

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Rivingtonroirebis, LLC v. Orangzaib Abbas, fasion
Case No. D2025-4470

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Rivingtonroirebis, LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Foster Garvey PC, United States.

The Respondent is Orangzaib Abbas, fasion, Pakistan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <rrr123official.com> is registered with CloudFlare, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on October 30, 2025. On October 30, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 31, 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, Cloudflare, Inc.") and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 3, 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 November 8, 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 November 17, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 7, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on December 9, 2025.

The Center appointed Iris Quadrio as the sole panelist in this matter on December 19, 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, RIVINGTONROI REBIS, LLC, is a United States company and the owner of the luxury streetwear brand RIVINGTON ROI REBIS, also known as RRR123. The Complainant operates in the fashion and apparel sector, designing, producing, and marketing high-end streetwear clothing characterized by oversized silhouettes, bold graphic elements, and handcrafted finishes. Since at least 2016, the Complainant has continuously used the RRR123 mark in commerce and has invested substantial resources in the promotion, marketing, and development of its brand, achieving widespread recognition and a dedicated consumer following in the highly competitive streetwear market.

The Complainant presents and promotes its brand primarily through its official website at <rrr-123.com>, which was registered on June 29, 2019. This website serves as the Complainant's principal online platform, showcasing its creative vision, exclusive apparel collections, and limited-edition designs, and also operates as an e-commerce platform through which consumers may purchase authentic RRR123 products. The Complainant further distributes its products through authorized distributors under agreements that allow the Complainant to exercise quality control and quality assurance over the goods bearing its trademarks.

Moreover, the Complainant is the owner of the following trademarks, among others: (i) United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO): RIVINGTON ROI REBIS, Reg. No. 7540254, registered since October 22, 2024, in class 25; RRR123, Reg. No. 7431334, registered since July 2, 2024, in class 25; RRR, Reg. No. 7644909, registered since January 7, 2025, in class 25; International Registration: RIVINGTON ROI REBIS, Reg. No. 1694666, registered since October 11, 2022, in class 25; RRR123, Reg. No. 1668241, registered since May 25, 2022, in class 25; 123, Reg. No. 1667927, registered since May 25, 2022, in class 25.

Accordingly, the Complainant is the owner of several trademark registrations for the marks RIVINGTON ROI REBIS, RRR123, and 123 in multiple jurisdictions, including China, the European Union, and the United Kingdom.

These registrations predate the registration of the disputed domain name and establish the Complainant's exclusive rights in the RRR123 and RIVINGTON ROI REBIS marks in connection with clothing and related goods.

The disputed domain name <rrr123official.com> was registered on February 18, 2025, well after the Complainant had established rights in its trademarks and had been using the RRR123 mark extensively in commerce. According to the Complainant's annexes, at the time relevant to the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to an active website that prominently used the Complainant's RRR123 trademark in a source-identifying manner, including within the website content, product descriptions, and contact email address, and purported to offer RRR123-branded clothing and related goods at a discount while presenting itself as an "official" source, despite the absence of any authorization from the Complainant.

The record further indicates that the use of the disputed domain name has since changed. At present, the website appears to offer clothing under the name "Raspberry Hills" and no longer displays RRR123- or RIVINGTON ROI REBIS-branded products. Nevertheless, publicly available, non-official online searches and archived materials indicate that the disputed domain name was previously used in the manner described by the Complainant.

The Complainant has confirmed that it has no affiliation, business relationship, or contractual connection with the Respondent, and has never licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the RRR123 or RIVINGTON ROI REBIS trademarks, to register a domain name incorporating those marks, or to sell any goods under them.

Lastly, the Respondent is identified as "Orangzaib Abbas, fasion", located in Pakistan, based on the Registrar disclosed information. No evidence has been submitted by the Respondent to demonstrate any business activities, trademark rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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 <rrr123official.com> is confusingly similar to its RRR123 trademark, for which the Complainant has prior rights.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name <rrr123official.com>, and that the Respondent is not related to the Complainant in any way. The Complainant has not authorized or licensed the Respondent to use its RRR123 trademark or to register any domain name incorporating that mark.

