



(Hong Kong Office)

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Case No.	HK-1700948
Complainant:	LSpace America, LLC
Respondent:	ji shupeng
Disputed Domain Name(s):	<LSPACEBIKINI.COM >

1. The Parties and Contested Domain Name

The Complainant is LSpace America, LLC, of 557 Wald Street, Irvine, California 92618, United States of America.

The Respondent is ji shupeng, of Jizhuang, Xingzheng Village, Jizhuang, Machang Town, Taikang County, Zhoukou City, Henan Province, People's Republic of China.

The domain name at issue is <LSPACEBIKINI.COM> ("*Disputed Domain Name*"), registered by Respondent with PDR Ltd. D/B/A (PUBLICDOMAINREGISTRY.COM) of 501, IT Building No3, NESCO IT Park, NESCO Complex, Western Express Highway, Goregaon (East), Mumbai 400063 Maharashtra, India ("*the Registrar*").

2. Procedural History

On 17 February 2017, pursuant to the Internet Corporation For Assigned Names And Numbers (ICANN) Uniform Domain Name Policy ("*the Policy*"), the Rules of Uniform

Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (“*the Rules*”) and the Asian Domain Name Dispute Resolution Centre Supplementary Rules to the ICANN Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy and the Rules For the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (“*the Supplemental Rules*”), the Complainant filed a Complaint in the English language with the Hong Kong Office of the Asian Domain Dispute Resolution Centre (“*ADNDRC-HK*”) and elected to have the case in question be dealt with by a single member panel.

On 17 February 2017, the *ADNDRC-HK* notified *the Registrar* of the *Disputed Domain Name* proceedings by email. By which, the *ADNDRC-HK* requested *the Registrar* to provide the following information, namely:-

- “1. Whether the above domain name is registered with “*PDR LTD. D/B/A, PUBLICDOMAINREGISTRY.COM*”;
2. Whether the Respondent “*ji shupeng*” is the Registrant or holder of the disputed domain name;
3. Whether the ICANN Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy is applicable to the current dispute;
4. The language of the Registration Agreement of the disputed domain name(s). In accordance with the UDRP, the language of the proceedings shall be the language of the Registration Agreement, unless otherwise agreed by the parties or decided by the Panelist;
5. Please provide us with the registration date and expiration date of the disputed domain name(s);
6. Please confirm with us that the disputed domain name(s) has/have been locked and would not be transferred to another holder or registrar during the current administrative proceeding or for a period of 15 business days

after the proceeding is concluded in accordance with Paragraph 8 of the Policy;

7. *Please provide us with the Whois information regarding the disputed domain name(s);”*

In the meantime, the **ADNDRC-HK** reminded *the Registrar* to take appropriate action towards the *Disputed Domain Name*, namely < **LSPACEBIKINI.COM** > in accordance with the rules stipulated by *the Policy*, such as prohibiting the *Disputed Domain Name* from being transferred to a third party.

On 17 February 2017, the **ADNDRC-HK** notified the Complainant by email that they received the Complaint concerning the *Disputed Domain Name*, namely < **LSPACEBIKINI.COM** >. The **ADNDRC-HK** requested the Complainant to submit the case filling fee on or before 27 February 2017, in accordance with Paragraph 19(c) of the **Rules** and Article 15 of the **Supplemental Rules**. The **ADNDRC-HK** also stated that:-

“We have notified the concerned Registrar of the disputed domain name. Upon receipt of the Registrar’s confirmation on the WHOIS information, we shall proceed to review your Complaint and let you know whether it is in administrative compliance with the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy”). If it is in compliance, we shall forward your complaint to the Respondent and formally commence the proceedings in accordance with Paragraph 4(c) of the Rules. If it is not in compliance and in accordance with Paragraph 4 (d) of the Rules, you will be requested to rectify the deficiencies within 5 calendar days after our notification of such deficiencies.”

