

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Goop Inc. v. mmd ndrae
Case No. D2025-0687

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Goop Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Frost Brown Todd LLC, United States.

The Respondent is mmd ndrae, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <goopcareers.com> 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 19, 2025. On February 20, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 20, 2025, 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 (“unknown”) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 21, 2025, 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 February 25, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on February 26, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 18, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 19, 2025.

The Center appointed Ik-Hyun Seo as the sole panelist in this matter on March 24, 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 lifestyle company founded in 2008 by Oscar-winning actress and entrepreneur Gwyneth Paltrow, providing lifestyle goods and services to customers around the world. The Complainant's business covers areas such as fashion, lifestyle, beauty, wellness, home décor, and food, and extends to podcast services and a streaming Netflix show. The Complainant began its business on e-commerce and mobile platforms, but in 2017, the Complainant opened its first brick-and-mortar location in Los Angeles, California, and now has six brick-and-mortar store locations. The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for GOOP and GOOP-based marks, including United States Trademark Registration Numbers 4,946,429 and 5,232,763, registered on April 26, 2016, and June 27, 2017, respectively, for the trademark GOOP.

The Respondent appears to be an individual with an address in the United States.

The disputed domain name was registered on February 4, 2025, and does not resolve to any active website.

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 name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the marks in which the Complainant has rights since the disputed domain name incorporates the GOOP mark in its entirety and the addition of the term "careers" does not obviate the impact of this incorporation.

The Complainant also contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and confirms that it has not authorized or licensed rights to the Respondent in any respect. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent used the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant's employees and claim to be on the "hiring team" at the Complainant. The Complainant contends that in one instance, the Respondent used the name of an actual recruiting director of the Complainant to send an email to a prospective job applicant inviting them to apply, and that this constitutes "job phishing" perpetuated by scammers in order to obtain personal information and/or money from unknowing job applicants. The Complainant contends that such use does not give the Respondent rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant contends that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name long after the GOOP mark had become a well-known trademark of the Complainant and is passively holding the disputed domain name and using a privacy shield, and as such, it is clear that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with bad faith to defraud confused consumers seeking information on job opportunities with the Complainant. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent had bad faith in carrying out the job phishing scam.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms – here, “careers” – 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 3.0](#), 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 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 name. 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 name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Moreover, “UDRP panels have found that domain names identical to a complainant's trademark carry a high risk of implied affiliation. Even 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 3.0](#), section 2.5.1. Here, the additional term “careers” suggests that the disputed domain name is for the recruiting department of the Complainant, and as the Complainant is a company, one may expect to regularly hire and recruit new talent.

In addition, the Respondent used the disputed domain name to contact and invite prospective job applicants to apply for jobs that did not exist, impersonating an actual employee of the Complainant, likely, in order to fraudulently obtain their financial and/or personal information. Panels have held that the use of a domain

name for illegal activity – here, claimed phishing and impersonation/passing off – 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name which incorporates the distinctive trademark of the Complainant along with the term “careers” which makes the disputed domain name appear as though it is used by the recruiting department of the Complainant. It is unlikely for the Respondent to have done so without prior knowledge of the Complainant and its marks. Rather, based on the manner of use of the disputed domain name, it is clear that the Respondent knew of the Complainant and its marks and targeted them when registering the disputed domain name.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for – illegal activity – here, claimed phishing and impersonation/passing off, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes 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 name <goopcareers.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ik-Hyun Seo/

Ik-Hyun Seo

Sole Panelist

Date: April 9, 2025