

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Mango Wonder, Inc. v. John Harper  
Case No. D2025-2287

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Mango Wonder, Inc., United States of America, represented by Neal & McDevitt, LLC, United States of America.

The Respondent is John Harper, United States of America.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <betterlifecleaningproducts.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 11, 2025. On June 12, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 13, 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 (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 16, 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 amendment to the Complaint on June 30, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 July 1, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 21, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 22, 2025.

The Center appointed Colin T. O'Brien as the sole panelist in this matter on July 25, 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 the owner of the BETTER LIFE brand which the Complainant uses to market and sell a variety of household cleaning preparations. The Complainant markets, promotes and sells its goods bearing the BETTER LIFE mark primarily on Amazon.

The Complainant owns the following trademark registrations in the United States of America:

- BETTER LIFE (Reg. No. 3897618, registered December 28, 2010)
- BETTER LIFE (Reg. No. 6463946, registered August 24, 2021).

The Complainant has used its BETTER LIFE mark in commerce since at least 2010.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on August 28, 2024, some 14 years after the Complainant first used its BETTER LIFE mark in commerce.

The website at the disputed domain name prominently displays the Complainant's BETTER LIFE mark and redirects Internet users to the Complainant's Amazon page. The disputed domain name incorporates a non-prominent disclaimer at the end of the website: "© 2025. This website is not affiliated with Better Life brand".

#### **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 and contends that:

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's BETTER LIFE mark. The disputed domain comprises the Complainant's BETTER LIFE mark in its entirety, which is sufficient for a finding of confusing similarity under the Policy. The addition of the descriptive term "cleaning products" in the disputed domain name does not eliminate the confusing similarity. The Complainant's mark remains sufficiently recognizable for a showing of confusing similarity under the Policy.

There has never been any relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent that would give rise to any license, sponsorship, permission or authorization for the Respondent to use or register the disputed domain name. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use the BETTER LIFE mark or any similar variation in a domain name, at any website, or for any other purpose.

The Respondent will not be able to provide any evidence of legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is using the disputed domain name to generate advertising revenue.

The Respondent will not be able to provide any evidence of demonstrable preparation to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to trade off the goodwill of the Complainant's mark to imitate the Complainant can never give rise to legitimate rights on the part of the Respondent. The Respondent has sought to deceive Internet users by using the disputed domain name to offer what purport to be the Complainant's products but instead is a fraudulent imitation. The inclusion of the words "cleaning products" within the disputed domain

name supports the idea that the Respondent seeks to trade off the goodwill of the Complainant's mark, which is used for these types of products.

The BETTER LIFE mark is so closely linked and associated with the Complainant (as shown by its many years of use and registration) that the Respondent's use of this mark, or any minor variation of it, strongly implies bad faith – where a domain name is so obviously connected with such a well-known name and products, its very use by someone with no connection with the products suggests opportunistic bad faith. At the time of registration of the disputed domain name, the Respondent knew, or at least should have known, of the existence of the Complainant's trademarks. Such knowledge is demonstrated by the fact that the Respondent did indeed set up a website specifically targeting the sale of the Complainant's products (directing Internet users to Amazon.com to purchase the Complainant's products, thereby generating ad revenue for the Respondent). By using the disputed domain name to set up and operate a website that infringes on the Complainant's trademark rights (i.e., by imitating the Complainant and acting as if it was authorized to sell the Complainant's products), the Respondent has used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

The Complainant has demonstrated it owns registered trademark rights in its BETTER LIFE Marks. The addition of "cleaningproducts" does not prevent the Complainant's trademark from being recognizable in the disputed domain name. The generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such may be disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.8, and *Hoffmann-La Roche AG v. Domain Admin, Privacy Protection Service INC d/b/a PrivacyProtect.org / Conan Corrigan*, WIPO Case No. [D2015-2316](#).

Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a mark in which the Complainant has rights.

### **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

The Complainant has presented a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and has not been commonly known by the disputed domain name. The fact that the Respondent obtained the disputed domain name years after the Complainant started selling its goods and services under the BETTER LIFE marks indicates that the Respondent sought to piggyback on the BETTER LIFE marks for illegitimate reasons.

After a complainant has made a prima facie case, the burden of production shifts to a respondent to present evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. See, e.g., *Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2003-0455](#).

The Respondent has provided no evidence of any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Moreover, the evidence provided by the Complainant shows that the disputed domain name resolved to website featuring the Complainant's trademark, logo, and copyrighted images of the Complainant's trademarked goods with a link to the Complainant's Amazon webstore.

Above all, the nature of the disputed domain name incorporating the Complainant's trademark in its entirety, carries a risk of implied affiliation, especially when considering the impersonating nature of the content exhibited at the disputed domain name, and as such cannot constitute fair use. See section 2.5.1 of the

[WIPO Overview 3.0](#). The presence of a non-prominent disclaimer does not prevent the finding of a lack of a bona fide offering of goods and services, or legitimate noncommercial fair use of the disputed domain name.

In the absence of any evidence rebutting the Complainant's prima facie case indicating the Respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the Respondent's bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name. Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy states that evidence of bad faith may include a respondent's use of a domain name to intentionally attempt to attract Internet users for commercial gain.

Due to the incorporation of the BETTER LIFE mark in the disputed domain name and the resolving to an active website seemingly impersonating the Complainant by featuring the Complainant's trademark, logo, and copyrighted images of the Complainant's trademarked goods it is inconceivable that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names without knowledge of the Complainant. The facts establish a deliberate effort by the Respondent to cause confusion with the Complainant for commercial gain. Such an impersonation of the Complainant is sufficient to establish the Respondent's bad faith (see section 3.1.4 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#)). Under these circumstances, the Panel finds no plausible good faith reason for the Respondent's conduct and concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Panel also finds the mere existence of a disclaimer cannot cure such bad faith (see section 3.7 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#)).

The Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(iii) 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 <betterlifecleaningproducts.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Colin T. O'Brien/*

**Colin T. O'Brien**

Sole Panelist

Date: August 8, 2025