

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fridababy, LLC v. Vladimir Veselovskiy
Case No. D2025-3565

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Fridababy, LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Vladimir Veselovskiy, Ukraine.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <thefridamom.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 September 3, 2025. On September 4, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 5, 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, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 11, 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 15, 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 15, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 5, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 6, 2025.

The Center appointed Richard C.K. van Oerle as the sole panelist in this matter on October 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 a corporation headquartered in the United States. The company specializes in maternity, baby and fertility products. The Complainant has a global reach, with its leading products being sold and distributed in over 50 countries worldwide and in over 40,000 stores throughout the United States. The FRIDA MOM brand is the Complainant's pregnancy, postpartum and breast care relief line.

The Complainant holds numerous trademarks registrations on a worldwide basis, inter alia:

- International Trademark Registration for FRIDA MOM, registration No. 1570689, registered August 26, 2020, designating the United Kingdom;
- United States Trademark Registration for FRIDA MOM, registration No. 6229086, registered December 22, 2020; and
- International Trademark Registration for FRIDA, registration No. 1591897, designating, alongside other countries, Ukraine, where the Respondent is reportedly located, registered on December 17, 2020.

All registrations have been duly renewed and are still valid and will hereafter together referred to in singular as the "Trademark".

The Complainant communicates online through various domain names, such as the domain name <frida.com>, which the Complainant gained control of since August 2019.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 15, 2024. It resolves to a website that displays the Complainant's official logo and products, purportedly offers information about the Complainant's products and displays the Complainant's contact information.

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 is confusingly similar to the Trademark in which the Complainant has rights. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's Trademark in its entirety. The addition of the term "the" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The Top-Level Domain ("TLD") ".com" is disregarded under the first element of the Policy.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and is not authorized by the Complainant to use its Trademark nor is it affiliated with the Complainant. The Respondent is not identified in the Whois database by the disputed domain name. Furthermore, at the time of filing of the Complaint, the Respondent was using a privacy Whois service, which also equates to a lack of legitimate interest. Hence, the Respondent was not commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not making a bona fide offering of goods or services or legitimate noncommercial fair use of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant asserts that it owns trademark rights in the well-known FRIDA MOM Trademark, registered in multiple jurisdictions and used extensively since 2014, well before the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name on November 15, 2024.

According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name incorporates its Trademark in its entirety, differing only by the addition of the article "the.". This, it argues, makes the disputed domain name confusingly similar to its Trademark and its primary domain name, <frida.com>. The Complainant contends that this demonstrates the Respondent's awareness of its brand and deliberate targeting of it.

The Complainant further claims that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to host a website that copies its official logo, design, and contact details, and provides information about its products, thereby creating a false impression of association and misleading consumers for commercial gain.

The Complainant argues that such use is intended to attract Internet users by exploiting a likelihood confusion with its Trademark, amounting to bad faith registration and use under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Additionally, the Complainant alleges that the Respondent's conduct disrupts its business by offering its goods or services without authorization, and that no plausible good-faith reason exists for the registration of a domain name so similar to its mark.

The Complainant also points to evidence of active MX records associated with the disputed domain name, suggesting potential use for fraudulent email communications, which it submits further supports an inference of bad faith.

The Complainant adds that the Respondent has a history of adverse UDRP decisions, indicating a pattern of cybersquatting, and that the Respondent's use of a privacy service to conceal its identity strengthens the conclusion that the domain name was registered and used in bad faith.

On the totality of the evidence, the Complainant contends that it is more likely than not that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name with knowledge of and intent to target the Complainant's Trademark.

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

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Preliminary Matters

The Panel notes that no communication has been received from the Respondent.

Since the Respondent's postal address is stated to be in Ukraine, which is subject to an international conflict at the date of this Decision that may impact case notification, it is appropriate for the Panel to consider, in accordance with its discretion under paragraph 10 of the Rules, whether the proceeding should continue (see *Wilshire Refrigeration & Appliance, Inc. v. Oleksandr Kliuiev, Henryslist.com*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-0962](#)). Having considered all the circumstances of the case, the Panel is of the view that it should. The Panel notes that the Center has used the Respondent's email address as registered with the Registrar for the purposes of notifying the Complaint. There is no evidence that the case notification email to this email address was not successfully delivered.

Further, the Respondent apparently registered the disputed domain name as recently as November 2024, and thus would appear to be capable of controlling the disputed domain name and the related content and, having apparently received notification of the Complaint by email, it would have been able to formulate and file a Response if it wished to do so.

It is moreover noted that, for the reasons which are set out later in this Decision, the Panel has no serious doubt (albeit in the absence of a Response) that the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name in bad faith and with the intention of unfairly targeting the Complainant's goodwill in its Trademark.

Lastly, the Complainant has selected as the mutual jurisdiction the courts at the location of the principal office of the concerned Registrar, such courts not being subject to an international conflict and thus the Panel finds that proceeding with this Decision does not preempt the Respondent from asserting its rights under paragraph 4(k) of the Policy to submit this dispute to the courts at the applicable mutual jurisdiction.

Accordingly, the Panel considers it is able to proceed to determine this Complaint and to draw inferences from the Respondent's failure to file any Response. While the Respondent's failure to file a Response does not automatically result in a decision in favor of the Complainant, the Panel may draw appropriate inferences from the Respondent's default (see, e.g., *Verner Panton Design v. Fontana di Luce Corp*, WIPO Case No. [D2012-1909](#)).

6.2. Substantive Elements of the Policy

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 Trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here "the" and/or "mom", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Trademark 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.

Among these factors demonstrating bad faith registration and use is the use of a domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to a website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website or location or of a product or service on the website or location.

In the present case, the Panel finds it inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant and its Trademark when it registered the disputed domain name:

- the Complainant's Trademark predates the registration of the disputed domain name by several years;
- the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's FRIDA MOM Trademark in its entirety with the only addition of the term "the"; and
- the website linked to the disputed domain name copies the Complainant's official logo, design, displays the Complainant's official contact details, and provides information about its products.

In the Panel's view, the circumstances of this case indicate that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's Trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

MX records have been set for the disputed domain name which may be used to enable the sending of emails arguably using an "@thefridamom.com" format potentially to mislead users into having them believe that these emails would originate from the Complainant likely for phishing or fraudulent purposes.

In addition, the Panel notes that the Respondent has already been found to have registered and used other domain names in bad faith in a previous UDRP case involving the same Parties. See *Fridababy LLC v. Vladimir Veselovskiy*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3224](#) and *Fridababy, LLC v. Vladimir Veselovskiy*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-0248](#). The disputed domain name in the last case was registered on the same day as the disputed domain name in these proceedings.

In the Panel's view, this indicates a pattern of trademark-abusive domain name registrations, which is further evidence of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.2.

By failing to respond to the Complaint, the Respondent did not take any initiative to contest the foregoing. Pursuant to paragraph 14 of the Rules, the Panel may draw the conclusions it considers appropriate.

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 <thefridamom.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Richard C.K. van Oerle/

Richard C.K. van Oerle

Sole Panelist

Date: October 24, 2025