

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

RJ Brands, LLC v. tyu dfds
Case No. D2025-4723

1. The Parties

Complainant is RJ Brands, LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Adelman Matz P.C., United States.

Respondent is tyu dfds, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <chefiq.shop> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 14, 2025. On November 14, 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 that differed from the named Respondent (Privacy User #fe799361) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on November 19, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on November 20, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on November 25, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 15, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on December 16, 2025.

The Center appointed Jeffrey D. Steinhardt as sole panelist in this matter on December 22, 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

Founded in 2009, Complainant is a privately held consumer products distributor and parent company primarily known for its kitchen appliance brands, Chefman and CHEF iQ. Complainant's products are widely distributed through brick and mortar stores and on line, with primary markets in the United States and Canada.

Complainant owns numerous registrations in several countries for its CHEF IQ family of trademarks, for example: United States Trademark Registration No. 7569238, registered in International Class 11 on November 19, 2024, with a first use in date of April 30, 2020; United States Trademark Registration No. 7995791 registered in International Class 11 on October 21, 2025; and United States Trademark Registration No. 7095757, registered in International Class 9 on July 4, 2023, with a first use date of July 1, 2019.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 7, 2024 and does not currently resolve to an active webpage. However, exhibits submitted with the Complaint show that the disputed domain name previously resolved to a website offering for sale products that appear to be very similar to products promoted and sold by Complainant under its CHEF IQ marks on Complainant's website at "www.chefiq.com".

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, Complainant alleges that "[...] Respondent has copied the Chef iQ Mark in the product descriptions, replicated the exact product names, and deliberately listed [...] counterfeit products at nearly half the genuine prices displayed on the Complainant's official website, all with the intent to mislead consumers into believing they are purchasing authentic Chef iQ Products." The Complaint annexes exhibits permitting the Panel to compare Complainant's official website to the website to which the disputed domain name previously resolved.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to 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.

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.

The Panel finds that the first element of Policy paragraph 4(a) 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.

Complainant has presented credible evidence demonstrating that the website to which the disputed domain name resolved has used Complainant’s marks to sell products that appear similar to those promoted by Complainant under its trademarks. The Panel accepts this unopposed evidence. The Panel also accepts Complainant’s allegations that Respondent is not authorized to use the CHEF IQ marks on its website and products and that Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds that Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent has not rebutted 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, the alleged sale of counterfeit goods, unauthorized products or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel finds that the second element of Policy paragraph 4(a) 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 the present case, the Panel notes that Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant’s mark, a clear demonstration of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Complainant has also presented unopposed evidence that the disputed domain name (which is identical to Complainant’s CHEF IQ marks) has been used to promote the sale of counterfeit and unauthorized products. The Panel also accepts this evidence.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, (here, the alleged sale of counterfeit goods, unauthorized products or other types of fraud) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that Complainant has established the third element of paragraph 4(a) 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 <chefiq.shop> be transferred to Complainant.

/Jeffrey D. Steinhardt/

Jeffrey D. Steinhardt

Sole Panelist

Date: January 5, 2026