

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Williams-Sonoma, Inc. v. Domain Administrator, NameSilo, LLC
Case No. D2025-0537

1. The Parties

Complainant is Williams-Sonoma, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Hanson Bridgett LLP, United States.

Respondent is Domain Administrator, NameSilo, LLC, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <williams-sonoma-store.shop> (the "Domain Name") is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 11, 2025. On February 11, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On February 11, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy, See PrivacyGuardian.org) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email to Complainant on February 13, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on February 14, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on February 18, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 10, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on March 11, 2025.

The Center appointed Robert A. Badgley as the sole panelist in this matter on March 17, 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

Complainant manufactures and sells a wide variety of household products and furniture, and has done so for more than 60 years.

“Complainant is one of America’s premiere home goods retailers and manufacturers whose well-known brands include Williams Sonoma®, Pottery Barn®, West Elm®, and Rejuvenation®, among others, selling internationally through its retail stores, catalogs, and online. Complainant launched its Williams Sonoma brand in 1956, and has since continuously offered a full line of in-house designed, exclusive products for the home, from kitchenware to furniture using the distinctive and well-known trademarks WILLIAMS SONOMA, WILLIAMS SONOMA HOME, WILLIAMS SONOMA SIGNATURE, WILLIAMS SONOMA CALIFORNIA, WILLIAMS-SONOMA RESERVE (collectively, the ‘WILLIAMS SONOMA Mark’) through catalogs, online storefronts such as www.williams-sonoma.com (the ‘Williams-Sonoma.com Website’), and over 150 retail store locations worldwide.”

Complainant holds hundreds of registered trademarks for WILLIAMS SONOMA in various jurisdictions. In the United States, Complainant holds United States Patent and trademark Office (“USPTO”) Reg. No. 2,353,758 for the mark WILLIAMS SONOMA, registered on May 30, 2000 in connection with, among other things, “retail store services,” “mail order catalog services,” and “on-line retail store services,” with a September 16, 1956 date of first use in commerce, as well as USPTO Reg. No. 2,442,099 for WILLIAMS SONOMA, registered on April 10, 2001 in connection with, among other things, dinnerware, glassware, cookware, and utensils, with a 1963 date of first use in commerce.

Complainant has owned the domain name <williams-sonoma.com> since October 3, 1995, and Complainant has used that domain name to host its commercial website.

The Domain Name was registered on February 3, 2025. The Domain Name currently does not resolve to a website. For a time, however, the Domain Name resolved to a website purporting to sell various merchandise under the WILLIAMS SONOMA mark. According to the Declaration submitted by Complainant’s counsel, and as corroborated by screenshots annexed to the Complaint:

“Respondent has used the confusingly similar Disputed Domain to deliberately imitate Complainant and its Williams Sonoma brand, by hosting a website that passes itself off as Williams Sonoma. The products ostensibly listed on the website at the Disputed Domain correspond to Complainant’s exclusive products listed on Complainant’s Williams-Sonoma.com Website, and the Disputed Domain is replete with Complainant’s copyrighted images and trademarks, as well as pages featuring products in which Complainant has valuable trade dress and/or design patent rights.”

“Respondent also identifies as Complainant on the “About Us” page on the website associated with the Disputed Domain.”

Respondent has not disputed any of the foregoing allegations or challenged any of the evidence annexed to the Complaint.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Name.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists the three elements which Complainant must satisfy with respect to the Domain Name:

- (i) the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Panel finds that Complainant has rights in the mark WILLIAMS SONOMA through extensive registration and use demonstrated in the record. The Panel also finds that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to that mark. The Domain Name entirely incorporates the WILLIAMS SONOMA mark, adds a couple of inconsequential hyphens, and adds the descriptive term "store." The WILLIAMS SONOMA mark remains clearly recognizable within the Domain Name notwithstanding these minor differences.

Complainant has established Policy paragraph 4(a)(i).

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Pursuant to paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, Respondent may establish its rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name, among other circumstances, by showing any of the following elements:

- (i) before any notice to you [Respondent] of the dispute, your use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or
- (ii) you [Respondent] (as an individual, business, or other organization) have been commonly known by the Domain Name, even if you have acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or
- (iii) you [Respondent] are making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

The Panel concludes, on the undisputed record and on a balance of probabilities, that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in connection with the Domain Name. As noted above, Respondent has not come forward in this proceeding to refute any of the allegations made by Complainant, including the allegation that Respondent developed a website designed to impersonate Complainant and lifted copyrighted content on Complainant's site for use on Respondent's site. In addition, Respondent's "About Us" page is clearly designed to create the false impression among consumers that Respondent's website is operated by or at least affiliated with Complainant.

Complainant has established Policy paragraph 4(a)(ii).

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides that the following circumstances, “in particular but without limitation,” are evidence of the registration and use of the Domain Name in “bad faith”:

- (i) circumstances indicating that Respondent has registered or has acquired the Domain Name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the Domain Name registration to Complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of its documented out of pocket costs directly related to the Domain Name; or
- (ii) that Respondent has registered the 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 Respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) that Respondent has registered the Domain Name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) that by using the Domain Name, Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to Respondent’s website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of Respondent’s website or location or of a product or service on Respondent’s website or location.

The Panel concludes that Respondent registered and used the Domain Name in bad faith under the Policy. The Panel incorporates its discussion above in the “Rights or Legitimate Interests” section. On this undisputed record, the Panel concludes that Respondent obviously had Complainant’s mark in mind when registering the Domain Name. This is a clear case of impersonation, and constitutes bad faith registration and use within the meaning of the above-quoted Policy paragraph 4(b)(iv).

Complainant has established Policy paragraph 4(a)(iii).

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 Domain Name <williams-sonoma-store.shop> be transferred to Complainant.

/Robert A. Badgley/

Robert A. Badgley

Sole Panelist

Date: March 24, 2025