ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Starbucks Corporation v. Amir Fakhori
Case No. DIR2026-0004

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Starbucks Corporation, United States of America (“United States”), represented Saba & Co. Intellectual Property s.a.l., Lebanon.

The Respondent is Amir Fakhori, Islamic Republic of Iran (“Iran”).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <starbucksoriginal.ir> is registered with IRNIC.

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 27, 2026. On February 27, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to IRNIC a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. The procedure was suspended from March 5, 2026 until June 14, 2026 due to unforeseeable events.

On June 16, 2026, IRNIC transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 16, 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 June 18, 2026. Hard copies of the Complaint and Amended Complaint were received on June 29, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint and the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the .ir Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “irDRP”), the Rules for .ir Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for .ir Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2(a) and 4(a), the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 2, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5(a), the due date for Response was July 22, 2026. On July 24, the Center notified the Respondent’s default.

The Center appointed Wilson Pinheiro Jabur as the sole panelist in this matter on July 28, 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 coffee company that was founded in 1971 in the United States, having expanded internationally since then to over 41,000 stores across 87 countries. The Complainant's official website is available at "www.starbucks.com".

The Complainant is the owner of the following, amongst others, trademark registrations in Iran (Annexes 4-8 to the Complaint):

- Trademark Registration No. 111902 for STARBUCKS COFFEE and device in classes 30 and 43;

- Trademark Registration No. 273818 for the word mark STARBUCKS and its Farsi equivalent, in classes 29, 30, 31, 32, 35, 39; and

- Trademark Registration No. 153857 for the word mark STARBUCKS in Persian in class 43.

Past UDRP panels have already found STARBUCKS to be a "globally well-known" trademark (*Starbucks Corporation v. starbucks dealership*, WIPO Case No. D2023-0337).

The disputed domain name was registered on October 5, 2025, and presently resolves to a parked webpage with a message in Persian stating that the webpage is no longer available. The disputed domain name has been used in the past in connection with a webpage offering the Complainant's products.

The Complainant sent a warning letter to the Respondent on February 7, 2026 (Annex 2 to the Complaint) to which no reply was received.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant asserts that given its continuous, widespread and extensive global use, the STARBUCKS trademark enjoys significant worldwide and local consumer recognition creating a strong presumption that the public associates STARBUCKS exclusively with the Complainant.

Under the Complainant's view, the disputed domain name plainly misappropriates the textual components from the Complainant's STARBUCKS trademark so much so that an ordinary Internet user who is familiar with the Complainant's STARBUCKS trademarks would, upon seeing the disputed domain name, think that an affiliation exists between the disputed domain name and the Complainant or its STARBUCKS trademark.

Regarding the absence of the Respondent's rights or legitimate interests, the Complainant argues that the Respondent:

i. has not been commonly known by the disputed domain name;

ii. is not making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, without intent for commercial gain misleadingly to divert consumers or to tarnish the Complainant's trademark, given that the website that used to be available at the disputed domain name offered products using the STARBUCKS trademark without the Complainant's authorization, creating the impression to be an authentic STARBUCKS website for Iran;

iii. has no authorization to use the Complainant's STARBUCKS tradename and trademark; and

iv. is not an authorized distributor or manufacturer of the Complainant's products; there being no business relationship whatsoever between the Complainant and the Respondent.

As to the registration and use of the disputed domain name, the Complainant states that:

i. it is inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant and the STARBUCKS trademark when the Respondent registered the disputed domain name;

ii. the website that used to be available at the disputed domain name offered products using the STARBUCKS trademark without the Complainant's authorization, creating the impression to be an authentic STARBUCKS website for Iran;

iii. there is no authorization for the Respondent to register any domain names containing the Complainant's trademarks, nor did the Respondent seek permission from the Complainant to do so; and

iv. the Respondent has not replied the warning letter sent by the Complainant's representatives prior to this proceeding, which is a further indicative of the Respondent's bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy sets forth the following three requirements, which have to be met for this Panel to order the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and

(ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and

(iii) the disputed domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant must prove in this administrative proceeding that each of the aforementioned three elements is present in order to obtain the transfer of the disputed domain name.

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 Selected UDRP Questions, ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 1.7.[1]

---

[1] Given the similarities between the Policy and the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "UDRP"), the Panel will refer to the WIPO Overview 3.1 where relevant to this proceeding.

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 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 the term "original" 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 Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a nonexclusive list of circumstances that may indicate the Respondent's rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. These circumstances are:

(i) before any notice of the dispute, the Respondent's use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name or a name corresponding to the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or

(ii) the Respondent (as individuals, businesses, or other organizations) has been commonly known by the disputed domain name, in spite of not having acquired trademark or service mark rights; or

(iii) the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

According to the evidence submitted, the Complainant has made a prime facie case against the Respondent which has not been commonly known by the disputed domain name and is neither an authorized reseller of the Complainant's products nor has it been licensed or otherwise permitted to use any of the Complainant's trademarks or to register a domain name incorporating its STARBUCKS trademark.

Also, according to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the use made of the disputed domain name in connection with an online shop purportedly offering the Complainant's products, clearly suggests at least an affiliation with the Complainant, which in fact does not exist.

In addition to that, not disclosing the lack of relationship with the trademark owner does not meet the criteria for a bona fide offering of goods or services as established in *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. D2001-0903 , which is, under this Panel's view enhanced by the nature of the disputed domain name which carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant.

Under these circumstances and absent evidence to the contrary, the Panel finds that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name.

C. Registered or Used in Bad Faith

The Policy indicates in paragraph 4(b) that bad faith registration and use can be found in view of:

(i) circumstances indicating that the Respondent has registered or acquired the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring it to the Complainant who is the owner of a trademark relating to the disputed domain name or to a competitor of the Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the Respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name; or

(ii) the Respondent has registered the disputed 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 the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website or other location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website or location or of a product or service on the Respondent's website or location.

Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.4.

Furthermore, as seen above, not disclosing the lack of relationship with the trademark owner does not meet the criteria for a bona fide offering of goods or services as established in *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, *supra* and, which is, under this Panel's view enhanced by the nature of the disputed domain name which carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. Accordingly, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark, which supports a finding of bad faith registration and use.

Furthermore, the Panel notes that the current content of the website refers "این صفحه از دسترس خارج شده است.", which translates to "This page is no longer available". Despite the inactive website, the Panel finds that the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith.
See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.3.

The third element of the Policy has therefore 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 <starbucksoriginal.ir> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Wilson Pinheiro Jabur /
Wilson Pinheiro Jabur
Sole Panelist
Date: August 3, 2026