On 20 February 2017, **the Registrar** through the entity PDR Ltd. D/B/A (PUBLICDOMAINREGISTRY.COM) of 501, IT Building No3, NESCO IT Park, NESCO Complex, Western Express Highway, Goregaon (East), Mumbai 400063 Maharashtra, India acknowledged the email of the **ADNDRC-HK** confirming that the **Disputed Domain Name** is registered with **the Registrar**, that “ji shupeng” is the holder of the **Disputed Domain Name**, that **the Policy** is applicable to the **Disputed Domain Name**, the language of the Registration Agreement of the **Disputed Domain Name** is English as the Registrar stated that “*The English language was used to inform the Registrant of both the Domain Registration Agreement as well as the Customer Master Agreement during the domain name Registration and Customer Signup process*” and confirmed that the **Disputed Domain Name** is under Registrar lock status “*To avoid any Registrant contact modifications during the proceedings of this case, we have currently locked the domain name from the registrar control panel*”. Further, **the Registrar** notified the **ADNDRC-HK** of the contact information of the Respondent as well as its email address of “*zucysh6804423@126.com*”.

On 27 February 2017, the **ADNDRC-HK** acknowledged that it had received the case filing fee from the Complainant concerning the **Disputed Domain Name** < **LSPACEBIKINI.COM** > within the stipulated timeframe.

On 28 February 2017, the **ADNDRC-HK** sent a Written Notice of Complaint in the Chinese and English languages (“the said Notice”), together with the Complaint Form C enclosed with annexures to the email address of the Respondent’s contact for the **Disputed Domain Name** (as recorded in the WHOIS database, the Respondent’s email address is zucysh6804423@126.com as well as postmaster@LSPACEBIKINI.COM). The said Notice gave the Respondent twenty (20) calendar days to file a Response, i.e. on or before 20 March 2017).

On 21 March 2017, the **ADNDRC-HK** sent an email notifying the Complainant (with a copy to the Respondent) that the Respondent failed to submit a response within the prescribed timeframe (i.e. on or before 20 March 2017).

On 24 March 2017, the **ADNDRC-HK** sent an email to Dr. Christopher To enquiring from him whether he can act and if so whether he can act independently and impartially in the matter in question.

On 24 March 2017, Dr. Christopher To sent an email to the **ADNDRC-HK**, confirming that he is able to take on the reference and the he does not have a conflict of interest in the matter on hand.

On 27 March 2017, the **ADNDRC-HK** sent a Notice of Appointment to Dr. Christopher To and the parties by email confirming Dr. Christopher To's appointment in this matter.

In accordance with Rule 15(a) of the **Rules** of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute resolution Policy, the Panel shall decide the Complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted.

Also, according to Rule 15(d) of the **Rules** of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy this Panel shall issue a reasoned decision.

3. Factual background

For the Complainant

The Complainant is a Limited Liability Company registered in the State of California, United States of America.

LSpace America, LLC. ("LSpace") is a sun-kissed California Lifestyle Brand. LSpace Swim - by Monica Wise is known for its stylish silhouettes, luxurious fabrics, and fashion forward designs in modern lines. LSpace swim line is all about femininity, beauty, and enhancing a woman's curves whether lounging poolside or being active on the beach.

The Complainant's official website is <www.lspace.com>.

The Complainant registered the domain name <LSPACE.COM> via godaddy.com on 10 December 2002 whereas the *Disputed Domain Name* was registered on 13 October 2016.

