

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

419Studios Ltd v. NameSilo, LLC, Domain Administrator; Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC; Monique Rochelle
Case No. D2025-0336

1. The Parties

The Complainant is 419Studios Ltd, United Kingdom, represented by Harbottle & Lewis LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondents are NameSilo, LLC, Domain Administrator, United States of America (“United States”); Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC, Saint Kitts and Nevis; and Monique Rochelle, France.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <corteiz.vip> is registered with Tucows Domains Inc (the “Registrar”).

The disputed domain name <crtez.xyz> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

The disputed domain name <crtzz.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 28, 2025. On January 29, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On January 29, 2025, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondents and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 5, 2025, 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 domain names are under common control.

The proceedings were suspended at the request of the Complainant on February 18, 2025. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on March 27, 2025. The proceedings were reinstated on April 2, 2025.

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 April 2, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 22, 2025. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents’ default on April 28, 2025.

The Center appointed Kaya Köklü as the sole panelist in this matter on May 5, 2025. 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 company based in the United Kingdom, which is active in the field of offering and selling streetwear clothing since at least 2019.

The Complainant is the owner of the CORTEIZ, CRTZ RTW and CRTZ trademarks. Among others, the Complainant is the registered owner of the European Union Trademark Registration No. 018963656, registered on May 3, 2024, for CORTEIZ, and International Registration No. 1679478, registered on May 30, 2022, for CRTZ RTW, both covering protection inter alia for clothing as protected in class 25. Furthermore, the Complainant is the registered owner of the United States Trademark Registration No. 7318144, registered on March 5, 2024, for CRTZ (as an illustration drawing), also covering protection inter alia for clothing.

The Complainant further owns and operates its official website at <crtz.xyz> since at least 2019.

The Respondents’ true identity remains unclear due to seemingly false contact information.

The disputed domain name <corteiz.vip> was registered on August 8, 2024.

The disputed domain name <crtz.xyz> was registered on April 21, 2024.

The disputed domain name <crtzz.com> was registered on April 16, 2024.

The screenshots provided by the Complainant show that the disputed domain names resolved to similar, partly even identical websites, purportedly offering clothing, in particular streetwear, at discounted prices. On the websites at the disputed domain names and, as far as can be seen on the provided screenshots, the Respondent prominently used the CORTEIZ and CRTZ trademarks as well as further official logos and copyright protected material of the Complainant in a way that created a look and feel as if the websites were operated by the Complainant. Particularly, the associated websites did not provide for a visible disclaimer describing the (lack of) relationship between the Parties.

At the time of the Decision, the disputed domain names were no longer linked to active websites.

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.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Consolidation of Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different disputed 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.

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 Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 4.11.2.

In light of the criteria set out above, the Panel finds that the Complainant has provided unrebutted evidence that all disputed domain names are likely under common control for the following reasons:

All disputed domain names were registered between a period of only a few months between April and August 2024. Furthermore, the disputed domain names provide for a similar nature and composition pattern, all of them comprising the entirety of the Complainant's CORTEIZ or CRTZ trademark or in slightly amended form. In addition, the Panel notes that the websites previously linked to the disputed domain names were highly similar regarding content and design, partly even identical to each other.

The Panel concludes that the Respondents are more likely than not somehow connected. Hence, the Panel accepts that all disputed domain names are under common control.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why a consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different registrants of disputed domain names (referred to below as "the Respondent", whenever appropriate) in a single proceeding.

6.2. Substantive Issues

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, the Panel shall decide the Complaint in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the three following elements is satisfied:

- (i) the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and
- (iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy states that the Complainant bears the burden of proving that all these requirements are fulfilled, even if the Respondent has not replied to the Complainant's contentions. *Stanworth Development Limited v. E Net Marketing Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-1228](#).

However, concerning the uncontested information provided by the Complainant, the Panel might, where relevant, accept the provided reasonable factual allegations in the Complaint as true. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.3.

It is further noted that the Panel has taken note of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) and, where appropriate, will decide consistent with the consensus views stated therein.

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. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the CORTEIZ, CRTZ RTW and the CRTZ trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the CORTEIZ and the CRTZ marks are reproduced within the disputed domain names <corteiz.vip> and <crzz.com> respectively. While the disputed domain name <corteiz.vip> is identical to the Complainant's CORTEIZ trademark, the disputed domain name <crzz.com> only differs from the Complainant's CRTZ trademark by an additional letter "z". Accordingly, these disputed domain names are identical to the CORTEIZ mark respectively confusingly similar to the CRTZ mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Panel further finds the CRTZ mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name <crtez.xyz>. The Panel accepts that minor alterations of the CRTZ trademark do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the CRTZ trademark and the disputed domain name <crtez.xyz>. Rather, the Panel believes that the mere addition of the letter "e" within the disputed domain name compared to the Complainant's CRTZ trademark does not affect a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name <crtez.xyz> and the Complainant's CRTZ trademark. Accordingly, the Panel finds that also the disputed domain name <crtez.xyz> is confusingly similar to the CRTZ mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7 and 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 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 3.0](#), 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. Particularly, the Complainant put forward that the Respondent is neither an authorized business partner of the Complainant nor a licensee of its trademarks and that the Respondent is not commonly known by the terms “corteiz”, “crtez”, “crtzz” or any other similar terms. 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.

In light of the above, the Panel has no doubt that the Respondent was well aware of the Complainant and its CORTEIZ, CRTZ RTW and CRTZ trademarks before registering and using the disputed domain names. The Panel particularly notes that the nature of the disputed domain names along with the design and content of the associated websites (reproducing the Complainant’s word and figurative trademark and offering products under the Complainant’s trademarks, presumably counterfeit), indicates the Respondent’s illegitimate intention to mislead Internet users into believing that the websites are operated or endorsed by the Complainant. While the Complainant claims that the goods offered on the website at the disputed domain names must be counterfeits, it is not necessary for the Panel to make any ultimate determination as to the nature of the goods, as the evidence clearly shows the Respondent has attempted to pass itself off as the Complainant.

In view of the Panel, the Respondent’s attempt to impersonate the Complainant results in an illegitimate use that can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), 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.

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 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent was apparently well aware of the Complainant and its CORTEIZ, CRTZ RTW and CRTZ trademarks when registering the disputed domain names. It is obvious to the Panel, that the Respondent has deliberately chosen the disputed domain names to target the Complainant and mislead Internet users.

With respect to the use of the disputed domain names, the Panel further notes that the disputed domain names resolved to websites deliberately creating the false impression to be operated by the Complainant or at least with its authorization.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here impersonation and claimed sale of counterfeit goods, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

The fact that the disputed domain names currently do not resolve to an active website anymore does not prevent a finding of bad faith.

In the light of the above and having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under the Policy. Even more, the Panel is convinced that this is a typical cybersquatting case.

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 <cortez.vip>, <crtez.xyz>, and <crtzz.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Kaya Köklü/

Kaya Köklü

Sole Panelist

Date: May 19, 2025