

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

New Outdoor Voices IP Holdings, LLC v. ThomasineCarver, Mitchell Webb,
and Eren Ayverdi
Case No. D2026-2003

1. The Parties

The Complainant is New Outdoor Voices IP Holdings, LLC, United States of America ("United States" or "US"), represented by Tucker & Latifi, LLP, United States.

The Respondents are ThomasineCarver, Mitchell Webb and Eren Ayverdi, United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <outdoorvoicessale.com> and <outdoorvoices-us.com> are registered with Gname.com Pte. Ltd. (the "Registrar").

The disputed domain name <outdoorvoicesus.com> is registered with Name SRS AB (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 8, 2026. On May 11, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On May 11 and 12, 2026, the Registrars respectively transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (not available) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 15, 2026, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) 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 disputed domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed the amended Complaints on May 19, 20 and 21, 2026, respectively.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaints 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 29, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 18, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents’ default on June 23, 2026.

The Center appointed Clark W. Lackert as the sole panelist in this matter on June 25, 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 OUTDOOR VOICES trademark (the “Mark”) was created by the Complainant in 2013, with the goal of creating apparel that made recreation wear more approachable, rather than the intense performance gear at the time. The Mark has been registered in the United States and elsewhere for apparel, retail store services, and online retail store services since at least as early as 2015, in various jurisdictions including the following:

Jurisdiction	Registration Number	Registration Date
United States	4831380	October 13, 2015
China	54867990	October 14, 2021
China	54864516	October 14, 2021
China	54871082	October 14, 2021
European Union	019072505	January 9, 2025
United Kingdom	UK00004087486	November 8, 2024

The domain name <outdoorvoices.com> was registered by the Complainant on December 9, 2008, which resolves to the Complainant’s official website.

The disputed domain names <outdoorvoicessale.com>, <outdoorvoices-us.com>, and <outdoorvoicesus.com> were registered by the Respondents on March 11, 2026, December 31, 2025, and April 16, 2026, respectively. The disputed domain names resolve to very similar websites displaying the Mark and purportedly offering for sale similar products including those bearing the Mark.

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 names.

The disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights (Policy, paragraph 4(a)(i); Rules, paragraphs 3(b)(viii), (b)(ix)(1)).

Many years after the Complainant’s trademark rights were established, the Respondents registered and/or began to use the disputed domain names outdoorvoicessale.com, outdoorvoices-us.com, and outdoorvoicesus.com to infringe upon the Mark. The disputed domain names are confusingly similar, and both incorporate the Mark in its entirety. The disputed domain names have added additional elements to the disputed domain names, namely, the generic word “sale” and the geographic identifier “us”. The inclusion of the additional word “sale” in the disputed domain name <outdoorvoicessale.com> in no way changes the meaning or significance of the Mark, since it only serves to lure legitimate customers away from the original source of online goods offered by the Complainant by indicating that the goods would be on “sale”. Likewise,

the inclusion of the geographical indicator “us” in the other disputed domain names in no way changes the meaning or significance of the Complainant’s unique Mark, it once again only serves to lure legitimate customers away from the original source of online goods offered by the Complainant, a “US” based company.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names (Policy, paragraph 4(a)(ii); Rules, paragraph 3(b)(ix)(2)).

The Complainant has not authorized nor licensed the Respondents to use its registered trademarks and service marks and the Respondents have no rights or legitimate rights to use the Mark owned by the Complainant. The Respondents are not commonly known by the disputed domain names and there can be no legitimate business reason for the Respondents to own and/or use the disputed domain names. Doing so violates the law, infringes upon the Complainant’s intellectual property rights, and wrongfully leads the public to believe that the Respondents’ websites are associated with, authorized by, or sponsored by the Complainant.

The disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith_(Policy, paragraphs 4(a)(iii), 4(b); Rules, paragraph 3(b)(ix)(3)).

By using the disputed domain names, the Respondents are intentionally attempting to attract for commercial gain Internet users to the Respondents’ websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Mark to falsely create the impression that the Respondents’ websites and the goods and services being offered on these websites are actually those of the Complainant or somehow affiliated with the Complainant. Thus, the Complainant believes the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith, solely to create a likelihood of confusion in the marketplace. The copycat websites operated by the Respondents imitating the Complainant’s website by showing similar images and themes, effectively pirate the official website of the Complainant.

B. Respondents

The Respondents are in default and did not reply to the Complainant’s contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the disputed domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules, since it claims: “The domains were both registered within a few months of each other. Two of the domain names, www.outdoorvoicessale.com and www.outdoorvoices-us.com are registered with the same registrar, Gname.com Pte. Ltd. The other domain name, www.outdoorvoicesus.com has a different registrar, NAME SRS AB, but lists Gname.com Pte Ltd. as the abuse contact. The domains serve the same purpose, to attract internet users to their site for the sale of counterfeit goods. The domains both incorporate the OUTDOOR VOICES mark in its entirety, and the websites at the infringing domains are visually similar. All three Registrants are located in California and utilize a similar (and likely fake) email address layout, namely, the registrants first and last name, followed by similar address endings”.

The domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant’s request. 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 the 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. For the reasons stated below, the request for consolidation is granted.

Regarding common control, the Panel notes that the Complainant, who has the burden of proof to show common control over the three Respondents, has offered sufficient evidence to demonstrate common control, including a) the disputed domain names were registered within a short period of time; b) while the disputed domain names were registered through two different Registrars, the Registrar, Gname.com Pte. Ltd. is listed as the reseller and abuse contact of the disputed domain name <outdoorvoicesus.com>, registered through the Registrar Name SRS AB; c) all of the Respondents are located in California, United States; d) the disputed domain names <outdoorvoicesus.com> and <outdoorvoicesus.com> only differs from each other in terms of a hyphen “-” and all three disputed domain names follow a similar naming pattern; e) the websites at the disputed domain names are highly similar including the use of same product images with same prices. See, for example, *BENDA BILL v. Hierra Mela, Huang Bao Chuan, Harold McConnell, asd asfasf, asgfasgsgas, jottsoldes jottsoldes, jottsoldes, John John, Wei Lin, and Xu Zheng*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-1120](#), where similar evidence was offered.

Moreover, the Respondents have not objected to the Complainant’s consolidation request and the Panel finds that this consolidation is fair and equitable to the Parties herein.

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

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 names. [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 names, together with the word “sales” or “us” which does not affect the overall similarity. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 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 names. 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 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 finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's prior registered Mark in violation of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, by using the Mark together with a word "sales" or "us" in the disputed domain names for copycat websites purportedly offering for sale similar products including those bearing the 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here claimed as passing off, or other types of fraud 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 names 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 names <outdoorvoicessale.com>, <outdoorvoices-us.com>, and <outdoorvoicesus.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Clark W. Lackert/

Clark W. Lackert

Sole Panelist

Date: July 13, 2026