The Complainant is and was at all material times the registered proprietor of the trademark

L★SPACE
in Mainland of China as shown below:-

	Mark	Reg. No.	App. Date	Class	Goods/Service	Validation Date
1	L★SPACE	6764209	2008-06-04	25	Beach clothes; Dresses; Underwear, etc.	2011-01-21 to 2021-01-20

The Complainant is and was at all material times the registered proprietor of the trademark

L★SPACE
in United States of America as shown below:-

	Mark	Reg. No.	First Use	Class	Goods/Service	Reg. Date
1	L★SPACE	4751718	Feb. 26, 1997	25	Bikinis; Coverups; Flip flops; Knit bottoms; Pants; Shorts; Swim wear; etc.	Jun. 9, 2015
2	L★SPACE	4964860	Feb. 26, 1997	14	Bracelets; Jewelry; Key chains as jewellery.	May 24, 2016
3	L★SPACE	4618396	Mar. 18, 2002	18	All-purpose carrying bags; Beachbags; Garment bags for travel; etc.	Oct. 7, 2014

For the Respondent

The Respondent, ji shupeng, is an individual residing in Jizhuang, Xingzheng Village, Jizhuang, Machang Town, Taikang County, Zhoukou City, Henan Province, People's Republic of China.

On or around 13 October 2016, the *Disputed Domain Name* < **LSPACEBIKINI.COM** > was registered by PDR Ltd. D/B/A (PUBLICDOMAINREGISTRY.COM) ("*the Registrar*") in the name of ji shupeng.

In the light of the WHOIS search Record dated 17 February 2017, the holder of the contested domain name as noted by the Registrar is ji shupeng.

On 21 March 2017, the *ADNDRC-HK* sent an email notifying the Complainant (with a copy to the Respondent) that the Respondent failed to submit a response within the prescribed timeframe (i.e. on or before 20 March 2017). As such, the Respondent has not contested the allegations of the Complainant and is in default.

4. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant's contentions may be summarized as follows:

(i) Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks

The Complainant contends that, the registration date of the *Disputed Domain Name* is later than the registration date of the trademarks and domain name of the Complainant.

The main parts of the *Disputed Domain Name* are "lspace" and "bikini". Firstly, the *Disputed Domain Name* contains the trademark and domain name <lspace> of the Complainant. Secondly, "bikini" is generic, and consumers will easily understand <lspacebikini> as the <lspace> branded bikini. Thirdly, the business of the Complainant is selling lspace branded bikini, and one important distribution spot is its official website <www.lspace.com>. Thus, the use of <lspacebikini> will substantively cause confusion amongst consumers.

The Complainant raised the case of *Pomellato S.p.A. v. Richard Tonetti*, WIPO Case No. D2000-0493 in relation to the ".com" extension and believes that it is irrelevant to the identification or confusingly similar aspects as highlighted by that Panelist "*the addition of the generic top-level domain (gTLD) ".com" after the name POMELLATO is not relevant, since use of a gTLD is required, necessary and functional to indicate use of a name in Internet and for the average Internet user it would not confer any further distinctiveness to any name*".

(ii) **The Respondent has no right or legitimate interest in respect of the disputed domain name**

The Complainant contends that, there is no evidence to prove that the Respondent has any prior rights relating to LSpace or similar marks, nor did the Respondent claimed any civil rights in relation to them, nor did the Respondent obtain authorization from the Complainant to register the *Disputed Domain Name*. The Respondent is not affiliated in any way with the Complainant.

The burden of proof shifts to the Respondent once the Complainant provides prima facie evidence showing that the Respondent lacks legitimate right or interests. The Complainant quotes the case of *Neusiedler Aktiengesellschaft v. Kulkarni*, WIPO Case No. D2000-1769.

(iii) **The Respondent has shown bad faith in registering and using the domain name**

The Complainant contends that there is already evidence of bad faith since the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the *Disputed Domain Name*.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent's bad faith is further evident by Paragraph 4(b)(ii),(iii) and (iv) of *Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy*:

(ii) you have registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that you have engaged in a pattern of such conduct;

The registration of the *Disputed Domain Name* <LSPACEBIKINI.COM> prevents the Complainant from registering it.

