

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Koninklijke Douwe Egberts B.V. v. jack ma
Case No. D2025-4252

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Koninklijke Douwe Egberts B.V., Netherlands (Kingdom of the) , represented by Ploum, Netherlands (Kingdom of the).

The Respondent is jack ma, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <jde-coffee.shop> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 16, 2025. On October 16, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 17, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (Unknown / Redacted for Privacy Purposes, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 21, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on October 22, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “UDRP”), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on October 28, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 17, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on November 19, 2025.

The Center appointed Tobias Malte Müller as the sole panelist in this matter on November 28, 2025. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

It results from the Complainant's undisputed allegations that it is part of Jacobs Douwe Egberts. Jacobs Douwe Egberts, in turn, is part of JDE Peet's, the largest pure play coffee and tea company, headquartered in the Netherlands. The group's coffee and tea portfolio is available in over 100 countries around the world and sold in, inter alia, Europe and North America. Jacobs Douwe Egberts is abbreviated to JDE. The JDE trademark is used as an umbrella brand in relation to the Complainant's coffee and tea portfolio. This portfolio consists of many household names including (without limitation) Jacobs, Tassimo, Moccona, Senseo, L'OR, Douwe Egberts, TiÒra, Super, Kenco, Pilao and Gevalia. All product packages of these household names include both the household trademark and the JDE trademark. In addition to this, "JDE" and "JDE Peet's" are used as trade names. JDE Peet's is the trade name of the parent company of the group. Whilst "JDE" is the abbreviation of the trade name Jacobs Douwe Egberts, which JDE often uses when doing business.

The Complainant operates websites at numerous domain names incorporating the JDE trademarks, e.g., <jdecoffee.com>. In addition to this, the Complainant uses the domain name <jdecoffee.com> for its official email addresses.

The Complainant is the registered owner of several trademarks worldwide consisting of and/or containing JDE, e.g., International Registration Nr. 1248744 JDE (figurative) registered on April 16, 2015, amongst others for "coffee" in class 30, designating several countries amongst other European Union; United Kingdom trademark Registration Nr. UK00801248744 JDE (word), registered for goods and services in classes 11, 30 and 43 registered on March 30, 2016 (Application Date April 16, 2015).

The disputed domain name <jde-coffee.shop> was registered on October 11, 2025. Furthermore, the undisputed evidence provided by the Complainant proves that the disputed domain name resolved to a website displaying in a prominent way the Complainant's mark and logo and allegedly marketing and selling a wide variety of the Complainant's coffee brands (among others OldTown, Moccona, L'OR, and SUPER). In addition, in the section "about us" of the website much information on the Complainant's group is provided, referring to "our story", "our brands", "our team" etc., implying that the website is run by the Complainant's group and/or by an entity which is part of the Complainant's group of companies. In this regard, the website indicates JDE Peet's Singapore as reference entity. Moreover, on the website in the section related to the "privacy policy", the contact information indicates JDE Peet's, Privacy Office with location in Amsterdam, the Netherlands and with a Dutch telephone number, clearly referring to the Complainant's registered seat.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that

(1) the disputed domain name is at least confusingly similar to the JDE trademark. The combination of the JDE trademark with the descriptive term "coffee" further enhances the confusion, since coffee is the key product for which the JDE trademark is used and very well known for;

(2) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant, the Respondent is not commonly known under the name “JDE”, “JDE Peet’s” and/or “JDE Peet’s Singapore”. In addition, the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and the Complainant has not licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the JDE trademarks or to register a domain name incorporating these trademarks. The use of the JDE trademarks by the Respondent can in no event lead to a legitimate interest for the Respondent, whereas the Respondent does not make demonstrable use of the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services. This is because the website does not meet the requirements as set out by numerous panel decisions for a bona fide offering of goods and services, i.e., referring to the *Ok! Data* jurisprudence. In particular, it is not disclosed on the Website that the Respondent is not in any way affiliated with the Complainant. The Respondent did quite the opposite, calling the website “JDE”, “JDE Peet’s” and/or “JDE Peet’s Singapore” as its business name. In addition to this, the Respondent is using the registered word/device mark JDE on its Website and for its contact details, clearly distinguishing its own business, goods and services. Thus, the Respondent is clearly impersonating the Complainant, intentionally trying to make the Internet users believe that the Website is an official website run by (a subsidiary of) the Complainant. The Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name cannot be considered fair use as it falsely suggests affiliation with the Complainant and the JDE trademarks;