Moreover, the Complainant sustains that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, as it incorporates the Complainant's trademark in its entirety together with the term "official", and has been used to mislead Internet users into believing that the associated website is an official or authorized source of RRR123-branded products, thereby seeking to take unfair advantage of the Complainant's reputation.

Finally, the Complainant requests that the Administrative Panel appointed in this administrative proceeding order the transfer of the disputed domain name <rrr123official.com> to the Complainant

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, for this Complaint to succeed in relation to the disputed domain name, the Complainant must prove each of the following, namely that:

- 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 was registered and is being used 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 mark 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. Disregarding the Top-Level Domain “.com”, in accordance with section 1.11.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), the disputed domain name differs from the Complainant’s registered trademark RRR123 only by the addition of the descriptive term “official”.

It is well established in prior UDRP decisions that the mere addition of a descriptive or non-distinctive term to a complainant’s mark does not avoid a finding of confusing similarity. Although the addition of other terms (here, the descriptive term “official”) may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that 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 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 stated that it has not authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to register or use the disputed domain name <rrr123official.com> or to use any of the Complainant’s trademarks RIVINGTON ROI REBIS, RRR123, or RRR in any manner. There is no evidence in the record suggesting that the Respondent has, or could have, any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Moreover, the Complainant holds prior rights in its trademarks, which have been registered and extensively used in commerce for several years before the Respondent registered the disputed domain name.

In addition, the Respondent is not identified as “RRR123” or any similar designation, but as “Orangzaib Abbas, fasion”. This discrepancy reinforces that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. Consistent with prior UDRP decisions, panels have held that a respondent is less likely to be considered “commonly known” by a domain name where the registrant information does not correspond to the disputed domain name.

The Panel further considers that the composition of the disputed domain name carries a clear risk of implied affiliation. In the present case, the disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant’s trademark RRR123 in its entirety, with the mere addition of the descriptive term “official”. Such addition does not confer any

distinctiveness; on the contrary, it reinforces the misleading impression that the disputed domain name is operated, authorized, or endorsed by the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

Likewise, it does not appear that the Respondent has made, or is making, any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The record shows that the disputed domain name has been used to advertise and sell clothing and related goods under the RRR123 mark, using the Complainant's trademark and copyrighted images without authorization and falsely presenting the website as an official source. Panels have consistently held that such impersonation can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 2.13.1 and 2.13.2.

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 this regard, the Complainant has submitted evidence demonstrating that its RRR123 trademark is well known in connection with luxury streetwear and has been registered and used extensively in commerce well before the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name <rrr123official.com> was registered on February 18, 2025, long after the Complainant had established trademark rights and goodwill in the RRR123 mark.

By registering the disputed domain name, the Respondent has clearly targeted the Complainant's trademark by reproducing it in its entirety and adding only the generic and descriptive term "official". Such addition does not dispel confusion; rather, it reinforces the false impression that the disputed domain name is operated, authorized, or endorsed by the Complainant. Prior UDRP panels have consistently held that the use of terms such as "official" in combination with a complainant's trademark carries a strong risk of implied affiliation and constitutes evidence of opportunistic bad faith.

Furthermore, the record shows that the disputed domain name has been used to host a website prominently displaying the RRR123 trademark in a source-identifying manner, offering the Complainant's clothing and related goods, or counterfeits, at a discount, purporting to be official RRR123 products, and using the Complainant's copyrighted images without authorization. Such conduct demonstrates that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and the products offered.

The Panel further notes that the use of the term "official" in the disputed domain name aggravates the likelihood of confusion and was plainly intended to mislead Internet users into believing that the Respondent's website is an official or authorized online store of the Complainant. This false suggestion of endorsement or affiliation constitutes a classic example of bad faith, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Even to the extent that the content of the website associated with the disputed domain name may have changed over time, the overall circumstances of this case, including the composition of the disputed domain name, the prior use of the website to sell unauthorized goods under the RRR123 mark, and the absence of any disclaimer or authorization, confirm that the Respondent has sought to take unfair advantage of the Complainant's reputation and goodwill.

Considering the above, the Panel finds that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith, with the intent to exploit the Complainant's trademark, disrupt the Complainant's business, and mislead Internet users for commercial gain.

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 <rrr123official.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Iris Quadrio/

Iris Quadrio

Sole Panelist

Date: January 2, 2026