(iii) you have registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor;

The *Disputed Domain Name* <LSPACEBIKINI.COM> is used to build a website <www.lspacebikini.com>, which passes for the Complainant's official website <www.lspace.com> in every aspect. Both websites are offering for sale a variety of bikini products. In particular, the trademark of the Complainant **L★SPACE** is prominently used on the website <www.lspacebikini.com>. The purpose of the *Disputed Domain Name*, through its actual use, is to disrupt the business of the Complainant.

(iv) by using the domain name, you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your web site 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 your web site or location or of a product or service on your web site or location.

The *Disputed Domain Name* is identical to the Complainant's website thus demonstrating that its sole purpose of passing off as the Complainant. The Complainant further confirms that the products offered for sale on the website <www.lspacebikini.com> are not authorized by the Complainant. Because of the full scale resemblance of the <www.lspacebikini.com> to <www.lspace.com>, and because of the blatant use of the complainant's trademark **L★SPACE** by the <www.lspacebikini.com>, consumers can be easily misled into believing that the bikinis that are offered for sale by <www.lspacebikini.com> are sourced from the Complainant.

For the foregoing reasons, the Complainant submits that there is a prima facie case that the Respondent has shown bad faith in registering and using the *Disputed Domain Name*.

In gist, the Complainant asserted that all of the 3 elements as aforementioned have been satisfied in this case, the Complainant seeks to ask the Panel to make an order that the *Disputed Domain Name* be transferred to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

The Respondent's contentions may be summarized as follows:

On or around 13 October 2016, the *Disputed Domain Name* < **LSPACEBIKINI.COM**> was registered by PDR Ltd. D/B/A (PUBLICDOMAINREGISTRY.COM) in the name of ji shupeng.

On 21 March 2017, the *ADNDRC-HK* sent an email notifying the Complainant (with a copy to the Respondent) that the Respondent failed to submit a response within the prescribed timeframe (i.e. on or before 20 March 2017). As such, the Respondent has not contested the allegations of the Complainant and is in default.

In gist, the Respondent has not asserted any claims, defenses or contentions, nor submitted any evidence denying the claims by the Complainant.

5. Findings

A. The Language of the Proceedings

The Complainant stated in the Complaint the following under paragraph 13:-

“The Complainant has tried but failed to obtain a copy of the registration agreement. The reason is that the Registrar of the disputed domain name operates business in a very rare model. According to its official website, the Registrar “do not deal directly with, or, market our services directly to

Customers and low-volume Resellers. We have tied up with select partners worldwide who offer our Domain Registration Services.”

Therefore, the disputed domain name must have been registered firstly through a “partner” of the Registrar, in other words, a vendor of the Registrar. Because the identity of this vendor is unknown to the public including the Complainant, it is impossible to obtain a copy of the registration agreement. While this will not affect the applicability of Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy in this matter, this might has effect upon the language to be used for the dispute resolution. The Complainant has no choice but to use English as the Language of Proceedings, which is the official language adopted by the Registrar according to its website. The Complainant is willing to modify Language subject to the authority of the Panel”.

The Internet Corporation For Assigned Names and Numbers Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (“the Rules”) Paragraph 11 (a) provides that:

“Unless otherwise agreed by the Parties, or specified otherwise in the Registration Agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the Registration Agreement, subject to the authority of the Panel to determine otherwise, having regard to the circumstances of the administrative proceeding.”

In the present case the Parties had not agreed to use a particular language for these proceedings. As the Registration Agreement is in the English language as confirmed by the **Registrar** in its email of 20 February 2017 then in accordance with Article 11(a) of the

Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy the language of the administrative proceedings shall be in the English language. In these circumstances given that the Complaint is drafted in the English language which is in line with the Registration Agreement and that the Respondent has failed to communicate on the matter, the Panel considers that it would be appropriate (and without prejudice to any of the parties) for the present proceedings to be conducted in the English language.

B. Discussions and Findings

Having considered all the documentary evidence before me, and the Respondent's non-participation in these proceedings after being afforded every opportunity to do so in accordance with Paragraph 5(f) of the **Rules**, the Panel is of the view that it should proceed to decide on the **Disputed Domain Name**, namely < LSPACEBIKINI.COM > based upon the Complaint and evidence adduced by the Complainant.