(3) that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. According to the Complainant, due to the fact that JDE is a well-known company and brand, the fact that the JDE trademarks are highly distinctive and given the great similarities between the JDE trademarks and the disputed domain name, the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant, the JDE trademarks, as well as the goodwill associated with it, when the Respondent registered the disputed domain name, which indicates a registration in bad faith. The website does not (prominently nor accurately) disclose its (non-existing) relationship with the Complainant, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s company and its JDE trademarks as to the affiliation of the website. This is further enhanced by the fact that on the Website the Respondent is calling its business “JDE”, “JDE Peet’s” and/or “JDE Peet’s Singapore”, making it all the more clear that the Respondent has specifically targeted the Complainant and its JDE Trademarks and trade names. In addition to this, the Registrar-provided registrant information demonstrated that the Respondent’s address corresponds with a public park in the middle of Washington D.C., in order to stay anonymous. The provision of false contact information underlying a privacy or proxy service is an indication of bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant’s contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to “decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable”. Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires a complainant to prove each of the following three elements in order to obtain an order that each disputed domain name be transferred or cancelled:

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

The Panel will therefore proceed to analyze whether the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are satisfied.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1. It is true that said trademark is a figurative trademark, containing a design element. However, it is acknowledged that also such figurative marks prima facie satisfy the requirement that a complainant show "rights in a mark" for further assessment as to confusing similarity, [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.10.

The above test typically involves a side-by-side comparison of the domain name and the textual components of the relevant trademark to assess whether the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. In the case at hand, the entirety of the mark's textual component JDE is reproduced within the disputed domain name. The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, "coffee" and a hyphen) may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the difficult task of "proving a negative", requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name is clearly constituted by the entirety of the Complainant's trademark plus an additional term "coffee" which is within the Complainant's field of commerce or indicating goods related to the JDE brand. The Panel finds it most likely that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the intention of suggesting an affiliation with the Complainant. This is also confirmed by the content of the website to which the disputed domain name resolved, displaying in a prominent way and without authorization the Complainant's registered trademark and logo, and allegedly marketing and selling a wide variety of the Complainant's coffee brands. In addition, on the website there were many elements to

infer that the Respondent aimed to impersonate the Complainant, e.g., using the business names “JDE”, “JDE Peet’s” and/or “JDE Peet’s Singapore” and providing much information on the Complainant’s group (without disclosing the inexistence of a relationship with the Complainant), in order to create the impression that the website is an official website run by the Complainant and/or by an entity which is part of the Complainant’s group of companies. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, 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.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

One of these circumstances is that the Respondent by using the disputed domain name, has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website or location or of a product or service on its website or location (paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy).

In the present case, the Panel notes that it results from the Complainant’s documented allegations that the disputed domain name resolved to a website displaying prominently and without authorization the Complainant’s registered trademark and logo and allegedly marketing and selling a wide variety of the Complainant’s coffee brands.

By the time the disputed domain name was registered, the Panel considers it to be unlikely that the Respondent did not have knowledge of the Complainant and its marks, which are entirely included in the disputed domain name, and which had been existing for many years at the time the disputed domain name was registered. Consequently, and in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, the Panel is convinced that the Respondent also knew that the disputed domain name included the Complainant’s trademark when it registered the disputed domain name.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent’s registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1. In the case at hand, the Panel considers the following circumstances to confirm said bad faith:

- (i) the nature of the disputed domain name (wholly incorporating the Complainant’s trademark plus an additional term which describes the Complainant’s field of commerce by indicating goods related to the Complainant’s trademark);
- (ii) the content of the website to which the disputed domain name directed (i.e., displaying without authorization the Complainant’s registered trademark and logo, and allegedly marketing and selling a wide variety of the Complainant’s coffee brands; using the business names “JDE”, “JDE Peet’s” and/or “JDE Peet’s Singapore”; providing a lot of information on the Complainant’s group (without disclosing the inexistence of a relationship with the Complainant));
- (iii) a clear absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with no response for the Respondent’s choice of the disputed domain name;
- (iv) the Respondent concealing its identity through a privacy service and use of false contact details

Finally, Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <jde-coffee.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Tobias Malte Müller/

Tobias Malte Müller

Sole Panelist

Date: December 12, 2025