

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

SEEELECT, INC. v. Gilad Tisona, Helfy

Case No. D2025-4173

1. The Parties

The Complainant is SEEELECT, INC., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Mosaic Legal Group, PLLC, United States.

The Respondent is Gilad Tisona, Helfy, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <reboost.com> (the "Disputed Domain Name") is registered with Amazon Registrar, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on October 11, 2025. On October 13, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On October 13, 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 (Sky Marketing Limited) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 15, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and requesting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on October 17, 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 24, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 13, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on November 14, 2025.

The Center appointed Gabriela Kennedy as the sole panelist in this matter on November 24, 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.

On December 16, 2025, the Panel issued a Procedural Order No. 1 inviting the Parties to, by December 21, 2025, comment on public information found by the Panel. On December 19, 2025, the Complainant sent an email to the Center providing its comments. The Respondent did not submit any response.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is based in the United States and offers powdered isotonic sports drinks under the brand REBOOST.

The Complainant owns the United States Trademark Registration No. 3655677 for REBOOST in Class 32, registered on July 14, 2009 (the "Complainant's Trademark").

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on October 5, 2005, a few years before the Complainant registered the Complainant's Trademark. At the time of the filing of the Complaint and the rendering of this Decision, the Disputed Domain Name resolved to a website offering for sale health-supplement gummies (the "Respondent's Website").

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:

- (a) The Disputed Domain Name is identical to the Complainant's Trademark. The Complainant has used the Complainant's Trademark in commerce in the United States since as early as June 2, 2008 in connection with powdered isotonic sports drinks and the Complainant maintains rights in the Complainant's Trademark.
- (b) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. The Internet Archive Wayback Machine records show no use of the Disputed Domain Name prior to December 5, 2024. Before this date, there was no evidence of the Respondent's use of, or demonstrable preparations to the use of the Disputed Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Respondent is not known or commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name. The Respondent has never acquired any trademark or service mark rights in the Disputed Domain Name despite its use of the trademark registration symbol on the Respondent's Website. Moreover, the Respondent's Website does not actually allow users to purchase any products. When the Complainant attempted to purchase products from the Respondent's Website, the Respondent's Website displayed the message "Checkout is disabled on this site". The relationship between the Respondent in this case and the registrant of the European Union Trade Mark RE BOOST should be explained in detail by the Respondent, as any such potential relationship cannot be verified or confirmed by any other third party.
- (c) The Respondent has registered the Disputed Domain Name and is using it in bad faith. Given the Respondent's use of the Complainant's Trademark on its Website, along with images of gummies and the words "Wellness-Essentials", it appears that the Respondent is intentionally trying to trick customers into thinking that the Complainant is behind the Disputed Domain Name. The Respondent uses the trademark registration symbol "®" in connection with the Complainant's Trademark on the Respondent's Website

thereby misleading consumers into thinking that either it is the lawful owner of the Complainant's Trademark or that it is actually the Complainant. The Respondent's Website does not actually allow users to purchase products and instead displays the message "Checkout is disabled on this site." The Respondent is using the Disputed Domain Name to pass itself off as the Complainant and is damaging the goodwill of the Complainant's business by not legitimately offering a commercial product.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove each of the following three elements:

- (i) the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and is being used by the Respondent 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 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 Complainant's Trademark is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark 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 / Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Under the general powers of a panel articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the UDRP Rules, a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record if it would consider such information useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.8.

In the present case, the Panel searched "Gilad Tisona, Helfy" on an Internet search engine and the first results returned information about Helfy Ltd., a company with which the Respondent is associated. Helfy's website at <helfy.co> identifies the Respondent, Gilad Tisona as its CEO. A further search with the European Union Intellectual Property Office revealed one trademark registered by Helfy Ltd., European Union Trade Mark No. 018651325 for  registered on June 15, 2022 in Classes 3, 5, 38, and 44.

The Panel notes the Complainant's response to Procedural Order No. 1 that, inter alia, the above information does not alter the Complainant's position in this proceeding, the information should be disregarded absent Respondent's explanation, and the long use by Complainant of its trademark and limited functionality of the disputed domain name website suggest nefarious activity by the Respondent. While the Respondent has not

clarified some open questions raised by this information, this does not necessarily mean that this information should be disregarded or that the Complainant should prevail on the limited record of the present proceeding. The burden of proof under all three elements of 4(a) of the Policy remains on the Complainant, regardless of the Respondent's default.

Moreover, the Panel notes that the Respondent's Website uses a different color scheme and logo visually distinct from the color scheme and logo used on the Complainant's website to offer vitamin gummies, whereas the Complainant appears to offer sports hydration powders – this is not a case of clear impersonation.

In view of the above, the Panel notes that this case exceeds the relatively limited “cybersquatting” scope of the UDRP, and would be more appropriately addressed by a court of competent jurisdiction (see section 4.14.6 of [WIPO Overview 3.0](#)). Past UDRP panels, their governing instruments, and legislative background, are all clear that the Policy was designed to prevent extortionate or abusive behavior also known as “cybersquatting” and cannot be used to litigate all disputes involving domain names. See *Philippe Dagenais designer inc. / Philippe Dagenais v. Groupe Dagenais MDC inc. (formerly Philippe Dagenais Mobilier Décoration Conseils Inc.) / Mobilier Philippe Dagenais*, WIPO Case No. [D2012-0336](#); *Bugatti International S.A. v. Jacques Pensini, Point Office / Philippe Schriqui*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-2805](#); *Les Editions Jalou v. Sidharth Saigal and Chalk Media FZE*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-1430](#); and *Anniversary University, LLC v. The History Factory*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-2180](#). A panel may decide that the administrative proceeding is not an appropriate forum to evaluate certain contentions of the parties, while it has not been provided with the full set of facts (or authority) necessary to make that determination. See *Pinnacle Intellectual Property v. World Wide Exports*, WIPO Case No. [D2005-1211](#).

The Panel is not in a position to make findings on the factual and legal questions discussed above, which would require a far more complete evidentiary record than what has been provided by the Complainant.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Gabriela Kennedy/

Gabriela Kennedy

Sole Panelist

Date: December 26, 2025