

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

EE Holding Group LLC v. ZEESHAN MALIK, ZEST INNOVATION HOUSE LTD

Case No. D2026-0659

1. The Parties

The Complainant is EE Holding Group LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by The Sladkus Law Group, United States.

The Respondent is ZEESHAN MALIK, ZEST INNOVATION HOUSE LTD, Pakistan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <theericmanuelofficialstore.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 16, 2026. On February 16, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 16, 2026, 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 (Registration Private, Domains by Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 18, 2026, 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 amendment to the Complaint on February 18, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 February 20, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 12, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 16, 2026.

The Center appointed Dr. Hong Xue as the sole panelist in this matter on March 24, 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 sells ERIC EMANUEL sportswear products through its website at “www.ericmanuel.com” and other channels authorized by the Complainant. The Complainant is the exclusive owner of the ERIC EMANUEL and EE & device trademarks. The trademark registrations owned by the Complainant include the following ones:

- ERIC EMANUEL (No. 6721224) registered in the United States on May 24, 2022; and
- EE & device (No. 7310338) registered in the United States on February 20, 2024.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 17, 2025. The domain name registration information confirmed by the Registrar shows that the Respondent is apparently an individual and a company located in Pakistan.

According to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the disputed domain name is being used for a website, which claims itself as “Eric Emanuel Official Store – Shop Authentic EE Shorts & More”. The website repeatedly and prominently uses the trademarks ERIC EMANUEL and EE & device to offer to sell the products of “EE SHORTS”, hoodies, shirts and sweatsuits at discounted prices, and makes the promises that “We did not care about boundaries and shipping iconic Eric Emanuel products across the globe. Whether you live in any part of Europe or are looking to get our products on your doorstep in Asia, we have every option for you.”

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 the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant’s registered ERIC EMANUEL mark in its entirety. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s registered ERIC EMANUEL mark.

The Complainant did not authorize Respondent to register the disputed domain name or otherwise use its marks in any manner. The Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name is not in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Respondent has not been commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent is using the disputed domain name to host a website selling a variety of counterfeit ERIC EMANUEL brand clothing. The Respondent is intentionally attempting to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent’s disputed domain name and associated website. The Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain names in bad faith.

The Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to the Complainant.

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 Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The disputed domain name <theericmanuelofficialstore.com>, apart from the generic Top-Level Domain ".com", apparently consist of the three parts, i.e., "the", "eric emanuel" and "official store". Although the prefix of "the" and the suffixes "official store" added to the Complainant's mark ERIC EMANUEL may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 that 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 3.1](#), 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 Respondent claims the website of the disputed domain name an ERIC EMANUEL official store and displayed the Complainant's ERIC EMANUEL and EE & device marks to offer to sell the goods that is clearly unauthorized by the Complainant through that website. Panels have held that the use

of a domain name for the illegal activity of impersonation/passing off can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

Further, the composition of the disputed domain name also carries a risk of implied affiliation as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

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.

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 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for the illegal activity of impersonation/passing off constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent not only registered the disputed domain name that is similar to the Complainant's trademark and spelling of "the ERIC EMANUEL official store", but is also using the disputed domain name for a website claiming itself as "Eric Emanuel Official Store – Shop Authentic EE Shorts & More", offering to sell "EE SHORTS" and other sportswear products unauthorized by the Complainant, and promising to deliver "iconic Eric Emanuel products across the globe" including any part of Europe or Asia.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of 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 <theericemanuelofficialstore.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Dr. Hong Xue/

Dr. Hong Xue

Sole Panelist

Date: April 7, 2026