

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Les Mills International Limited v. Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC
Case No. D2025-2100

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Les Mills International Limited, New Zealand, represented internally.

The Respondent is Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC, Saint Kitts and Nevis.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <lesmills.fit> and <lesmills.love> are registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 28, 2025. On May 28, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On May 28, 2025, the Registrar 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 verified that the 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"), and that the Policy and Rules apply to disputes relating to domain names in the .fit and .love gTLDs.

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 6, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 26, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response.¹ Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 3, 2025.

¹Given the absence of a Response, the Panel has carefully reviewed the record to ensure that the Respondent received the opportunity for fair notice of this proceeding. See *Nicole Kidman v. John Zuccarini, d/b/a Cupcake Party*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-1415](#). The Center sent notification of the Complaint to the Respondent by email, courier, and through a contact form available at one of the disputed domain names. Although one of the emails (to the postmaster address) bounced back as being undeliverable, the email sent to the

The Center appointed David H. Bernstein as the sole panelist in this matter on July 15, 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 an international fitness brand founded by Olympian Les Mills. Incorporated in 1997, the Complainant offers LES MILLS branded fitness classes – like yoga, cycling, dance, martial arts, strength training, and high intensity interval training – through a network of over 91,000 accredited instructors and over 22,000 gyms.

The Complainant owns a portfolio of over 1,500 active trademarks registrations worldwide and over 380 registrations for LES MILLS or LES MILLS formative trademarks in more than 100 jurisdictions, including in the United States of America, Canada, the European Union, China, and Japan. These registrations cover a range of goods in international classes 9, 16, 25, 28, and 41. The Complainant also owns domain names that incorporate the LES MILLS trademark, for instance <lesmills.com>, <lesmills.de>, <lesmills.live>, and <lesmills.tv>.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain names in September 2024. The disputed domain names operate as platforms allowing subscribers to download the Complainant's Les Mills programs and Les Mills audio-visual content for a fee. The LES MILLS trademark and logo also feature prominently at the top of the landing pages of the websites to which the disputed domain names resolve.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant alleges that the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to the LES MILLS trademark, which the Complainant owns and incorporates into its domain names. The Complainant alleges that its LES MILLS trademark is well-known globally, evidenced by its 380 registrations for the LES MILLS or LES MILLS formative trademarks in more than 100 jurisdictions for exercise related goods and services.

The Complainant alleges that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests to the disputed domain names, which are identical to the Complainant's well-known trademark LES MILLS and distinctive for exercise goods and services. The Complainant alleges that the Respondent uses the disputed domain names to sell recordings of the Complainant's copyrighted programs and audiovisual content for a fee without authorization. The Complainant also alleges that it has not given the Respondent permission, authorization, or license or obtain or post these materials, and has no commercial relationship with the Respondent.

The Complainant alleges that the Respondent registered and used the domain names in bad faith. The Complainant alleges that the use of the identical LES MILLS trademark in the disputed domain names, paired with the Respondent's use of the Complainant's trademarks, logos, and copyrighted material on the websites to which the disputed domain names resolve, is evidence of an intent to deliberately associate the

email addresses provided by the Registrar for the Respondent appears to have been received. The Written Notice sent by courier was also delivered to the address provided by the Registrar. It thus appears that the Respondent received actual notice of the Complaint by email and courier, but regardless, the Panel finds that the Center has discharged its obligation to provide fair notice to the Respondent as required by the Rules, paragraph 2(a).

disputed domain name with the Complainant. The Complainant alleges that there is a high risk of deception or confusion with the Complainant's mark.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has proven that it owns rights in the mark LES MILLS, as it has over 380 registrations for LES MILLS or LESS MILLS formative trademarks in over 100 jurisdictions. "Where the complainant holds a nationally or regionally registered trademark or service mark, this prima facie satisfies the threshold requirement of having trademark rights for purposes of standing to file a UDRP case." WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 1.2.1.

The LES MILLS trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain names; indeed, it is wholly incorporated in the disputed domain names. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy.

The Complainant has established the first element of the Policy

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant has shown that the Respondent lack rights or a legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. Les Mills is a distinctive term for exercise goods. The Complainant registered its LES MILLS class 9 word mark in the United States on March 6, 2018 (US Serial Number 87076552, Registration Number 5418999). The Respondent did not register the disputed domain names until 2024. There is no evidence of prior use of the Les Mills name by the Respondent. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.2.

The Respondent uses the disputed domain names to prominently display the Complainant's registered trademark and sell the Complainant's copyrighted content despite the Respondent having no right to do so. The Respondent is not using the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Complainant has established bad faith. The Respondent uses the disputed domain names to infringe on the Complainant's intellectual property rights for the Respondent's commercial gain. The Respondent's use of the LES MILLS name, logo, and trademark is an intentional attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark and brand.

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 <lesmills.fit> and <lesmills.love> be transferred to the Complainant.

/David H. Bernstein/

David H. Bernstein

Sole Panelist

Date: July 24, 2025