

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Strellson AG v. ren wei, ren wei
Case No. D2025-3380

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Strellson AG, Switzerland, represented by Leo Schmidt-Hollburg Witte & Frank Rechtsanwälte Partnerschaft mbB, Germany.

The Respondent is ren wei, ren wei, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <joop-outlets.shop> is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 22, 2025. On August 22, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 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 and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 27, 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 August 27, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 1, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 21, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 23, 2025.

The Center appointed Zoltán Takács as the sole panelist in this matter on October 7, 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 fashion and lifestyle company, a successor of JOOP! GmbH, which was founded by a well-known German fashion designer in 1988.

The Complainant is the owner of among others the European Union Trademark Registration (“EUTM”) No. 009222142 JOOP!, registered on December 10, 2010, and the EUTM No. 013083852 JOOP, registered on February 3, 2015.

The Complainant is also owner of the domain name <joop.com> (registered on November 3, 1998) which resolves to its “www.joop.com” website where the Complainant offers for sale products under its JOOP! trademark.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 7, 2025, and used to resolve to a mirrored version of the Complainant’s official website and was allegedly offering for sale the Complainant’s products at discounted prices. The website at the disputed domain name featured the Complainant’s JOOP! trademark and product images. The “About Us” page merely included information about, and references to, the Complainant and its JOOP! business and promised the opportunity for the visitors to get 80% discount on their purchase if they sign up for the newsletter by providing their email addresses.

Currently the disputed domain name 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 which incorporates its JOOP trademark in its entirety with the addition of the descriptive term “outlets” is confusingly similar to the trademark;
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name since it is unable to rely on any of the circumstances set out in paragraphs 4(c)(i), (ii), or (iii) of the Policy; and
- the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name with the Complainant’s well-known trademark in mind with the intention to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark as well as to collect email addresses from unsuspecting Internet users.

The Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred from the Respondent to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A complainant must evidence each of the three elements required by paragraph 4(a) of the Policy in order to succeed on the complaint, namely that:

- (i) the domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights;
- (ii) the 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

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 JOOP trademark is reproduced and is recognizable 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 a hyphen and the term "outlets" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that 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 that 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.

According to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant by hosting a copycat website allegedly offering for sale the Complainant's products at discounted prices.

There is no evidence as to whether the goods offered on the Respondent's website at the disputed domain name were counterfeit or "genuine", or whether any of those goods ultimately existed. While prior UDRP panels have recognized the limited rights of resellers to use a third party's trademark, such use must satisfy fair use requirements described in [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.8.

Here, there was no information disclosing the lack of relationship between the Respondent and the Complainant and the content on the website at the disputed domain name implied that the Respondent's website was operated by, or associated with, the Complainant, contrary to the fact. Consequently, even if the products that appeared on the Respondent's website under the disputed domain name had existed and had been genuine, the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name would still have not qualified as fair use. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.8.1 and *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#).

It is evident that the Complainant never authorized, licensed, or allowed the Respondent or any third party to use its trademarks in the disputed domain name or in any other way that would confer validity or legitimacy upon such use.

In the Panel's view it is also evident that the Respondent was impersonating the Complainant by using on its website at the disputed domain name the Complainant's trademark and imagery without disclosing its lack of relationship with the Complainant. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here impersonation/passing off can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

Coupled with the impersonation on the website and lack of disclaimer, the misleading nature of the disputed domain name, incorporating the Complainant's trademark and the related term "outlets", commonly used in retail industry to designate types of shops where manufacturers sell products directly to consumers at discounted prices reflects the Respondent's ultimate intent to mislead Internet users into believing that the website is operated or endorsed by the Complainant.

The Panel finds that 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.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

In the present case, the Panel notes that UDRP panels have found that the JOOP trademark is a widely-known fashion brand directly associated with the Complainant's activities. See *Strellson AG. v. WhoisGuard, Inc./ Dipesh Patel*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-0112](#) and *Strellson AG. v. Qibao Chen*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-0347](#).

The mere registration of a domain name that is identical or in this case confusingly similar to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

In view of the Panel the Respondent clearly registered the disputed domain name with the Complainant's trademark in mind. The Respondent's intent to target the Complainant's trademark can be readily inferred from the contents of the Respondent's website seeking to impersonate the Complainant by directing Internet traffic to its copycat version of the Complainant's official website in order to gain illegitimate profit through impersonation or false association. Visitors of the Respondent's website might have reasonably believed that it was connected to or approved by the Complainant as it appeared to offer the Complainant's products and gave impression that the site attached to the disputed domain name was official or connected to the Complainant, while it clearly was not the case.

Prior UDRP panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, in this case impersonation/passing off constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

As mentioned above, currently the disputed domain name does not resolve to any active website. However, this does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Considering the totality of the circumstances of the case, in this context the Panel notes the reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name and the nature of the Respondent's previous use of the disputed domain name as mentioned above and finds that the current passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of 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 <joop-outlets.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Zoltán Takács/

Zoltán Takács

Sole Panelist

Date: October 21, 2025