

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Corner Rock B.V. v. asd vdfga
Case No. D2025-3828

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Corner Rock B.V., Netherlands (Kingdom of the), represented by NLO Shieldmark B. V., Netherlands (Kingdom of the).

The Respondent is asd vdfga, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <norahwinkels.com> is registered with Gname.com Pte. Ltd. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 19, 2025. On September 22, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 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 September 26, 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 30, 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 October 2, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 22, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 27, 2025.

The Center appointed William A. Van Caenegem as the sole panelist in this matter on October 30, 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, the company Corner Rock B.V. is a Dutch fashion retail brand established in 2014, specializing in women's clothing. The Complainant is headquartered in the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

The Complainant operates over 90 physical stores across the Netherlands and runs a webshop that serves both domestic and international customers.

The Complainant is the owner of, amongst others, the following trademark registrations for the word NORAH, European Union Trade Mark No. 013052055, registered on November 26, 2014 and duly renewed; and United Kingdom Trade Mark No. UK00913052055 registered on November 26, 2014 and duly renewed.

The Complainant's NORAH home page and webshop is located at "www.norah.eu" and <norah.eu> is used for all its corporate email addresses.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 9, 2024, and resolves to a website purportedly offering clothing at discount prices under the trademark NORAH.

The language of the registration agreement is English.

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 it goes without unnecessary explanation and argumentation that the disputed domain name is identical and confusingly similar to the trademark and tradename of the Complainant, considering the fact that "winkels" is translated as "shops" from the Dutch language and therefore descriptive.

Further, the Complainant says that the disputed domain name was registered on July 9, 2024, and consequently the Complainant contends that the Respondent does not have (prior) rights to the trademark or company name NORAH. Moreover, the Complainant says that the Respondent does not have a legitimate interest in respect of the disputed domain name, in relation to which the Complainant also refers to the risk of fraudulent use.

The Complainant also contends that the website at "www.norahwinkels.com" prompts consumers to initiate a purchasing process during which they are required to submit extensive personal and financial information, including their full name, residential address, telephone number, email address, and complete credit card details. The Complainant asserts that its financial institution has recognized this as a phishing website.

The Complainant then contends that these data collection practices, especially in the absence of a secure payment gateway or legitimate business credentials, strongly indicate that the website is operating with fraudulent intent, and thus in bad faith. Furthermore, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent uses photographs of the same models as those featured on the Complainant's website, albeit dressed in different clothing. The Complainant says that this deliberate replication of visual content further underscores the Respondent's intent to mislead consumers and impersonate the Complainant's legitimate business.

The Complainant contends that no other conclusion can be drawn than that the Respondent has copied the Complainant's website for fraudulent purposes and that therefore the disputed domain name is self-evidently registered and being used in bad faith, with the intent to deceive consumers and unlawfully collect personal and financial data. The Complainant points out that it sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent but without reaction.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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.

Although the addition of other terms, here, "winkel" (the Dutch term for "shop"), may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds 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 registered trademark of the Complainant, that being NORAH, is included in the disputed domain name in its entirety and is thus clearly recognizable within it.

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 Complainant has not authorized the use of its registered trademark NORAH in any way by the Respondent and the latter is not known by that term or by the disputed domain name. Since the Respondent did not reply to the complaint, there is no other evidence before the Panel that it has any prior rights to or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here claimed as phishing by way of the establishment of a impersonating website, 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 a domain name that includes the NORAH registered trademark for clothes at a time when that mark had already been registered and was used in the Kingdom of the Netherlands in relation to a clothing chain with some 70 shops in that country. A simple online or trademark search would have revealed the trademark rights of the Complainant in the mark NORAH in relation to clothing stores and the like.

In any case it is apparent from the inclusion of the term "winkel", Dutch for "shop" or "store", that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's activities in that field and its reputation in the NORAH mark, at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. The subsequent use of the disputed domain name, resolving as it did to an online clothing store mimicking the Complainant's online branding and even replicating its models, indicates that without doubt the Respondent deliberately registered a domain name incorporating a trademark to which it had no rights, with the intent of establishing a deceptive and fraudulent website. It appears on the balance of the evidence that the real aim of the Respondent was to engage in phishing, that is, the dishonest obtention of Internet users' personal data for the purpose of defrauding them.

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 <norahwinkels.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/William A. Van Caenegem/

William A. Van Caenegem

Sole Panelist

Date: November 12, 2025