

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Koninklijke Douwe Egberts B.V. v. zhang zhang, Hong Kong, China
Case No. D2025-4679

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Koninklijke Douwe Egberts B.V., Netherlands (Kingdom of the), represented by Ploum, Netherlands (Kingdom of the).

The Respondent is zhang zhang, Hong Kong China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <jdecoffee.shop> and <jdecoffeestore.shop> are registered with Spaceship, Inc. (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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 13, 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 14, 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 21, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 11, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on December 15, 2025.

The Center appointed Ada L. Redondo Aguilera as the sole panelist in this matter on December 16, 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 is Koninklijke Douwe Egberts B.V. that is part of Jacobs Douwe Egberts.

Jacobs Douwe Egberts was formed in 2015 by merging D.E. Master Blenders, founded in 1753, and the coffee division of Mondelez International. Jacobs Douwe Egberts in turn, is part of JDE Peet's, the largest pure play coffee and tea company, headquartered in the Netherlands. The group's coffee and tea portfolio is available in over 100 countries around the world and is sold in Europe and North America.

Jacobs Douwe Egberts is abbreviated to JDE. The JDE trademark is used as an umbrella trademark in relation to the Complainant's coffee and tea portfolio. This portfolio consists of many worldwide well-known household names, including (without limitation) Jacobs, Tassimo, Moccona, Senseo, L'OR, Douwe Egberts, TiÓra, Super, Kenco, Pilao & Gevalia. All product packages of these household names include both the household trademark and the JDE trademark.

Koninklijke Douwe Egberts B.V. owns and operates websites at numerous domain names incorporating the JDE and the JACOBS DOUWE EGBERTS brand, e.g. <jdecoffee.com> and <jacobsdouweegberts.com>.

For many years, Koninklijke Douwe Egberts B.V. has been the owner of a large and significant number of trademark registrations worldwide, including several European countries, consisting of or including the element JDE.

The Complainant is the owner numerous trademark registrations, including:

- International trademark JDE, registration number 1248744, registered on April 16, 2015; and
- United Kingdom trademark JDE, registration number UK00801248744, registered on March 30, 2016.

This dispute concerns the domain names are <jdecoffee. shop> registered in: October 30, 2025, and <jdecoffeestore.shop> with registration date November 2, 2025, both disputed domain names are inactive and have been activated as of MX (mail eXchange) records

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 confusingly similar to the Complainant's JDE trademark, notwithstanding the inclusion of the additional terms · "coffee" and "store". It is asserted that the addition of the terms "coffee" and "store" is insufficient to render the disputed domain names distinct from the JDE trademarks, since the descriptive terms relates to stores and coffee which are products and services offered by the Complainant.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests regarding the disputed domain names. According to the Complainant, the Respondent has not made legitimate or fair use of the disputed domain names. The Complainant further alleged that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain names in bad faith. The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain names to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

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 names. 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 trademarks or service marks 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 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.

The disputed domain names reproduce the Complainant's JDE trademark in its entirety. The addition of the descriptive terms "coffee" and "store" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The Panel notes that , the term "coffee" directly corresponds to the Complainant's core business. The Panel determines that the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the trademarks in accordance with the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Furthermore, the Panel finds that the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") in the present case, ". shop", may typically be disregarded when assessing whether a domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark, as it is a technical requirement of registration. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1

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 that the Complainant has established a prima facie case indicating that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainants' prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel notes that while the overall burden of proof rests with the Complainant, a Complainant is only required to make out a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant, has not been authorized to use the Complainant's trademarks, and there is no evidence of any bona fide offering of goods or services.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that, for 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 Complainant's JDE trademarks predate the registration of the disputed domain names. Given the mark's distinctiveness and reputation of the trademarks, the Panel finds it inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's rights when registering the disputed domain names. The inclusion of the term "coffee" and "store" further reinforces the association with the Complainant's business.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels have consistently held that the passive holding of a domain name, including circumstances in which it resolves to a blank or "coming soon" page does not prevent a finding of bad faith. As set out in section 3.3 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), the assessment of bad faith in such cases must take into account the totality of the circumstances. Here, the Panel notes in particular the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademarks, the composition of the disputed domain names, and the absence of any plausible good-faith use by the Respondent. In light of these factors, the Panel finds that the passive holding of the disputed domain names does not preclude a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied 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 names <jdecoffee.shop> and <jdecoffeestore.shop> be transferred to the Complainant

/Ada L. Redondo Aguilera/

Ada L. Redondo Aguilera

Sole Panelist

Date: December 30, 2025