

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Sack Consulting Inc. v. CIERRA JUNE, JESSE PAUL GARCIA, AIYANA ASHLIN PEOPLES, MOR OSHRI, CAMERON SMITH
Case No. D2026-2344

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Sack Consulting Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Nelson Mullins Riley & Scarborough LLP, United States.

The Respondents are CIERRA JUNE, JESSE PAUL GARCIA, AIYANA ASHLIN PEOPLES, MOR OSHRI, and CAMERON SMITH, United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <getresilia.online>, <myresilia.online>, <myresillia.shop>, <resiliaa.com>, <resilia-try.shop>, <try-resilia.com>, <tryresilia.online>, and <try-resilia.shop> are registered with NameSilo, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 29, 2026. On June 1, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On June 9, 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 (See PrivacyGuardian.org) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 10, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, 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 domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on June 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 the Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 15, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 5, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents’ default on July 7, 2026.

The Center appointed Kathryn Lee as the sole panelist in this matter on July 16, 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 an online health and nutritional supplements company doing business through its website at the domain name <resilia.shop>. The Complainant was founded in 2024 and the domain name <resilia.shop> was registered on August 31, 2024. Since then, the Complainant has offered for sale through its website an oil of oregano supplement product sold under the RESILIA brand. Also, since launching the RESILIA brand, the Complainant has spent on average USD 2.8 million on marketing and advertising.

The Complainant has pending applications for RESILIA and RESILIA-based marks before the United States Patent and Trademark Office as below:

- RESILIA – Serial Number 99402158 filed on September 19, 2025 and published on May 19, 2026;
- RESILIA OIL OF OREGANO – Serial Number 99471759 filed on October 30, 2025 and published on May 19, 2026; and
- RESILIA DAILY DEFENSE – Serial Number 99705424 filed on March 16, 2026 and under examination as of the date of this Decision.

Based on information from the Registrar, the Respondents are individuals with different addresses and contact details in the United States.

The disputed domain names were registered between February 23, 2026 and May 12, 2026.

The disputed domain names are registered to AIYANA ASHLIN PEOPLES (<getresilia.online> and <tryresilia.online>), MOR OSHRI (<myresilia.online>), JESSE PAUL GARCIA (<myresillia.shop>), CAMERON SMITH (<resiliaa.com>), and CIERRA JUNE (<resilia-try.shop>, <try-resilia.com>, and <try-resilia.shop>).

As regards the disputed domain name <resiliaa.com>, there is no evidence that it has ever been used, and it resolved to a website containing no content at the time of filing of the Complaint.

The evidence also shows that at the time of filing of the Complaint, each of the disputed domain names <resilia-try.shop> and <tryresilia.online> resolved to a website indicating the store is unavailable.

As for the remaining disputed domain names, the submitted evidence shows that they at one point resolved to websites displaying the Complainant’s RESILIA mark and purportedly offering health supplements, including oil of oregano products. The evidence further shows that these websites featured substantially

the same – if not identical – content and color scheme as the Complainant's official website. The evidence further shows that contents of the websites associated with the disputed domain names <try-resilia.shop> and <resilia-try.shop> were removed in March 2026 following the submission of a Digital Millennium Copyright Act takedown notice by the Complainant.

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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that it has common law rights in the RESILIA mark, and that as the RESILIA mark is clearly identifiable in each of the disputed domain names, and the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the RESILIA mark. The Complainant also contends that <try-resilia.shop>, <try-resilia.com>, <tryresilia.online>, <resilia-try.shop>, <myresillia.shop>, <getresilia.online>, and <myresilia.online> each contains a word or phrase directly related to the Complainant's supplements business, and that <resiliaa.com> is an instance of typosquatting.

The Complainant also contends that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names and confirms that it has not authorized or licensed rights to the Respondents in any respect. The Complainant further contends that there is no evidence of the Respondents' use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain names in providing any bona fide offering of goods or services, nor any evidence that the Respondents have been commonly known by the disputed domain names or are making legitimate noncommercial or fair use of them. The Complainant also contends that as the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark, they carry a high risk of implied affiliation which does not support a finding that the respondents have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Complainant also contends that the Respondents used the disputed domain names in furtherance of an illegal activity, namely, impersonation/passing off and possibly/probably also harvesting of personal information.

Finally, the Complainant contends that its RESILIA mark is highly distinctive and has garnered notoriety since its launch in 2024, and that the Respondents knew or should have known of the Complainant when registering the disputed domain names. The Complainant also contends that the disputed domain names were used to impersonate the Complainant, which is evidence of use in bad faith.

B. Respondents

The Respondents 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 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.

The disputed 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.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that the disputed domain names <getresilia.online> and <tryresilia.online> are both registered in the name of AIYANA ASHLIN PEOPLES, while the disputed domain names <resilia-try.shop>, <try-resilia.com>, and <try-resilia.shop> are all registered in the name of CIERRA JUNE. The Panel further notes from the evidence that all five disputed domain names, except <tryresilia.online> and <resilia-try.shop>, resolved, at one point, to similar websites and were used in a substantially identical manner. Taken together with the common registrant information for the two groups of domain names, this supports a finding that these five disputed domain names are under common control.

