

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Adanola Limited v. Name Redacted and Schulze Sabine, Sabine Schulze
Case No. D2025-3641

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Adanola Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Demys Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondents are Name Redacted¹, and Schulze Sabine, Sabine Schulze, Germany.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <adanolaau.com> (the “first disputed domain name”) and <adanola-deutschland.com> (the “second disputed domain name”) are registered with CNOBIN Information Technology Limited (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 9, 2025. On September 17, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On September 17, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 17, 2025, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file a separate complaint for the disputed domain name associated with the different underlying registrant 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 17, 2025.

¹ The name and/or contact details of a third party appears to have been used when registering the disputed domain name <adanolaau.com>. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted the Respondent's name of the disputed domain name <adanolaau.com> from this decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this Decision an instruction to the Registrar regarding transfer of this disputed domain name, which includes the name of the Respondent. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in this proceeding and has indicated that Annex 1 to this Decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST 12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1788](#).

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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 23, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 13, 2025. On October 7, 2025, the Center received an email from a third party, stating that it was not and had never been the registrant, owner, or administrator of the disputed domain names and did not control them. The Center confirmed to the Parties of the commencement of the panel appointment process on October 17, 2025.

The Center appointed Christiane Féral-Schuhl as the sole panelist in this matter on October 23, 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 company incorporated in England and Wales, founded in 2015. Its business concerns the design, manufacture and sale of clothing, footwear and accessories.

The Complainant owns several registered trademarks incorporating the term “Adanola” (the “ADANOLA Trademarks”) including the following trademarks:

- the United Kingdom word trademark ADANOLA No. UK00003152822, registered on May 27, 2016, for goods in class 25;
- the European Union word trademark ADANOLA No. 018310759, registered on February 24, 2021, for goods and services in classes 18, 25, and 35; and
- the International word trademark ADANOLA No. 1823867, registered on July 31, 2024, for goods and services in classes 3, 9, 14, 18, 24, 25, 26, and 35.

The Complainant is also the owner of a domain name incorporating the ADANOLA Trademarks, such as <adanola.com>, and operates and maintains official social media accounts, notably on Instagram and TikTok, under the ADANOLA Trademarks.

The second disputed domain name was registered on September 15, 2024, and the first disputed domain name was registered on October 6, 2024.

The disputed domain names either currently resolves to (regarding the first disputed domain name) or previously resolved to (regarding the second disputed domain name) very similar websites which appear to display the ADANOLA Trademarks and purportedly offer the Complainant’s products for sale. However, since around August 2025, the second disputed domain name’s website configuration has been modified and now displays an inactive “503 Service Unavailable” site.

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 names.

First, the Complainant submits that the two disputed domain names are under common control since inter alia (i) they were registered through the same Registrar, (ii) they either currently resolve to (regarding the first disputed domain name) or used to resolve to (regarding the second disputed domain name) similar websites which appear to offer the Complainant's products and use the Complainant's branding, with a highly similar website structure and design, (iii) they were registered only 22 days apart, (iv) email addresses for both disputed domain names, revealed by the Registrar, follow a similar pattern of random letters hosted with the same email provider, and (v) both disputed domain names are configured with the same nameserver (NS) records and with A-records owned by the same entity.

Then, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the ADANOLA Trademarks in which it has rights. The Complainant submits that the ADANOLA Trademarks predate the registration of the disputed domain names. The Complainant notes that the disputed domain names incorporate the ADANOLA Trademarks in their entirety and only differ by the addition of the geographical terms "au" (for "Australia") and "deutschland" (for the "Germany" in German) respectively. The Complainant considers that the ADANOLA Trademarks are the most dominant and distinctive element of each disputed domain name, combined with geographical designations, which do not dispel confusing similarity.

Secondly, the Complainant stands that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. The Complainant explains that there is no evidence that the Respondents have been commonly known as "Adanola", "Adanola au" or "Adanola-deutschland" prior or after the registration of the disputed domain names. The Complainant also submits that the Respondents are not licensees of the Complainant and have not received any permission or consent from the Complainant to use the ADANOLA Trademarks. The Complainant contends that given that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the ADANOLA Trademarks, there is no conceivable use to which the disputed domain names would confer any legitimate interest upon the Respondents. The Complainant adds that the Respondents are not making legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names, considering the risk of implied affiliation. The Complainant highlights that the Respondents are not part of the Complainant's distribution network and as such the Complainant's goods offer for sale on the Respondent's websites associated with the disputed domain names are likely to be either counterfeit, parallel import, or grey market goods. The Complainant also notes that the disputed domain names are not used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, as the Respondents' websites associated with the disputed domain names are/were impersonating the Complainant's website and do not display any disclaimer regarding the relationship between the Respondents and the Complainant. The Complainant then asserts that the second disputed domain name currently does not resolve to an active website and as such, is not used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Finally, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. The Complainant avers that the Respondents have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to their websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the ADANOLA Trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of their websites. The Complainant submits that the Respondents registered the disputed domain names with prior knowledge of the ADANOLA Trademarks and that the Respondents' purpose was to interfere with the Complainant's business, as the Respondents' websites offer products purportedly produced by or, at least, appearing to be endorsed by the Complainant. For completeness, the Complainant also asserts that passive holding of the second disputed domain name also constitutes a use in bad faith.

B. Respondents

None of the Respondents formally replied to the Complainant's contentions. On October 7, 2025, the Center received a communication from a third party stating that it has no connection with the disputed domain names and implying its identity was stolen.

6. Discussion and Findings

Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the 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 Respondents 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 inter alia that both disputed domain names:

- are construed in an identical way and began with the ADANOLA Trademarks followed by a geographical indication and end with the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com";
- are registered through the same Registrar;
- either currently resolve to (regarding the first disputed domain name) or used to resolve to (regarding the second disputed domain name) very similar websites which appear to offer the Complainant's products and use the Complainant's branding, with a highly similar website structure and design; and
- were registered by the Respondents using the email addresses that follow a similar pattern of random letters hosted with the same email provider.

The Respondents also had the opportunity to respond to the Complaint but did not do so nor did any Respondent deny any affiliation with the other.

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 below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

Substantive Issues

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 names. [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 Panel finds the ADANOLA Trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are 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 “au” for Australia or “-deutschland” for Germany, 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 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 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.

Indeed, it appears that the Respondent is not affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant in any way.

Moreover, it appears from the past and actual use of the disputed domain names that the Respondent is not using or has not prepared to use the disputed domain name with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor is the Respondent making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names without intent for commercial gain.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here claimed as applicable to this case: sale of possible counterfeit goods and impersonation/passing off the Complainant 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 Respondent has registered the disputed domain names well after the registration of the ADANOLA Trademarks. The Panel finds that the Respondent must have had the Complainant in mind when registering the disputed domain names since the first disputed domain name currently resolves to and the second disputed domain name used to resolve to very similar websites which appear to offer for sale the Complainant's products and use the Complainant's branding.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

Although the second disputed domain name is no longer active, panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademarks, the composition of the second disputed domain name, and the previous use of the second disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the current passive holding of the second disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here claimed sale of possible counterfeit goods and impersonation of the Complainant's website constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes 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 names <adanolaau.com> and <adanola-deutschland.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Christiane Féral-Schuhl/

Christiane Féral-Schuhl

Sole Panelist

Date: November 6, 2025