

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

**Nana Wall Systems, Inc. v. Q Q, J Y**

**Case No. D2025-4678**

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Nana Wall Systems, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented internally.

The Respondents are Q Q and J Y, United States.

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

The disputed domain names <nanawallcustomerissues.com>, <nanawallnightmares.com>, <nanawallproductproblems.com> and <nanawallwoes.com> are registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 11, 2025. On November 12, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On November 12, 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 (unknown (privacy protected) and contact information in the Complaint).

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 24, 2025 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaints for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on November 24, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 December 5, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 25, 2025. The Response was filed with the Center on December 8, 2025.

The Center appointed W. Scott Blackmer as the sole panelist in this matter on January 5, 2026. 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 Complaint provides little information about the Complainant apart from its trademark registration. The Panel notes that the Complainant is a corporation established under the laws of the State of California, United States in 1989, according to the online database of the California Secretary of State<sup>1</sup>. The Panel notes further that the Complainant operates a website at “www.nanawall.com”, which describes the Complainant’s business, based in Corte Madera, California, as offering customizable “folding glass walls”.

The Complainant holds United States Trademark Registration Number 2862312 (registered on July 13, 2004) for the word mark NANAWALL in International Classes 6 and 19.

The disputed domain names were all registered with the same Registrar on the same date, July 3, 2023, within minutes of each other. The Respondent used a domain privacy service, but the Registrar provided the following details after the Complainant was filed in this proceeding:

Disputed domain name	Registrant	Postal Address	Contact email
<nanawallcustomerissues.com>	J Y	“SOMWHERE” [sic], Jackson, Michigan, United States	[xxx]@gmail.com
<nanawallnightmares.com>	J Y	“SOMEWHERE”, Jackson, Michigan, United States	[xxx]@gmail.com
<nanwallproductproblems.com>	J Y	“SOMEWHERE”, Jackson, Michigan, United States	[xxx]@gmail.com
<nanawallwoes.com>	Q Q	“SOMEWHERE”, Jackson, Michigan, United States	[xxx]@nanawallwoes.com

The registrants “Q Q” and “J Y” are clearly incomplete or pseudonymous, and no organization is listed for the registrants. Similarly, the postal addresses are incomplete and undeliverable, lacking a street address or postbox, and the contact telephone numbers provided (not shown above) are nonsensical. Nevertheless, the Center was able to contact the Respondent, who duly submitted a Response, as detailed below.

The disputed domain names all resolve to similar “gripe sites” criticizing the Complainant’s products and services. The Respondent’s websites are each headed with a title corresponding to the respective disputed domain name, such as “NanaWall Customer Issues”, and consist of an illustrated account of a consumer’s problems with the Complainant and a blog illustrated with photos. The text is similar on the respective websites, although the images differ and the text on the website associated with <nanawallwoes.com> more pointedly criticizes named employees of the Complainant. The home page on each of the Respondent’s websites includes this disclaimer located above or below a central image:

---

<sup>1</sup> Noting the general powers of a panel articulated in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, it is commonly accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record, as the Panel has done in these proceedings. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), section 4.8.

“Disclaimer: Not an official NanaWall website — just the only place where you can actually see what happened. All content reflects one homeowner’s firsthand experience with a certified NanaWall installation. It exists because my installation didn’t look like the brochures. They handle the advertising. I handle the truth. The opinions are mine; the photos, unfortunately, are also mine.”

The Respondent’s websites do not identify the website operator by name but characterize the website operator as a disappointed homeowner. The purpose of the Respondent’s websites is given as follows:

“Sharing my poor experience with NanaWall and their luxury \$80,000 Sliding glass panel. Discover the visual defects, wrong sizes, scratches, and the company’s lack of response. Don’t be gaslighted, join me in exposing their denial of workmanship and quality.”

The Respondent’s websites are linked to social media sites and invite visitors to enter an email address to subscribe to a newsletter.

The Respondent’s websites do not promote any competing goods or services and do not feature commercial pop-ups or banner advertisements.

A Response was filed by Joshua Yankelove (“J Y”), who identifies himself as a Michigan homeowner who purchased a custom NanaWall system in 2022-2023 that proved to be defective, and that the Complainant allegedly never fully repaired or replaced.

## **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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are all confusingly similar to its registered NANAWALL trademark. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in these disputed domain names, as it is not affiliated with the Complainant, is not commonly known by the names, is not using them for a commercial offering, and is using them only “to mislead and tarnish the Complainant’s reputation”, “for purposes of criticism or harm”.

