

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

The Ridge Wallet LLC v. Jony Maick  
Case No. D2025-4729

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is The Ridge Wallet LLC, United States of America (“United States” or “U.S.”), represented by Gina Johnson, United States .

The Respondent is Jony MAICK, United States.

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

The disputed domain name <ridgestoreus.com> is registered with Cosmotown, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 14, 2025. On November 17, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 19, 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 19, 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 25, 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 26, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 16, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on December 17, 2025.

The Center appointed Angela Fox as the sole panelist in this matter on December 30, 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 2014 in the United States. It manufactures and sells compact wallets, rings, everyday carry bags for electronic devices, phone covers, pens and other consumer goods. It has sold more than five million wallets worldwide. Its products are offered under the trademark RIDGE, and it operates websites at the domain names <ridge.com>, <ridgewallet.ca>, <ridgeau.com>, <ridgewallet.co.uk>, <ridgewallet.eu> and various other region-specific domain names. It also operates a wholesale platform at the domain name <wholesale.ridge.com> and its products are available for purchase on Amazon in North America, Canada, and the European Union. The Complainant also engages with consumers through multiple social media platforms, including Facebook, Instagram, X (formerly Twitter), YouTube and TikTok.

The Complainant owns multiple trademark registrations in countries around the world for RIDGE in plain and stylized form and marks including RIDGE, including the following, details of which were annexed to the Complaint:

- U.S. Registration No. 5964856 for RIDGE, in Class 18, registered on January 21, 2020;
- U.S. Registration No. 7779921 for RIDGE [Stylised] , in Class 8, filed on August 9 2023, and registered on April 29, 2025; and
- International Registration No. 1777868 for RIDGE [Stylised], in Classes 14 and 18, registered on January 10, 2024.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 2, 2025. Print-outs annexed to the Complaint show its use in connection with a website which purports to sell the Complainant's RIDGE-branded products including wallets, rings, everyday device carrier bags and phone cases, albeit at heavily discounted prices (eg reduced from USD 370 to USD 74). The website at the disputed domain name prominently displays the Complainant's RIDGE logo and the layout and content appears to mimic that of the Complainant's own official RIDGE-branded website. The Respondent's website does not state whether there is a relationship with the Complainant; indeed, no details of the entity responsible for the Respondent's website appear on the site.

#### **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 identical or confusingly similar to its registered trademarks. The Complainant's trademark RIDGE appears and is clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name and the additional element "storeus" does not avoid confusing similarity, not least since it is likely to be understood as denoting an official U.S. website of the Complainant where the Complainant's RIDGE-branded goods can be purchased.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant has not licensed, permitted, or otherwise authorized the Respondent to use the RIDGE mark, nor is the Respondent affiliated with the Complainant in any way. The Respondent is not authorized to sell or promote the Complainant's products. There is no evidence that the Respondent has

ever been commonly known by the disputed domain name or by any name incorporating RIDGE. The Respondent is moreover not making a bona fide commercial use of the disputed domain name, because it is operating a website that impersonates the Complainant and is likely to create the false impression that it is an official or affiliated online store of the Complainant. The Complainant submits that the Respondent's use does not comply with the requirements in *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, (WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#)) that a reseller must (i) actually offer the trademarked goods; (ii) use the site to sell only the trademarked goods; (iii) accurately disclose the registrant's relationship with the trademark owner; and (iv) not attempt to corner the market in domain names. The Complainant also submits that in light of the steeply discounted prices, the goods being offered by the Respondent may in fact be counterfeit, or the Respondent may be engaged in a fraudulent scheme to collect payments without delivering genuine products. The Complainant further points out that the Respondent was previously the subject of a panelist decision finding that it had registered and used a domain name in bad faith in connection with an impersonation website offering the brand owner's products, similar to the facts of this case (*Rothy's, Inc. v. Jony MAICK*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-0794](#)).

Finally, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered and has been used in bad faith. The Complainant's RIDGE trademark has been in use for a decade and in light of its commercial success and the contents of the Respondent's website, the Respondent clearly knew of and was targeting the Complainant and its RIDGE brand when it registered the disputed domain name. The Complainant submits that the Respondent's registration and use in connection with a website that impersonates the Complainant is designed to attract Internet users for commercial gain and to disrupt the Complainant's business by creating a likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship or endorsement, and the use of the initials "us" indicate an intention to target the Complainant's U.S. customer base. The Complainant submits that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name in connection with a website impersonating the Complainant is, moreover, evidence of bad faith in itself (WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 3.1.4).

## **B. Respondent**

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions and is in default. No exceptional circumstances explaining the default have been put forward. Therefore, in accordance with paragraphs 14 (a) and (b) of the Rules, the Panel will decide the Complaint and shall draw such inferences, as it considers appropriate from the Respondent's default.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, a complainant can only succeed in an administrative proceeding under the Policy if the panel finds that:

- (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 the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

All three elements must be present before a complainant can succeed in an administrative proceeding under the Policy.

### **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 the trademark RIDGE for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1. The entirety of the Complainant's mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name, and it is clearly recognizable within it. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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.

In this case, the record shows that the disputed domain name has been in use to offer what purport to be the Complainant's RIDGE-branded goods for sale at a steep discount. There is nothing on the record to establish whether the goods are genuine or not or whether an order, if made, would be fulfilled. However, it is clear from the print-outs annexed to the Complaint that the website at the disputed domain name has copied the Complainant's logo marks and images, and there is nothing on the Respondent's website to indicate what if any relationship the Respondent has with the Complainant, as required of genuine re-sellers' websites under *Ok! Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#). Overall, the Respondent's website appears to be impersonating the Complainant and is likely to be assumed by Internet users to be a genuine website of the Complainant. There is no content on the website to prevent or correct this false impression. Indeed, the Respondent's website does not provide any details of the entity operating it, which in itself raises credible doubts as to the legitimacy of the Respondent's activities. Although the Respondent had the opportunity to respond to the Complaint on this and all other points raised in the Complaint, it did not do so.

The disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's registered trademark, the word "store" and the abbreviation "us" which are descriptive of the Complainant's business in selling its goods for purchase by consumers in the U.S., which is indeed its home market.

Taking all of the foregoing into account, it is clear that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. Impersonation or a false suggestion of a link with a complainant does not constitute fair use under the Policy ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1). The Respondent's failure to disclose its lack of a relationship with the Complainant further evinces a lack of any rights or legitimate interests in it. Impersonation frauds can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1).

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

### C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that, for 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.

Under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, in particular, such circumstances include that 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 its website or location or of a product or service on its website or location.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name in connection with a website impersonating the Complainant and copying the Complainant's logo mark and images from the Complainant's own website. It is evident from this that the Respondent was aware of and targeting the Complainant when it registered and used the disputed domain name. The offer of RIDGE-branded products through a domain name which is intrinsically likely to create the impression of a connection with the Complainant, using a website which impersonates the Complainant, demonstrates that the Respondent was using the disputed domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant.

The Panel notes that at least one prior domain name decision against the Respondent entailed a similar set of facts and resulted in a finding of registration and use in bad faith (*Rothy's, Inc. v. Jony MAICK*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-0794](#)).

Panels have also held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity such as impersonation or other types of fraud constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

Taking all of this into account, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Complainant has therefore 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 <ridgestoreus.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Angela Fox/

**Angela Fox**

Sole Panelist

Date: January 10, 2026