

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Koninklijke Douwe Egberts B.V. v. Paul Baumann
Case No. D2025-2928

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Koninklijke Douwe Egberts B.V., Netherlands (Kingdom of the), represented by Ploum, Netherlands (Kingdom of the).

The Respondent is Paul Baumann, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <jacobsdouwe-egberts.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 July 23, 2025. On July 24, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 25, 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 July 25, 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 July 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 July 28, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 17, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 18, 2025.

The Center appointed Luis Miguel Beneyto Garcia-Reyes as the sole panelist in this matter on August 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 a leading company in the alimentary sector, more concretely the coffee and tea sectors.

The Complainant is the owner – inter alia– of the following trademark registrations and applications protecting “JACOBS DOUWE EGBERTS” as the only word element:

European Union trademark registration n°012852315 JACOBS DOUWE EGBERTS for products/services in classes 5, 7, 11, 16, 21, 29, 30, 32, 35 and 43, registered on November 28, 2018;

Chinese trademark registration n°14520048 JACOBS DOUWE EGBERTS for products in class 21, registered on May 9, 2014.

International trademark registration n°1239007 JACOBS DOUWE EGBERTS, designating – inter alia– Japan, Australia, and the United States of America, with registration number 1239007, registered on October 10, 2014, for products/services in classes 5, 7, 11, 16, 21, 29, 30, 32, 33, 35 and 43.

The website identified by the disputed domain name is currently inaccessible but the Complainant has accredited that the disputed domain name was redirected to the Complainant's 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 Complainant, Koninklijke Douwe Egberts B.V., is part of Jacobs Douwe Egberts, which was formed in 2015 by merging D.E Master Blenders, founded in 1753, and the coffee division of Mondelez International. Jacobs Douwe Egberts is part of JDE Peet's, the world's largest pure play coffee and tea company, headquartered in the Netherlands (Kingdom of the).

The Complainant owns a large number of trademark registrations worldwide, consisting of or including the element Jacobs Douwe Egberts like European Union trademark registration n°012852315 JACOBS DOUWE EGBERTS, Chinese trademark registration n°14520048 JACOBS DOUWE EGBERTS and International trademark registration n°1239007 JACOBS DOUWE EGBERTS, designating, inter alia, Japan, Australia, and the United States of America.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name and linked the disputed domain name directly to Complainant's official website <jacobsdouweegberts.com> and when the Complainant informed the Registrar it responded with the immediate takedown of the Respondent's website.

The disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's earlier Trademarks, as it incorporates the JACOBS DOUWE EGBERTS Trademark in its entirety and including a hyphen between the terms does not prevent a conclusion of identity or confusing similarity between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name given that the Respondent is not commonly known under the name “Jacobs Douwe Egberts”, nor has the Respondent acquired any trademark or service mark rights; the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant, and Complainant has not licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the JACOBS DOUWE EGBERTS Trademark or to register a domain name incorporating said Trademark, and there is no evidence of the Respondent has made or is making use of the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offer of goods or services.

The disputed domain name has been registered in bad faith due to the fact that the JACOBS DOUWE EGBERTS Trademark is well-known and highly distinctive in the whole world and the disputed domain name is identical to the JACOBS DOUWE EGBERTS Trademark and tradename so the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its trademarks, as can be inferred from the fact that the disputed domain name was associated to the Complainant’s official domain name and website.

The disputed domain name is being used in bad faith taking into account that is not being actively used and it was used to redirect the Internet users to the official website of Complainant, so the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its Website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademarks, tradename, and website.

On the basis of the above-described allegations, the Complainant requests that the disputed domain name <jacobsdouwe-egberts.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove: i) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and iii) that the Respondent has registered and used the domain name in bad faith.

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.

The inclusion of a hyphen between the terms “jacobsdouwe” and “egberts” 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.

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, this conclusion is reached if we take into account:

- the Complainant’s trademark JACOBS DOUWE EGBERTS is reputed in its sector. The Respondent’s registration of the disputed domain name includes the Complainant’s trademark in its entirety, simply including a hyphen between the terms “jacobsdouwe” and “egberts”. The Panel’s conclusion is that the Respondent must have been aware that it was appropriating a name that was virtually identical to a reputed mark of a third party.

- the Complainant has accredited that the disputed domain name, although currently inactive, was redirected to the Complainant’s website with the purpose of creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s earlier trademark and the Complainant itself. The Panel considers relevant to bring the content of a prior decision rendered by the Center in this respect, as the one referred in the case *Accenture Global Services Limited v. Ranjan M*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-0235](#):

“The evidence in the case record establishes that the Respondent has redirected the disputed domain name to the Complainant’s own official Indian website. Thus, it is clear that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name with the Complainant’s trademark and business in mind. The Respondent’s failure to use the disputed domain name for any purpose but to redirect to Internet users to the Complainant’s website is evidence of bad faith registration and use. The circumstances in the case indicate that the disputed domain name has intentionally been used in an attempted to attract, most likely for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent’s website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website or location or of a product or service on that website or location. Internet users may be misled into believing that the disputed domain name belongs to or is in some way associated with or provided by the Complainant”.

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

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 <jacobsdouwe-egberts.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Luis Miguel Beneyto Garcia-Reyes/

Luis Miguel Beneyto Garcia-Reyes

Sole Panelist

Date: September 8, 2025