The Complainant argues that combining its trademark in the disputed domain names with “negative and disparaging terms” demonstrates an “intent to harm the Complainant’s reputation and disrupt its business”, which “falls squarely within the examples of bad faith under paragraph 4(b) of the Policy”, including the pattern of registering multiple domain names targeting the Complainant.

### **B. Respondent**

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied all three of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name. The Respondent does not challenge the Complainant’s trademark rights but argues that the Respondent has a legitimate interest in using the disputed domain names for genuine criticism sites, citing the Policy, paragraph 4(c)(iii):

“The sites are noncommercial, clearly critical, and contain prominent disclaimers. Their purpose is not exploitation of Complainant’s trademark, but transparency regarding an unresolved defect that has remained unaddressed since 2022.”

The Respondent asserts further that he has never offered the disputed domain names for sale, displayed commercial advertising on the associated websites, or attempted to impersonate the Complainant. He argues that the UDRP was not designed for censorship of consumer experience, which seems to be the

Complainant's aim. In the interest of transparency, the Respondent discloses that he also operates another, similar criticism site at "www.nanawalltroubles.com", which is not included in this proceeding.

## **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.

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. Here, the Respondent does not dispute this characterization and does not object to consolidation. 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.

#### **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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark, the registered NANAWALL word mark, for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1. This mark is incorporated in its entirety within each of 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, "customerissues", "nightmares", "productproblems", and "woes") 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 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. The Respondent relies on one of these, paragraph 4(c)(iii), a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names for genuine criticism sites of the Complainant's products and services, as described in [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.6.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has made legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names. The Panel refers to factors helpfully outlined in *Everytown for Gun Safety Action Fund, Inc. v. Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 1249561463 / Steve Coffman*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-0473](#) ("Momsdemand") to assess legitimate fair use of disputed domain names incorporated trademarks:

- the genuineness and nature of the criticism or commentary (which in this case is evident throughout the Respondent's websites);
- the possible pretextual nature of the Respondent's site (which is not evident in this case);

- the commercial or non commercial aspects of the Respondent's website (wholly non commercial here);
- the nature of the domain name itself (here, none of them consist solely of the trademark and all suggest issues or problems with the Complainant's products or services more than they suggest an affiliation with the Complainant);
- the use of disclaimers (here, these are unambiguous and appear on the first screen of the home page in each instance);
- other factors that suggest abuse as opposed to bona fide criticism or commentary (not apparent here).

On this record, the Panel finds that the Respondent's websites are genuine criticism sites associated with disputed domain names that, by their nature, suggest criticism. This accords with the example of legitimate fair use in the Policy, paragraph 4(c)(iii). <sup>2</sup>

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has not been established.

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

Given the Panel's finding on the second element of the Complaint, it follows that the Complainant cannot prevail on the third element, bad faith. The Complainant cannot establish bad faith by arguing, as it does, that it is improper for the Respondent simply to register and use domain names associating negative terms with the Complainant's mark and using them to "divert" Internet users to criticism sites. The Policy recognizes a legitimate interest in non commercial fair use for genuine criticism, as discussed in the preceding section. This does not constitute bad faith under the Policy. As detailed above, the record does not suggest that the Respondent's criticism sites are pretextual or that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain names to exploit the Complainant's mark.

The evidence in the case file as presented does not indicate that the Respondent's aim in registering the disputed domain name was to profit from or exploit the Complainant's trademark.

The Panel finds the third element of the Policy has not been established.

## **7. Decision**

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

*/W. Scott Blackmer/*  
**W. Scott Blackmer**  
Sole Panelist  
Date: January 19, 2026

---

<sup>2</sup> The Complainant suggests that the Respondent's sites are not within the Policy, paragraph 4(c)(iii) because they "tarnish" the Complainant's reputation and damage its business. But that view of tarnishment would effectively preclude any referential use of a trademark for a legitimate criticism site. Decisions under the UDRP (and the United States trademark law) do not treat genuine criticism as actionable "tarnishment" of a mark. See, e.g., Phantom Fireworks Showrooms, LLC / Phantom I.P., LLC v. Frank Elliott / Jurassic Fireworks, Seasonal Sales Inc., WIPO Case No. [D2021-4104](#); Concierge Auctions LLC v. Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC / Wesley Donehue, Donehue Direct, WIPO Case No. [D2020-1020](#).