

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Koninklijke Douwe Egberts B.V. v. GuiZi Guo  
Case No. D2026-0715

### **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 GuiZi Guo, Hong Kong, China.

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

The disputed domain name <lorespressoes.com> is registered with Realtime Register B.V. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 19, 2026. On February 20, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 23, 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 (unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 24, 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 amended Complaint on February 24, 2026.

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 February 26, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 18, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 19, 2026.

The Center appointed Estela Mariel de Luca as the sole panelist in this matter on March 31, 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, Koninklijke Douwe Egberts B.V., is part of Jacobs Douwe Egberts (“JDE”), by merging D.E Master Blenders, founded in 1753, and the coffee division of Mondelez International. Jacobs Douwe Egberts is part of JDE Peet’s, which is one of the world’s largest pure play coffee and tea companies, headquartered in the Netherlands (Kingdom of the). The group’s coffee and tea portfolio are available in over 100 countries around the world.

The Complainant is the owner of various trademark registrations, including:

- Chinese trademark registration No. 15074340 for L’OR, registered on September 21, 2015, in international class 30.
- International trademark registration No. 1055730 for L’OR ESPRESSO, registered on August 27, 2010, in international class 30.
- Indian Trademark Registration No. 1951538 for L’OR ESPRESSO, registered on April 16, 2010, in international class 30.

The Complainant is the registrant of the domain name <lorespresso.com>, registered on November 3, 2009.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 26, 2026, and resolves to a webpage that reproduces the Complainant’s official website.

#### **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 is confusingly similar to its L’OR ESPRESSO, and that the letters “es”, correspond with the country code of Spain. The Complainant further contends that the disputed domain name reproduces its L’OR trademark in its entirety, together with the term “espresso”, which is descriptive and does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant further asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests for the registration and use of the disputed domain name, noting that the Respondent is not commonly known as “L’OR Espresso”, is not affiliated with or licensed by the Complainant, and has not acquired any trademark or service mark rights

The Complainant further contends that the disputed domain name is not being used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services and is intended to benefit from the Complainant’s reputation.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, as the Respondent is impersonating the Complainant and/or its subsidiary, “Jacobs Douwe Egberts ES S.L.U.”, using its trade name, business address, VAT number, and email address. The Complainant further contends

that the Respondent has reproduced the Complainant's official website, including its text, images, and overall look and feel.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's highly distinctive L'OR ESPRESSO trademark at the time of registration, as evidenced by the use of the Complainant's business details.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant carries the burden of proving:

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

The Respondent's default in the case at hand does not automatically result in a decision in favor of the Complainant, however, paragraph 5(f) of the Rules provides that if the Respondent does not submit a Response, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel shall decide the dispute based upon the Complaint.

Further, according to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, the Panel may draw such inferences from the Respondent's failure to submit a Response as it considers appropriate.

### **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.

Although the addition of other terms here, "es", 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 3.1](#), 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed as applicable to this case: passing off — can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel also notes that the composition of the disputed domain name creates a risk of implied affiliation or suggests sponsorship and/or endorsement by the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

Accordingly, the Complainant has provided evidence supporting its prima facie claim that the Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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 illegitimate activity, here, , claimed as applicable to this case: passing off constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 evidence demonstrates that the Complainant holds long-standing rights to the L’OR ESPRESSO trademark and domain name, which predate the Respondent’s registration of the disputed domain name.

The mere registration of a domain name that is confusingly similar to a well-known trademark by an unaffiliated party can, in itself, create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

The Panel notes that the Respondent has used the Complainant’s copyrighted images on its website, together with the L’OR logo and business details, to offer coffee products.

In the Panel’s view, such conduct supports a finding of bad faith, as it demonstrates an intent to mislead Internet users and to take advantage of the Complainant’s mark and reputation.

By creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and the products offered thereon, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain. Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 <lorespressoes.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Estela Mariel de Luca/*

**Estela Mariel de Luca**

Sole Panelist

Date: April 10, 2026.