Paragraph 5 (f) of the **Rules** stipulates that:-

“If a Respondent does not submit a response, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel shall decide the dispute based upon the complaint.”

The ICANN Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy provides, at Paragraph 4(a), that each of three findings must be made in order for a Complainant to prevail:

- i. Respondent's domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights; and
- ii. Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and
- iii. Respondent's domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

i. Identical / Confusingly Similar

Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the *Policy* requires the Complainant to prove that the *Disputed Domain Name* is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights.

Taking into consideration of the evidence and background history submitted by the Complainant, the Panel considers that the Complainant has established that the

L★SPACE

Trade Mark has acquired distinctiveness through extensive use by the Complainant in commerce who has continuously carried on, supplied and marketed via the online platform in various jurisdictions around the world since 10 December 2002.

In view of the search engine results on the mark “ **L★SPACE** ” submitted by the Complainant, the Panel accepts that the **L★SPACE** Mark is also widely recognized by members of the public as being the Complainant itself.

In terms of the trademark registration, the Panel is convinced that the trademark rights are well known around the world given that the **L★SPACE** trade marks have been validly registered in the People’s Republic of China and the United States of America.

Further, this Panel accepts the decision of *Pomellato S.p.A. v. Richard Tonetti*, WIPO Case No. D2000-0493 as advocated by the Complainant and further highlights the case of *Rohde & Schwarz GmbH & Co. HG v. Petshire Marketing Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. D2006-0762 which states that:-

“It is well-established that the “.com” extension should be disregarded for determining confusing similarity.”

In the light of the above authority in support, the Panel considers that the identifiable part of the *Disputed Domain Name* “LSPACE” is clearly identical to the Complainant’s

L★SPACE
Trade Mark.

As aforementioned, the Respondent has not contested the allegations of the Complaint and is in default.

For all the foregoing reasons, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has discharged its burden of proof to establish the elements of identical and confusingly similar mark as stipulated in Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the *Policy*.

ii. Rights and Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the *Policy* provides, *inter alia*, that the burden of proof vests on the Respondent to prove and satisfy with the following circumstances, in order to demonstrate that it has rights and legitimate interests in the *Disputed Domain*

Name:-

- (i) *before any notice to you of the dispute, your 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; or*
- (ii) *you (as an individual, business, or other organization) have been commonly known by the domain name, even if you have acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or*
- (iii) *you are making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.*

This Panel accepts the authority of *Neusiedler Aktiengesellschaft v. Kulkarni*, WIPO Case no. D2000-1769 as advocated by the Complainant and further states the case of *Pepisi Co., Inc. v. Amilcar Perez Lista d/b/a Cybersor*, WIPO Case No. D2003-0174, whereby the Panel in that case held that:-

“Since the adoption and extension use by the Complainant of the trademark “PEPSI” predates the first entry of the <pepsix.com> and <pepsixxx.com> as domain names, the burden is on the Respondent to establish the Respondent’s right and legitimate interests the Respondent may have or have had in the domain name.”

In the present case, the Respondent has failed to contest the proceedings. The Panel accepts that the Respondent has failed to provide any evidence to support its rights and legitimate interests in using the ***Disputed Domain Name***, nevertheless the Complainant is still required to prove that the Respondent has no rights and legitimate interests.

As aforementioned, the Panel is convinced that the Complainant has acquired rights and interests in the **L★SPACE** Trade Mark, including but not limited to the People’s Republic of China. The Complainant has been using the Trade Mark since 26 February 1997. However, the Respondent has only acquired the ***Disputed Domain Name*** on or around 13 October 2016, which is roughly 18 years after the Complainant’s first use. The Panel is of the view that the word “LSPACE” does not reflect the Respondent’s name nor has the Respondent registered any trade mark reflecting the ***Disputed Domain Name*** elsewhere including the People’s Republic of China.

