

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Adanola Limited v. Zhenhe Qiu and zheng zhou
Case No. D2025-3640

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Adanola Limited, United Kingdom (or “UK”), represented by Demys Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondents are Zhenhe Qiu and zheng zhou, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain names <adanola-be.com>, <adanola-cz.com>, <adanola-es.com> and <adanola-fr.net> are registered with Cosmotown, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 9, 2025. On September 9, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On September 12, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (“Private Whois”) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 16, 2025 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants disclosed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all disputed domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on September 16, 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 22, 2025. In accordance with the Rules,

paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 12, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 14, 2025.

The Center appointed Vincent Denoyelle as the sole panelist in this matter on October 17, 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 UK headquartered company in the business of designing, manufacturing and selling clothing, footwear and accessories.

The Complainant owns several ADANOLA trade marks including the following:

- United Kingdom Trade Mark ADANOLA Registration number UK00003152822 registered on May 27, 2016; and
- European Union Trade Mark ADANOLA Registration number 018310759 registered on February 24, 2021.

The disputed domain names were registered on the following dates:

<adanola-be.com>	October 9, 2024
<adanola-cz.com>	September 19, 2024
<adanola-es.com>	September 30, 2024
<adanola-fr.net>	September 27, 2024

The disputed domain name <adanola-be.com> does not resolve to any website and the three other disputed domain names trigger a phishing website warning ("Suspected Phishing - This website has been reported for potential phishing. Phishing is when a site attempts to steal sensitive information by falsely presenting as a safe source").

All four disputed domain names have directed to websites highly similar to the Complainant's official website which gave the impression that they were local versions of the Complainant's e-commerce website for France, the Czech Republic, Spain and Belgium.

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 contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the registered ADANOLA trade mark in which the Complainant has rights in terms of the Policy.

The Complainant asserts that it has not found any evidence of any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names on the part of the Respondent. The Complainant points to the current or past use of the disputed domain names to essentially impersonate the Complainant, to conclude that no such misleading and confusing use could relate to a genuine, bona fide offering of goods and services and such use could not grant the Respondent a legitimate interest in the disputed domain names. The Complainant also highlights

the potential phishing activities carried out via some of the disputed domain names as further evidence of the absence of rights or legitimate interests on the part of the Respondent.

Turning to bad faith, the Complainant submits that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names with prior knowledge of the Complainant's ADANOLA mark and that the Respondent's purpose was to interfere with the Complainant's business. By diverting Internet users away from the Complainant's official website to its own site for commercial gain, the Complainant considers that the Respondent has disrupted the Complainant's business.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different disputed domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the disputed domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that:

- The disputed domain names are structured in an identical fashion, with the exact ADANOLA trade mark reproduced at the start of the respective disputed domain names, then a hyphen and a country code "be", "cz", "es" and "fr" respectively;
- The disputed domain names were registered through the same Registrar; and
- The disputed domain names all pointed to highly similar websites.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to herein as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the ADANOLA trade mark is reproduced within each of the four disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the ADANOLA trade mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, the country codes “cz”, “be”, “fr”, “es” respectively, 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 names and the ADANOLA trade 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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel finds that all four disputed domain names have been registered and used to mislead unsuspecting Internet users into thinking that the associated websites are owned by, affiliated with or endorsed by the Complainant. The Panel also notes that at least three of the disputed domain names trigger phishing website warnings.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, potential phishing and impersonation/passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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, the Panel notes that the disputed domain names reproduce the ADANOLA trade mark of the Complainant and this cannot be a coincidence given the overall circumstances of the present case including: (i) the reputation and online visibility of the ADANOLA trade mark and its close association with the Complainant, as shown by the Google search results provided by the Complainant, (ii) the fact that the ADANOLA trade mark corresponds to a fanciful term and (iii) the fact that the disputed domain names were

registered relatively recently and several years after the registration of the ADANOLA trade mark. Thus, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names were registered in bad faith.

As for the use of the disputed domain names in bad faith, the Panel considers that the disputed domain names are used in bad faith.

Here the Panel considers that the Respondent has unequivocally sought to create confusion with the Complainant, through the disputed domain names themselves and through the websites associated therewith as they all mimicked the Complainant's official website, without any type of disclaimer.

The fact that at least three of the disputed domain names trigger phishing website warnings can only reinforce the Panel's finding that the disputed domain names are used in bad faith.

In the present case, the disputed domain names are used to attract Internet users by taking unfair advantage of and creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's ADANOLA trade mark.

Additionally, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, potential phishing and fraudulent impersonation of the Complainant, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

Finally, given the overall circumstances, the fact that the Respondent chose not to respond to the Complaint and therefore not to come forward with an explanation as to why and how it decided to register and use the disputed domain names, is very telling and reinforces the Panel's finding of bad faith on the part of the Respondent.

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 names: <adanola-be.com>, <adanola-cz.com>, <adanola-es.com> and <adanola-fr.net> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Vincent Denoyelle/

Vincent Denoyelle

Sole Panelist

Date: October 31, 2025