ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Clean Colonic, LLC v. Elena Squiric, Ad Pages and Kynya Jarmon, Clean Touch Colonics LLC
Case No. D2026-2012

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Clean Colonic, LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Berger Law Firm, PLLC, United States.

The Respondents are Elena Squiric, Ad Pages, United States, and Kynya Jarmon, Clean Touch Colonics LLC, United States, self-represented[1].

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <cleantouchcolonics.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 May 9, 2026. On May 11, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 11, 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 (KYNYA JARMON, CLEAN TOUCH COLONIC, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 13, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint.

[1] Paragraph 1 of the Rules defines the respondent as "the holder of a domain name registration against which a complaint is initiated". The Registrar identified Elena Squiric, Ad Pages as the holder of the disputed domain name. The Respondent Elena Squiric, Ad Pages, however, did not take part in the present proceedings. At the same time, the Respondent Kynya Jarmon, Clean Touch Colonics LLC filed a formal Response, identifying itself as a co-owner of Clean Touch Colonics LLC to which the disputed domain name belongs. Considering the above, the Panel determines that Elena Squiric, Ad Pages and Kynya Jarmon, Clean Touch Colonics LLC are both Respondents in this dispute.

The Center verified that 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 1, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 21, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on June 5, 2026, by Kynya Jarmon, Clean Touch Colonics LLC. The Complainant filed a Supplemental Filing on June 18, 2026.

The Center appointed Evan D. Brown 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 Complainant is in the business of providing colon hydrotherapy and related services. It owns the mark CLEAN COLONIC for which it enjoys the benefit of registration in the United States (Reg. No.7,296,845, registered on February 6, 2024, claiming first use in commerce on December 31, 2016, and disclaiming the term "colonic"). The Respondents registered the disputed domain name on October 11, 2022. The Parties do not dispute that the Respondents have used the disputed domain name to set up a website relating to the Respondents' colon hydrotherapy services.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark; that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondents

The Respondent Kynya Jarmon, Clean Touch Colonics LLC asserts that the disputed domain name corresponds to the name of its business, which is a Texas-based colon hydrotherapy business. It asserts that it formed the business on July 22, 2022, and launched the website for the business on December 2, 2022. The Respondent Kynya Jarmon, Clean Touch Colonics LLC asserts that it registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant's business. It further contends that it did not target or attempt to impersonate the Complainant and has used the disputed domain name solely in connection with a legitimate local Texas business. The Respondent Kynya Jarmon, Clean Touch Colonics LLC asserts that there is no evidence of actual confusion between the two geographically separated businesses despite years of concurrent operation.

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied: (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights, (ii) the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, and (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

6.1. Preliminary Issue – the Complainant's Supplemental Filing

On June 18, 2026, the Complainant submitted an unsolicited Supplemental Filing, which it characterized as being narrowly directed to factual assertions set forth in the Response. Unsolicited supplemental filings are generally discouraged, unless specifically requested by the panel. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.6. Nonetheless, to ensure that each Party "is given a fair opportunity to present its case," the Panel accepts the unsolicited Supplemental Filing. Rules, paragraph 10(b).

6.2. Substantive Issues

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

This first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7. 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. *Id*. This element requires the Panel to consider two issues: first, whether the Complainant has rights in a relevant mark; and second, whether the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to that mark.

A registered trademark provides a clear indication that the rights in the mark shown on the trademark certificate belong to its respective owner. See *Advance Magazine Publishers Inc., Les Publications Conde Nast S.A. v. Voguechen*, WIPO Case No. D2014-0657. The Complainant has demonstrated its rights in the CLEAN COLONIC mark by providing evidence of its trademark registration. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

Although each case is judged on its own merits, in cases where at least a dominant feature of the relevant mark is recognizable in the domain name, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

The disputed domain name contains the relevant part of the Complainant's mark, the term "clean," together with "colonic" (as part of the term "colonics"), which directly corresponds to the second portion of the Complainant's mark. Although the Respondents have added the word "touch," this addition does not eliminate confusing similarity for purposes of the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. The first element of the Policy is satisfied.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Given the Panel's determination under the third element of the Policy, the Panel declines to address this second element. See *Alumni Ventures LLC v. SocialNicheGuru.com*, WIPO Case No. D2025-1624.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The disputed domain name was registered on October 11, 2022, prior to the Complainant's trademark registration dated February 6, 2024. Where a respondent registers a domain name before a complainant's trademark rights accrue, panels will not normally find bad faith. See *Rock Robotic Inc v. G O, Phoenix LiDAR Systems*, WIPO Case No. D2025-3629; WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.8.1.

Although the Complainant asserts that it has used the CLEAN COLONIC mark for "years," the record contains no substantive evidence of the duration, nature, extent, or actual timeline of such use. The Panel acknowledges that the registration certificate for the Complainant's CLEAN COLONIC mark lists a date of first use of December 31, 2016, but there is no accompanying evidence to support that assertion – it is simply a standalone statement.

To establish common law trademark rights, a complainant must demonstrate acquired distinctiveness through evidence such as duration and nature of use, sales volume and time period, advertising expenditures, degree of public recognition, and consumer surveys. See *Stephen Alexander / DAS RFP, LLC d/b/a Casetrack v. D. M. Precise Media LLC*, WIPO Case No. D2026-0201; WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.3. The Complainant has provided no such evidence. The Panel does not find the bare assertion of years of use persuasive to support any claim of common law rights predating the Respondents' registration of the disputed domain name.

The Panel also finds it appropriate to observe that this dispute more closely resembles a trademark infringement matter under national law rather than a cybersquatting case appropriate for UDRP resolution. Panels sometimes deny cases not on the UDRP merits but on the narrow grounds that the dispute between the parties exceeds the relatively limited "cybersquatting" scope of the UDRP and would be more appropriately addressed by a court of competent jurisdiction. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 4.14.6. This Panel is not a general domain name court, and the Policy is not designed to adjudicate all disputes of any kind that relate in any way to domain names. Rather, the Policy is narrowly crafted to apply to a particular type of abusive cybersquatting. *Innovative Research Technology, Inc v. 513 Ventures, LLC*, WIPO Case No. D2024-2861.

Here, the Respondents appear to be a legitimate business operator in the colon hydrotherapy industry who selected a domain name corresponding to its actual business name, operating in a different geographic market. The Parties appear to be competitors in the same industry, and the Complainant's grievance relates to potential trademark infringement in the ordinary commercial sense rather than the type of malicious cybersquatting for which the UDRP was designed. Such disputes are more appropriately resolved through trademark infringement litigation in a court of competent jurisdiction, where issues of likelihood of confusion, damages, and equitable relief can be fully adjudicated.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondents did not register or use the disputed domain name in bad faith. In these circumstances, the Complaint under the Policy must fail.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Evan D. Brown/
Evan D. Brown
Sole Panelist
Date: July 16, 2026