As for the disputed domain names <myresilia.online> and <myresillia.shop>, they were used in the same manner as some of the disputed domain names mentioned above. The Panel therefore finds that these disputed domain names are likewise subject to common control.

With respect to the disputed domain name <resiliaa.com>, the Panel notes that it incorporates the RESILIA mark in its entirety with a minor typographical variation, that it was registered within a relatively short period of the registration of the other disputed domain names, and that it was registered through the same Registrar as the other disputed domain names, and the registrant is also reportedly located in the United States as the registrants of the other disputed domain names. Based on this and the absence of any contrary explanation from the Respondents, these circumstances support an inference that the disputed domain name <resiliaa.com> forms part of the same overall scheme and is likewise under common control.

For the reasons above, the Panel is of the view that all eight disputed domain names are more likely than not under common control.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party. Besides, none of the Respondents submitted any arguments to the contrary.

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 name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

As of the date of the Decision, the Complainant's trademark applications remain pending before the United States Patent and Trademark Office. Generally, a pending trademark application would not by itself establish trademark rights within the meaning of UDRP paragraph 4(a)(i). [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.1.4. Therefore, the Panel will examine whether or not the Complainant has established common law trademark rights in the mark RESILIA.

To establish unregistered or common law trademark rights for purposes of the UDRP, the complainant must show with supporting evidence that its mark has become a distinctive identifier which consumers associate with the complainant's goods and/or services. Evidence that a respondent has targeted the complainant's mark (e.g., based on the manner in which the mark is used on the related website or impersonating documents or other instruments) may also support the complainant's assertion and evidence that its mark has achieved significance as a source identifier. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.3.

Here, the Complainant has submitted evidence of its use of RESILIA in connection with its oil of oregano supplements on its official website from as early as September 2024; evidence showing that the Complainant's website receives an average of approximately 1.1 million visitors per month; evidence of the Complainant's use of RESILIA as the name of its Instagram, TikTok, and YouTube accounts, as its handle on X, formerly Twitter, and as part of its domain name; and evidence that the Complainant has approximately 11,700 followers on Facebook, 8,500 followers on Instagram, 2,600 followers on TikTok, and 6,700 followers on YouTube.

The Complainant has also submitted an affidavit attesting that it has sold an average of 73,530 units of RESILIA-branded supplements per month since launch, and in May 2026, 191,340 units of RESILIA-branded supplements, generating revenue of USD 12,065,603. The Complainant has also attested that it had sales revenues of 250,980 units in March 2026 and 220,762 units in April 2026. The Complainant has further attested that, since launch, it has spent an average of USD 2,824,150 per month on marketing and advertising RESILIA products, and more recently, USD 9,805,614 in March 2026, USD 7,084,298 in April 2026, and USD 7,577,831 in May 2026.

The Panel further notes that some of the disputed domain names at one point resolved to similar websites displaying the Complainant's RESILIA mark and purportedly offering health supplements, including oil of oregano products. These websites featured substantially the same – if not identical – content and color scheme as the Complainant's official website.

Having considered the evidence of the Complainant's use of the mark, website traffic, social-media presence, sales, and substantial advertising expenditures, as well as the use of some of the disputed domain names for copycat websites imitating the Complainant, the Panel finds that the RESILIA mark has acquired distinctiveness as a source identifier for the Complainant's oregano oil supplements. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established unregistered trademark rights in RESILIA for purposes of the Policy.

And as the Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names, the disputed domain names are 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 terms “try”, “get”, or “my”, as well as additional letters “a” or “l” – may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

The Panel therefore finds that 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Moreover, "where a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term (at the second- or top-level), UDRP panels have largely held that such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner". [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1. Here, most of the disputed domain names incorporate the Complainant's exact mark, and the additional terms "try", "my" and "get" are descriptive with respect to the Complainant's business, which creates the misleading impression that the disputed domain names are associated or affiliated with the Complainant, where no such relationship exists. This is further affirmed by the Respondent's use of a number of the disputed domain names to advertise and possibly sell the very same product for which the Complainant is known, using the Complainant's RESILIA mark.

In addition, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity – here, claimed copycat sites and passing off for a number of the disputed domain names – 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 from the evidence that the Respondent operated copycat websites impersonating the Complainant through some of the disputed domain names. The registration and use of these disputed domain names constitute bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. Panels have also held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity – here, claimed copycat sites 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 these disputed domain names constitute bad faith under the Policy.

Further, evidence submitted by the Complainant shows that at the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain names <resilia-try.shop> and <tryresilia.online> resolved to the websites indicating the store is unavailable, while the disputed domain name <resiliaa.com> resolved to a blank page. The Panel further notes that contents were removed from the disputed domain names <try-resilia.shop> and <resilia-try.shop> based on infringement of the Digital Millennium Copyright Act. Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the reputation of the Complainant's trademark in its own industry, the composition of the disputed domain names and manner of use of the other disputed domain names by the Respondent, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of these disputed domain names <does not prevent a finding of 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 <getresilia.online>, <myresilia.online>, <myresillia.shop>, <resiliaa.com>, <resilia-try.shop>, <try-resilia.com>, <tryresilia.online>, and <try-resilia.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Kathryn Lee/

Kathryn Lee

Sole Panelist

Date: July 30, 2026