

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Charli D'Amelio LLC v. Nano Techan

Case No. D2025-3394

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Charli D'Amelio LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Chipperson Law Group, P.C., United States.

The Respondent is Nano Techan, Nigeria.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <charli-damelio.shop> is registered with Namecheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 22, 2025. On August 25, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 26, 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 August 28, 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 September 2, 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 September 4, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 24, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 26, 2025.

The Center appointed Jane Seager as the sole panelist in this matter on October 13, 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, Charli D'Amelio LLC, is the exclusive worldwide licensee of the personal name and likeness of Charli D'Amelio, a recognized social media influencer and reality television personality. The company leverages the "Charli D'Amelio" name across a wide range of consumer products, including fashion, beauty, bedding, books, and beverages, and operates its own online store via the domain name <charlidamelio.com>, registered in 2019. Active on TikTok since 2019, Charli D'Amelio has achieved significant fame, attaining over 100 million followers on TikTok by November 2020, and commercial success, with numerous brand collaborations, media appearances, and awards.

The Complainant is the owner of United States Trademark Registration No. 7043410, CHARLI D'AMELIO, filed on March 24, 2020 (first use in commerce on February 26, 2020), and registered on May 2, 2023.

The disputed domain name was registered on February 8, 2022. The disputed domain name previously resolved to a website (the "Respondent's website") that purported to offer merchandise bearing the Charli D'Amelio name and trademark. The Respondent's website stated "Charli D'Amelio Merchandise Store is the OFFICIAL Merchandise Store for Charli D'Amelio fans." At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name no longer resolves to an active web page.

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.

The Complainant asserts rights in the CHARLI D'AMELIO trademark, including common law rights predating the registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has been granted no licence or permission to use the Complainant's trademark or likeness. The Complainant notes that the Respondent has been named in at least nine UDRP decisions, all of which resulted in transfer of the concerned domain names. The Complainant submits that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to offer counterfeit goods bearing the Complainant's trademark.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant observes that the disputed domain name was registered well after Charli D'Amelio had launched her career as a social media influencer and television personality. The Complainant notes it applied for the CHARLI D'AMELIO trademark in March 2020, and that by November 2020 the Complainant had attained over 100 million followers on TikTok and had entered into a number of licensing agreements with companies such as Proctor & Gamble, Simmons Mattress, Orosa, and Dunkin' Donuts for sale of various consumer products. The Complainant submits that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in order to trade upon the goodwill, trademarks, and personality rights of Charli D'Amelio, in bad faith. The Complainant further submits that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name in connection with a website offering counterfeit goods, in bad faith.

The Complainant requests transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In order to prevail, the Complainant must demonstrate on the balance of probabilities that it has satisfied the requirements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy:

- (i) The disputed 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 disputed domain name; and
- (iii) The disputed domain name was 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 fact that a domain name may have been registered before a complainant has acquired trademark rights does not by itself preclude a complainant's standing to file a UDRP case, nor a panel's finding of identity or confusing similarity under the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.1.3.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established rights in the trademark CHARLI D'AMELIO, the registration details of which are provided in the factual background section above.

The disputed domain name comprises the Complainant's trademark in its entirety, altered only by the inclusion of a hyphen in the place of the space appearing in the Complainant's trademark, and the omission of the apostrophe.

The Panel finds the Complainant's trademark to be recognizable within the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

As noted above, the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to resolve to a website that purported to offer for sale goods bearing the Complainant's trademark, holding itself out as an official website of the Complainant. The Complainant alleges that the goods offered for sale via the Respondent's website were counterfeit, an allegation unrebutted by the Respondent.

Prior UDRP panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, including the sale of counterfeit goods and impersonation/passing off can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

There is no evidence to suggest that the Complainant has authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its name or trademark in any manner. The Panel finds that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name, as described above, does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services pursuant to paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy.

The Panel further finds that the Respondent cannot legitimately claim to be commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

Nor has the Respondent made any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name in accordance with paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy. Indeed, the composition of the disputed domain name itself, comprising the Complainant's trademark under the generic Top-Level Domain ".shop" is such that the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant, which does not support a claim of fair use.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that the Complainant's trademark, CHARLI D'AMELIO, was applied for on March 24, 2020, and that Charli D'Amelio had achieved significant fame and commercial success well before the registration of the disputed domain name on February 8, 2022. By that time, Charli D'Amelio had amassed over 100 million followers on TikTok and had entered into numerous licensing and endorsement agreements. The record demonstrates that the Complainant's name and mark had been used extensively in commerce, including in connection with a wide range of consumer products, media appearances, and brand collaborations, and had become closely associated with the Complainant.

Although formal registration of the CHARLI D'AMELIO trademark occurred after the disputed domain name was registered, the Panel finds that the Complainant had acquired common law trademark rights in the Charli D'Amelio name prior to the registration of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent's subsequent use of the disputed domain name indicates that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant, with a view to engaging in activity intended to mislead Internet users in bad faith.

As noted above, the Respondent used the disputed domain name to resolve to a website purporting to be the "OFFICIAL Merchandise Store for Charli D'Amelio fans", offering merchandise bearing the Complainant's trademark. The Complainant alleges that the goods offered were counterfeit and that the Respondent was not authorized to use the Complainant's name or trademark. Prior UDRP panels have consistently found that the use of a domain name to sell counterfeit goods or to impersonate a complainant constitutes bad faith registration and use. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4. In light of the above, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith, with the intention of trading on the goodwill and reputation of the Complainant's trademark and misleading consumers for commercial gain.

Furthermore, the Respondent has a history of adverse UDRP decisions, with at least nine prior cases resulting in the transfer of domain names, which supports a pattern of bad faith conduct.

The fact that the disputed domain name no longer resolves to an active website does not materially affect the Panel's findings above.

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 <charli-damelio.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Jane Seager/

Jane Seager

Sole Panelist

Date: October 27, 2025