ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Julie Vos Designs LLC v. d's'da's'da's'd dasd, huapusjmn huapusjmn
Case No. D2026-0920

1. The Parties

Complainant is Julie Vos Designs LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Tucker & Latifi, LLP, United States.

Respondents are d's'da's'da's'd dasd, Armenia, and huapusjmn huapusjmn, United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <julievos.shop> and <julievosstudio.shop> are registered with Spaceship, Inc.(the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on March 3, 2026. On March 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On March 4, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Spaceship, Inc.) and contact information in the Complaint.

Center sent an email communication to Complainant on March 6, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting Complainant to either file separate complaints for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on March 10, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 12, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 1, 2026. Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondents' default on April 2, 2026.

The Center appointed Jeffrey D. Steinhardt as sole panelist in this matter on April 17, 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

Complainant is a well-established online retailer of jewelry, operating in the United States and elsewhere for the past 20 years. Complainant owns numerous registrations for its JULIE VOS family of trademarks in the United States and other countries, including, for example United States Trademark Registration No. 7373784 for JULIE VOS, registered April 30, 2024, in International classes 14 and 35 with a first use in commerce date of January 1, 2013; and Australian trademark number 2042811 for JV JULIE VOS (logo above JULIE VOS in stylized lettering), registered June 2, 2020 in classes 14 and 35.

The disputed domain name <julievos.shop> was registered March 1, 2025 and does not resolve to an active webpage. The disputed domain name <julievosstudio.shop> was registered February 3, 2026 and resolves to a website that appears to offer for sale products under Complainant's JULIE VOS marks, using images and registered logos from Complainant's genuine website and promotional materials.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

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

Notably, Complainant contends that "The products at the www.julievosstudio.shop website purport to be genuine JULIE VOS-branded goods. These items are believed to be either: (i) counterfeit; or, (ii) non-existent, in-so-far as customers that would order the goods would have their credit cards charged and never receive any goods".

B. Respondents

Respondents did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.11.2.

With respect to common control, the Panel notes that (1) the disputed domain names were both registered using the same Registrar; (2) the disputed domain names both make use of Complainant's marks and the ".shop" Top-level Domain ("TLD"). Moreover, one of the registrants, "d's'da's'da's'd dasd", has a very substantial history of registering domain names and using the same method of reproducing well-known trademarks and adding the same ".shop" TLD.[1]

Despite the fact that registrant contact information for "d's'da's'da's'd dasd" is clearly fictitious, based on the Registrar's data, several URDP panels have found that registrant "d's'da's'da's'd dasd" uses a variety of aliases. The panels found that the registrant was party to abusive registration of well over a dozen domain names. Consolidation of multiple respondents was found appropriate in each case before transfer was ordered. See, e.g., *Victoria Beckham v. Tie Bor, hao ming, song lin, d's'da's'da's'd dasd, KentLorenz MJDNAH, ou oudi*, WIPO Case No. D2025-3991; *Universal Yarn, Inc. v. xiao qi, d's'da's'da's'd dasd,* WIPO Case No. D2025-2597; *Oats Overnight, Inc. v. xiao qi, Cynthia Parker and d's'da's'da's'd dasd,* WIPO Case No. D2025-1533.

This Panel reaches the same result, finding that the disputed domain names are under common control and that consolidation is called for here; noting also that the disputed domain name registrants did not comment on or object to Complainant's request.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "Respondent") in a single proceeding.

6.2 Substantive Issues

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 3.1, section 1.7.

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 entirety of the mark is reproduced within each of the disputed domain names. Accordingly, in the case of <julievos.shop> the disputed domain name is identical to the mark and, in the case of <julievosstudio.shop>, 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, the addition of the word "studio" to make up the disputed domain name <julievosstudio.shop>) may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that the addition of that word 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.

[1] A simple search of 2025 WIPO UDRP decisions reveals nine separate proceedings against registrant "d's'da's'da's'd dasd". Transfer was ordered in each proceeding.

The Panel finds that the first element of Policy paragraph 4(a) 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.

The Panel accepts Complainant's unopposed allegations that Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names and that Respondent lacks authorization to use Complainant's marks in the disputed domain names.

The record shows that one of the disputed domain names does not resolve to an active webpage, and the other is a passing off site using Complainant's marks and images from Complainant's webpage without authorization. The Panel finds that neither of these uses can be considered bona fide under the Policy.

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

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, alleged passing off) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1.

The Panel finds that the second element of paragraph 4(a) 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 Respondent included in the disputed domain names Complainant's well-established trademark without authorization. The Panel finds that Respondent's use of one of those disputed domain names for an online business that attempts to pass itself off as being Complainant's official site is a strong signal of Respondent's intention to target Complainant's marks. The Panel finds that Respondent has "intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark" in the sense of paragraph 4(b) of the Policy.

As discussed above, under the registrant contact name “d's'da's'da's'd dasd”, Respondent has similarly targeted many other well-established third-party marks to create identical or confusingly similar domain names, with the “.shop” TLD. As such, the Panel also finds therefore that Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain names in this proceeding is in bad faith, as provided under Policy paragraph 4(b)(ii) (registration of a 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…”).

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, the alleged 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 <julievosstudio.shop> constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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.

Considering the reputation or distinctiveness of the Complainant’s mark, and the composition of the disputed domain name <julievos.shop>, the Panel finds that the non-use of the disputed domain name <julievos.shop> does not prevent a finding of bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1. section 3.3.

Respondent’s use of false or incomplete registration details and failure to respond to the Complaint in this proceeding is further evidence of bad faith.

The Panel finds that Complainant has established the third element of paragraph 4(a) 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 names <julievos.shop> and <julievosstudio.shop> be transferred to Complainant.

/Jeffrey D. Steinhardt/
Jeffrey D. Steinhardt
Sole Panelist
Date: May 4, 2026