

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Adanola Limited v. Herbert Hedstrom, Herbert  
Case No. D2025-5283

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Adanola Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Com Laude Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Herbert Hedstrom, Herbert, United States of America (“United States”).

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <adanolastyle.com> is registered with Cosmotown, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 16, 2025. On December 18, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 23, 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 (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 23, 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 December 23, 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 December 29, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 18, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 21, 2026.

The Center appointed Andrea Jaeger-Lenz as the sole panelist in this matter on January 26, 2026. 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**

The Complainant is seated in the United Kingdom, was founded in 2015, incorporated in 2018 and has been trading since then under the name “Adanola”. The Complainant’s business concerns the design, manufacture and sale of clothing, footwear and accessories, ranging from activewear, casual wear and outer wear to related lifestyle items. The Complainant’s sales amounted to USD 112 million in 2024. The Complainant has been subject of some media coverage, including regarding its collaboration with supermodel Kendall Jenner in January 2025 (as per Annex 7 of the Complaint).

The Complainant owns several trademarks around the world for the term “Adanola” including the following (as per Annex 13 to the Complaint):

- United Kingdom trademark no. UK00003152822 ADANOLA (word), registered on May 27, 2016, for goods in Class 25;
- European Union trademark no. 018310759 ADANOLA (word), registered on February 24, 2021, for goods and services in Classes 18, 25 and 35; and
- United States trademark no. 7732312 ADANOLA (word), registered on March 18, 2025, for goods and services in Classes 18, 25 and 35;

The Complainant’s products are distributed mainly through its official website at the domain name <adanola.com> (as per Annex 4 to the Complaint), from where they can be ordered and shipped worldwide (as per Annex 5 to the Complaint) and through selected retail and e-commerce outlet in the United Kingdom and elsewhere (as per Annex 6 to the Complaint).

The disputed domain name was created on May 10, 2025. At the time of filing the Complaint, it resolved to a website resembling the Complainant’s website and appearing to offer the Complainant’s products for sale (as per Annexes 11 and 12 to the Complaint).

#### **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 it owns trademark rights in the term “Adanola” which predate the creating of the disputed domain name by years. The disputed domain name incorporates the trademark as a dominant and distinctive element in its entirety and only differs by the addition of the term “style”. This, being a descriptive term, does not serve to differentiate the disputed domain name from the Complainant’s trademark, but – according to the Complainant – only furthers likelihood of confusion among Internet users, who will perceive the disputed domain name as belonging to the Complainant. Consequently, with the “.com” Top-Level Domain being required for registration purposes, the Complainant concludes that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark, in which the Complainant owns rights.

On the second element, the Complainant states that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name: The Respondent is not commonly known as “ADANOLA” or “ADANOLA STYLE”, is not a licensee of the Complainant and has not received any permission or consent to use “Adanola”. According to the Complainant, the Respondent is not making any legitimate noncommercial fair use of the disputed domain name either; on the contrary, pointing to the website to which the disputed

domain name resolved, the Respondent created a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. The Complainant adds that the Respondent is not a genuine reseller of the Complainant's products either, and that its offering of goods can in no way be counted as bona fide offering, as the Respondent's website was – using various imagery taken from the Complainant's own website – purposefully designed to impersonate as the Complainant.

On the third element, the Complainant claims that the disputed domain name was registered and has been used in bad faith. The Complainant finds that the Respondent has sought to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion. With the creation of the disputed domain name consisting of the Complainant's trademark and the word "style", the Respondent sought to cause search engine results producing the Respondent's website, to create initial interest confusion with the Complainant and, by the particular design elements taken from the Complainant's website (brand name, copied photographs, same colour scheme, same logo as favicon), reinforcing the impression gained by Internet users that the website is affiliated with the Complainant. This, according to the Complainant, also amounts to disrupting the Complainant's business. Further, the Complainant points to the fact that the same Respondent was involved as a respondent in at least four earlier UDRP disputes displaying similarities with the present one.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **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.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced 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, "style", 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed impersonation/passing off, 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name incorporating the Complainant's ADANOLA trademark in combination with the term "style" and has created a website, to which the disputed domain name resolves, which effectively copies the Complainant's website, purportedly offering products of the Complainant for sale, and which Internet users are bound to falsely take for a website at least affiliated with the Complainant, if not operated by the Complainant itself.

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 present case, given the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark and the use to which the disputed domain name has been put, there is no conceivable other reason for its registration and use but that the Respondent intended to target the Complainant's trademark and impersonate the Complainant for commercial gain.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed impersonation/passing off, 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 <adanolastyle.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Andrea Jaeger-Lenz/*

**Andrea Jaeger-Lenz**

Sole Panelist

Date: February 4, 2026