is no genuine contestable issue, then the Examiner shall issue a Determination in favor of the Complainant. If the Examiner finds that any of the standards have not been satisfied, then the Examiner shall deny the relief requested, thereby terminating the URS proceeding without prejudice to the Complainant to proceed with an action in court of competent jurisdiction or under the UDRP. This is contrary to the claim in the Complaint, which merely states that the Complainant has made a prima facie case.

Second, as stated in 1.2.4. of URS Procedure “for each domain name, the Complainant shall include a copy of the currently available RDDS information and a description and copy, if available, of the offending portion of the website content associated with each domain name that is the subject of the Complaint”. The Domain Name is not active or otherwise accessible on the date of this determination. The Complaint annexes what is said to be a screenshot of a page taken on December 16, 2025, however it is entirely in Russian and no translation has been provided. It appears that there may have been photographs on the Respondent’s Website but the screenshot provided does not reproduce them. The Complaint asserts that the Domain Name “resolves to an active page reproducing the trademark and copyright material of the Complainant”. This statement simply is not supported by the evidence provided, nor is there any other clear and convincing evidence, understandable by the Examiner, that would show how the Domain Name is used.

This leaves some issues of material fact unresolved and it is not for the Examiner to conduct any additional investigation and research. The Examiner only deals with the arguments and evidence provided by the parties.

Under paragraph 9.1 of URS Procedure “there will be no discovery or hearing; the evidence will be the materials submitted with the Complaint and the Response, and those materials will serve as the entire record used by the Examiner to make a Determination” and under paragraph 9.3. if the Complainant does not satisfy the burden of proof, the URS proceeding is terminated.

While URS is a simplified procedure, it requires some serious preparatory work and high standard of proof for the complainants.

There is simply not enough information and evidence for the Examiner to decide on the bad faith element in this dispute and the Complainant fails to demonstrate that element by clear and convincing standard.

Relevant URS case law shows that mere assertions of bad faith are not sufficient and all the URS elements have to be demonstrated by clear and convincing evidence In *Wikimedia Foundation, Inc. v. WhoisGuard, Inc* Forum Case No. FA1804001780755 the Examiner noted: “The Examiner deplores the fact that the Complainant has not submitted any evidence supporting its claim of bad faith use and registration. The Examiner would have expected the Complainant to provide evidence of, for instance, the website associated with the disputed



domain name. The Examiner notes that the Complainant submitted a screenshot of its own website, but not of the Respondent's website." This is supported in URS DISPUTE No. 38D38101, involving the domain name <SUPERGANEGOZIO.ONLINE>. In the present case, the Complainant has provided a screenshot, but the absence of photographs or translation has resulted in the screenshot being effectively incomprehensible and not sufficient for the clear and convincing standard as required by URS. Therefore, the Examiner finds that the Complaint did not satisfy the standards of URS Procedure 1.2.6.3, namely that the Complaint did not provide any evidence of bad faith registration and use of the Domain Name.

4. Abusive Complaint

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

The Examiner finds that the Complaint was not substantiated, in particular in respect of the bad faith element, however this alone does not indicate abuse of proceedings. Had the Complainant provided more details and evidence, the outcome could have been different.

VIII. DETERMINATION

A. Demonstration of URS elements

Not demonstrated

B. Complaint and remedy

Complaint: Rejects

Domain Name: yaskawa.tech

Unlocks and returns to the full control of the Registrant

C. Abuse of proceedings

Finding of abuse of proceedings: Not finds

D. Publication

Publication: Publish the Determination

SIGNATURE

Name: Nicholas

Surname: Smith
Date: 2026-02-07