

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Alani Nutrition LLC v. Rambo  
Case No. D2026-0931

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Alani Nutrition LLC, United States of America (“United States” or “US”), represented by Edward Nathan Sonnenbergs Inc., South Africa.

The Respondent is Rambo, United States.

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

The disputed domain name <alaninus.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 4, 2026. On March 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 9, 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 (Dynadot Privacy Service / Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 9, 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 March 13, 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 March 17, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 6, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 7, 2026.

The Center appointed Gary Saposnik as the sole panelist in this matter on April 15, 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 a Limited Liability Company established in the United States, and is part of a group of companies affiliated to Celsius Holdings, Inc. (“Celsius”). In April 2025, Celsius acquired the Complainant and its Alani Nu brand, which serves a broad range of consumers across the functional energy and other adjacent wellness categories, including a functional beverage portfolio. The Complainant’s Alani Nu products are available in the US, Canada, Europe, and the Asia-Pacific region. They are sold through multiple channels, including conventional grocery, natural-food and convenience stores, fitness centers, mass-market and vitamin-specialty retailers, and e-commerce platforms.

The Complainant is the owner of a large portfolio of trademarks for its ALANI NU/ALANI name and brand, including the following trademark registrations:

- ALANI, International Registration No. 1860557, registered April 22, 2025, in classes 5, 21, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 35, 41, and 43;
- ALANI NU, United States Registration No. 5726640, registered April 16, 2019, in class 5, for “nutritional supplements; powdered nutritional supplement drink mix containing protein”;
- ALANI NU, International Registration No. 1860216, registered on April 22, 2025, in classes 5, 21, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 35, 41, and 43; and
- ALANI NU (figurative), European Union Registration No. 018864436, registered September 1, 2023, in classes 5 and 32.

The Respondent is purportedly an individual located in the United States. The disputed domain name was registered on June 12, 2025, and resolves to a website that is an online shop allegedly selling and offering the Alani Nu products. According to the Complainant, the website also uses the Complainant’s copyright-protected content appearing on or emanating to and/or from the Complainant’s own official website that is at “www.alaninu.com” and displays an email address ending with the Complainant’s domain name <alaninu.com>.

#### **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 identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant’s ALANI NU trademark. The disputed domain name reproduces the ALANI NU trademark in its entirety, in addition to the non-distinctive and descriptive letter “s”, which may either refer to the possessive noun or the plural of ALANI NU.

The Complainant alleges that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant has not licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use any of its trademarks or content or to register a domain name incorporating a mark that is identical to its ALANI NU trademark. The Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Rather, the Respondent has shown a clear intent to obtain an unfair commercial gain, with a view to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademarks owned by the Complainant. The Respondent is not an authorized distributor or reseller of the Complainant's products.

The resolving website also does not meet the requirements for a bona fide offering of goods. The Respondent does not disclose its relationship with the Complainant, which, as claimed by the Complainant, does not exist. The disputed domain name suggests at least an affiliation with the Complainant, as the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's ALANI NU trademark. Furthermore, the "Terms of Service" page on the resolving website states that the website "... is operated by Alani Nutrition, LLC ('Alani Nu', 'we', 'us' and 'our' refer to Alani Nu). Alani Nu offers this Site, including all information, tools, products, and services available from this Site or any part or content thereof (the 'Services') to you, the user, whether a browser, vendor, customer, merchant, content contributor, or otherwise...". In addition, the website prominently uses the Complainant's trademark and logo at the top of the website and in the website banner. The website further uses the Complainant's official ALANI NU content without authorization, while at the same time presenting a copyright notice at the bottom of the website which states that it is copyrighted by Alani Nu. This creates a false impression of an affiliation with and endorsement by the Complainant, while also fraudulently claiming rights in and to the material presented on the website. The website includes no information regarding the true identity of the provider of the website, which further serves to perpetuate the false impression of an official commercial relationship between the website and the Complainant.

Lastly, the Complainant avers that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The disputed domain name was registered after the Complainant (and/or its predecessors) commenced trading under the ALANI NU name and trademark, and after the registration of the ALANI NU trademarks. The Respondent also commenced using the Complainant's ALANI NU trademark and logos, as well as ALANI NU content on its website immediately after registering the disputed domain name. The Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name with the intention to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's registered ALANI NU trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website or location or of a product or service on its website, which constitutes registration and use in bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

## **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 the ALANI NU trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Complainant's ALANI NU 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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, an "s" after the mark, 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 addition of the "s" may be viewed as being plural or possessive of the Complainant's trademark, as well as typosquatting of the Complainant's mark, which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's mark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9.

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 evidence presented by the Complainant, as well as a review of the resolving website at the disputed domain name, shows a clear copycat site as well as passing off as the Complainant's website. In addition, the Respondent has used the Complainant's copyrighted images (including a copyright notice), logo, the same image as the Complainant's in the window tab, and an email address ending with the Complainant's domain name. Combined with the disputed domain name containing the Complainant's trademark in full, this creates a false impression of an affiliation with and endorsement by the Complainant, while also fraudulently claiming rights in and to the material presented.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed as applicable to this case: copycat site and passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 registered the disputed domain name several years after the Complainant attained registered rights in its ALANI NU trademark. The Respondent's website is a copycat site that is an attempt at passing itself off as the Complainant. The Respondent's use of the Complainant's images, logo, trademark, look and feel, same tab image, and an email address ending with the Complainant's domain name are clearly an intentional attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark.

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. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name containing the Complainant's ALANI NU mark in its entirety, along with a typo of the Complainant's widely known mark by the inclusion of an "s" after the mark. The Respondent has not responded to the Complaint, and has a clear absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with no credible explanation for the Respondent's choice of the disputed domain name.

Along with the above stated evidence, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed as applicable to this case: copycat site and 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 Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

### **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 <alaninus.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Gary Saposnik/*

**Gary Saposnik**

Sole Panelist

Date: April 29, 2026