Further, the Panel is of the view that the decision in *Expedia, Inc. v Dot Liban, Hanna El Hinn*, WIPO Case No. D2002-0433 has some relevance to the matter on hand, whereby the Panel in that case stated that:-

“there is no other evidence suggesting that the Respondent has rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain names. The domain names have not been independently chosen.....they have been used by the Respondent to redirect traffic to the Complainant’s site supports the Complainant’s contention as to derivation of the domain names.”

With regard to the use of the ***Disputed Domain Name*** by the Respondent, this Panel considered the decision of *Paris Hilton v. Deepak Kumar*, WIPO Case No. D2010-1364 is of relevance, whereby the Panel in that case concluded that:-

“the assessment of rights or legitimate interests boils down to a question as to whether the Respondent is using the domain name with the Complainant’s marks in mind and with a view to taking unfair advantage of the reputation of the Complainant’s marks?”.

In this case, the Panel considers that it is apparent from the prima facie evidence that the Respondent knowingly used the ***Disputed Domain Name*** notwithstanding its knowledge of the established reputation of both the Complainant and its

L★SPACE

Trade Mark. Such acts of the Respondent clearly shows that the Respondent deliberately misled internet users into believing that the ***Disputed Domain Name*** is identical to the Complainant’s site, enabling the Respondent to obtain commercial gain from internet users who accessed the ***Disputed Domain Name***.

For the forgoing reasons, the Panel concludes that the Respondent does not have any rights and legitimate interests in respect of the *Disputed Domain Name* pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the *Policy*.

iii. Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the *Policy* sets out four (4) factors in which the Panel shall take into account in determining whether the Respondent has registered and used the *Disputed Domain Name* in bad faith. The prescribed four (4) factors are as follows:-

- (i) *circumstances indicating that you have registered or you have acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of your documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or*
- (ii) *you have registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that you have engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or*
- (iii) *you have registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or*
- (iv) *by using the domain name, you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your web site 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 your web site or location or of a product or service on your web site or location.*

In view of the evidence before this Panel, the Panel considers that the Respondent should have had knowledge of the rights of the Complainant on the **L★SPACE** Trade Mark at the time of registering the *Disputed Domain Name* on 13 October 2016, in particular to the Complainant's reputation and goodwill established as being a popular trading platform within the internet worldwide through its reference to the **L★SPACE** Mark being registered in 1997.

Having considered the case of *Sony Kabushiki Kaisha (also trading as Sony Corporation) v. Inja, Kil* (WIPO Case No. D2000-1409), the Panel in that case stated that:-

“that it is inconceivable that the Respondent could make any active use of the disputed domain names without creating a false impression of association with the complainant.”


This Panel also accepts that in *Expedia, Inc. v. Dot Liban, Hanna El Hinn*, WIPO Case No. D2002-0433, in which “*the Respondent was acting in bad faith since the only purpose of the Respondent in registering the disputed domain names is to re-direct traffic to the Complainant's site without obtaining permission to do so*”.

In the present case, the evidence submitted by the Complainant clearly shows that the Respondent has an intention to mislead and/or to deceive internet users into believing that the *Disputed Domain Name* is that of the Complainant's by registering the *Disputed Domain Name* on 13 October 2016 and directing the same to the Complainant's website without consent of the Complainant, so that the Respondent can attract more users via the *Disputed Domain Name* with a belief that it is directed to the Complainant's website and as such the Respondent can obtain commercial gain.

6. Decision

For the foregoing reasons and in accordance with Paragraph 4 of the *ICANN Policy*, the Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has sufficiently proved the existence of all three

elements pursuant to Paragraph 4(a) of the **Policy**. The Panel orders that the **Disputed Domain Name** <LSPACEBIKINI.COM> be transferred to the Complainant.



“Dr. Christopher To”
Panelist

Dated: 17th April 2017