

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Unityforce Global Pte. Ltd v. Alexi Booth  
Case No. D2025-4578

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Unityforce Global Pte. Ltd, Singapore, represented by FPS Rechtsanwalts-gesellschaft mbH & Co. KG, Germany.

The Respondent is Alexi Booth, United States of America.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <creame-deluxe.com> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on November 5, 2025. On November 6, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 7, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response, confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that the 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 10, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 30, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on December 1, 2025.

The Center appointed Pablo A. Palazzi as the sole panelist in this matter on December 9, 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 sells canisters of nitrous oxide intended for use in professional kitchens, in particular to make whipped cream, cocktails, etc.

The Complainant owns trademark registrations for the CREAM DELUXE mark.

The Complainant owns the European Union Trademark Registration No. 018578234 for CREAM DELUXE in Classes 1 and 6, registered on January 27, 2022, and the European Union Trademark Registration No. 018578228 for CREAM DELUXE (and design) in Classes 1 and 6, registered on January 29, 2022.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 25, 2023, and it is currently not active. However, according to the evidence provided in the Complaint, the website previously displayed the Complainant's design CREAM DELUXE mark and closely mimicked the look and feel of the Complainant's site, while offering "Cream Deluxe" products on this website according to the screenshots available in Annex 5.

#### **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.

##### **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.

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

The Panel finds the addition of the letter "e" and the hyphen does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy.

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 composition of the disputed domain name, comprising the Complainant’s CREAM DELUXE trademark in its entirety and the intentional addition of the letter “e” after the trademark element “cream” together with the content related to the Complainant’s products and imitating the look and feel of its website signals the Respondent’s intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant.

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.

The Respondent registered a domain name nearly identical to the Complainant’s trademark. The only difference is the addition of the letter “e” after the word “cream”. Moreover, the Respondent has populated the disputed domain name with content imitating the Complainant’s official website, which constitutes evidence of bad faith.

Therefore, the Panel concludes that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to attract Internet users, in accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent’s website.

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 <creame-deluxe.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Pablo A. Palazzi/*

**Pablo A. Palazzi**

Sole Panelist

Date: December 18, 2025.