

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Tea Forté, Inc. (dba Jacobs Douwe Egberts USA) v. luwanglong  
Case No. D2025-4685

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Tea Forté, Inc. (dba Jacobs Douwe Egberts USA), United States of America (“U.S.”), represented by Ploum, Netherlands (Kingdom of the).

The Respondent is luwanglong, China.

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

The disputed domain name <teaforteon.com> is registered with Jiangsu Bangning Science & technology Co. Ltd. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 12, 2025. On November 12, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 14, 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 (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 28, 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 28, 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 December 1, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 21, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on December 22, 2025.

The Center appointed Daniel Peña as the sole panelist in this matter on December 26, 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 was founded in the U.S. in 2003, and produces and sells tea and related products inspired by Japanese tea ceremony. Now part of the Dutch company Jacobs Douwe Egberts, the Complainant sells its tea products in some 100 countries.

The Complainant owns a number of registered trademarks for its TEA FORTÉ and TF TEA FORTE trademarks, among which:

- International trademark registration No. 950871 for TEA FORTÉ, designated countries include Norway, Japan, and Russian Federation, registration date September 18, 2007;
- International trademark registration No. 895022 for TEA FORTÉ, designated countries include Russian Federation and Singapore, registration dated August 9, 2006; and
- International trademark registration No. 1240044 for TF TEA FORTE, designated countries include Russian Federation and Singapore, registration dated December 23, 2014.

The Complainant's business website is at "www.teaforte.com".

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on January 14, 2025. The website at the disputed domain name uses the Complainant's trademark and logo, and purports to sell the Complainant's tea and related products.

#### **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 is confusingly similar to its TEA FORTÉ trademark, as it incorporates the mark in its entirety with only the addition of the descriptive term "on.". The Complainant considers the dominant element of the domain name to be the TEA FORTÉ trademark, which remains clearly recognizable.

The Complainant argues that the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is irrelevant to the assessment of similarity.

The Complainant argues the Respondent is not commonly known by "Tea Forté" or any variation thereof, nor has it acquired trademark rights.

The Complainant considers that Respondent is neither affiliated with nor authorized by Complainant to use the TEA FORTÉ trademark.

The Complainant argues Respondent is not making a bona fide offering of goods or services but is instead engaging in fraudulent activity, including misuse of customer payment information. The Complainant considers that Respondent fails to meet the Oki Data reseller criteria, as it does not actually sell the goods and does not disclose its lack of affiliation. The Complainant argues that Respondent's use of the TEA FORTÉ name and logo on its website falsely suggests affiliation and cannot constitute fair use.

- The Complainant argues Respondent registered the domain name with knowledge of the well known TEA FORTÉ trademark and intentionally imitated Complainant's branding to mislead consumers. The Complainant considers that Respondent has attempted to attract users for commercial gain by creating confusion as to source, sponsorship, or affiliation.
- The Complainant argues that Respondent's fraudulent conduct, including attempted misuse of credit card data and potential phishing, evidences bad faith.
- The Complainant considers the use of privacy services to mask identity as further indication of bad faith.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied: (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; (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 in bad faith. Considering these requirements, the Panel rules as follows:

### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

The Panel holds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark TEA FORTÉ. Mere inclusion of the term "on" as a suffix at the end does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's marks.

The Complainant has provided evidence of its rights in the trademarks on the basis of its multiple TEA FORTÉ trademark international registrations. A trademark registration provides a clear indication that the Complainant has trademark rights for purposes of standing to file a UDRP case (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.2.1). It has also been established by prior UDRP panels that when a trademark is recognizable in a domain name it will be considered confusingly similar to the trademark. Such findings were confirmed, for example, within sections 1.7 and 1.9 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

Further, the addition of the gTLD ".com" to the disputed domain name is a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded. The Panel is satisfied that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark and the Complainant has satisfied the requirement of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

### **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

While 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 often impossible 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. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element

(see section 2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#)).

The Complainant has made a prima facie showing that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, including by asserting that the Respondent is not affiliated with it in any way and that it never authorized the Respondent to use its trademark as part of the disputed domain name. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Panel notes that the Respondent has not filed any response and thus did not deny the Complainant's assertions, nor brought any information or evidence demonstrating any rights or legitimate interests.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant satisfied the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

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

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy states that any of the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, shall be considered evidence of the registration and use of a disputed domain name in bad faith: (i) circumstances indicating that the respondent registered or acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant (the owner of the trademark or service mark) or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; (ii) the respondent has registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; (iii) the respondent has registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or (iv) by using the domain name, the respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the respondent's website or location or of a product or service on its website or location.

In the Panel's view, a finding of bad faith may be made where the Respondent "knew or should have known" of the Complainant's trademark rights prior to registering the disputed domain name. In this case, the Complainant submits that, at the date of registration of the disputed domain name, the Respondent would have had actual knowledge of the Complainant's mark TEA FORTÉ, given its longstanding international reputation and its extensive trademark portfolio. The Panel's bad faith finding is reinforced by the construction of the disputed domain name, which reproduces the Complainant's mark in its entirety with the mere addition of the suffix "on" at the end.

The Panel further notes that the Respondent is unknown to the Complainant, having concealed its identity through a privacy shield in the Whois records. The disputed domain name resolves to a website that prominently displays the Complainant's TEA FORTÉ trademark and logo, thereby creating the false impression that the site is operated by or affiliated with the Complainant. Evidence shows that the Respondent has copied the look-and-feel, text, recipes, and product images from the Complainant's official website, reinforcing the impersonation.

Moreover, the Complainant discovered that the website does not sell genuine TEA FORTÉ products but operates as a fraud. During a test purchase, after entering credit card details, an error message appeared, and soon after, fraudulent charges were attempted on the card. This shows the Respondent uses the domain to deceive customers and steal their financial information.

The Panel is satisfied that by directing the disputed domain name to a fraudulent commercial website, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark TEA FORTÉ as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website. Under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, this constitutes clear evidence of registration and use in bad faith.

Having considered the Complainant's submissions and in the absence of a Response, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and used in bad faith within paragraph 4(a)(iii) 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 <teaforteon.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Daniel Peña/*

**Daniel Peña**

Sole Panelist

Date: January 7, 2026