

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Global Brother SRL v. steve mark, XYZ

Case No. D2025-4749

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Global Brother SRL, Romania, represented by IPMatters OÜ, Estonia.

The Respondent is steve mark, XYZ, India.

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

The disputed domain name <holisticguidetowellness.shop> is 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 17, 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 17, 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 (Registration Private) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 18, 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 amendment to the Complaint on November 21, 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 November 25, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 15, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on December 16, 2025.

The Center appointed Adam Samuel as the sole panelist in this matter on December 19, 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 a Romanian corporation that owns and operates a website located at the domain name <holisticguidetowellness.com>, registered on November 1, 2022. It is the official website of the book “The Holistic Guide to Wellness”, a work on holistic healing and wellness practices, first published in March 2023 by the Complainant. The Complainant owns an EUIPO trademark for THE HOLISTIC GUIDE TO WELLNESS, Registration no. 18861848, registered on August 2, 2023.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 30, 2025. Currently, the disputed domain name does not resolve to a website. It previously resolved to a website which marketed publications on similar themes to the Complainant’s website.

#### **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 almost identical to the Complainant’s registered trademark, missing only the word “the” and the spaces between the words and with the addition of the generic Top Level Domain (gTLD) “.shop”.

The Complainant has never licensed authorized or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its trademark in any way. The respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the dispute domain name or any variation of it.

Shortly before the filing of this complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website that prominently featured a nearly identical book title and herbal imagery, creating a strong visual and textual association with the Complainant’s brand. In addition to textual similarities, the Respondent’s website displayed a book cover that closely replicated the visual design of the Complainant’s book “the Holistic Guide to Wellness” which is protected by the Complainant’s trademarks. The Respondent’s version used an almost identical cover design, with a green background, decorative border, and similar arrangement of herbal imagery, and adopted the same overall visual style, reinforcing the likelihood of confusion. In addition, the Respondent’s website promoted the book using herbal protocols and wellness claims that mirrored the Complainant’s product offerings. It featured promotional sections such as “Discover How Herbal Remedies Can Replace the Pharmacy” and detailed descriptions of herbal programs (e.g., Turmeric Curcumin, Heart Health Protocol, Liver Health Protocol), imitating the Complainant’s holistic marketing approach and content.

The website at the disputed domain name was presented as an online store bearing the Complainant’s exact trademark and purported to make sales of the Complainant’s book (real or counterfeit) for profit. Such use is neither legitimate nor fair, it clearly sought to mislead consumers into believing they are dealing with the Complainant or an authorized retailer. Here, the very choice of the “.shop” new generic Top-Level-Domain (“gTLD”) exacerbated the deception, as it implied that the connected website was an official online store operated by the trademark owner. In reality, the Respondent has no affiliation with the Complainant and was using the mark without permission to lure consumers for its own benefit.

The Respondent's acts of impersonation further confirm this bad-faith conduct. On the website to which the disputed domain name resolved, the Respondent included the following misleading statement: "Holistic Guide To Wellness operates this store and website, including all related information, content, features, tools, products and services, in order to provide you, the customer, with a curated shopping experience (the "Services"). Holistic Guide To Wellness is powered by Shopify, which enables us to provide the Services to you". This explicit claim falsely implied that the website was owned and operated by the Complainant and offered its official products. Such representation leaves no doubt that the Respondent sought to pass itself off as the Complainant to attract consumers for commercial gain.

Given the distinctiveness and fame of the Complainant's marks, it is inconceivable that the Respondent's registration was coincidental or made without knowledge of the Complainant. The Complainant registered lawfully its official domain name much earlier on November 01, 2022. The timing and context strongly indicate the Respondent targeted the Complainant's mark.

The disputed domain name's associated websites were hosted on the Shopify platform through which the Respondent was able to collect payments. This indicates a clear aim to make Internet users (prospective book buyers) believe they were dealing with the Complainant (the publisher) or an authorized site, thus attracting them to purchase the book from the Respondent.

## **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.

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

The disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's trademark without the word "the" in front of it and with the addition of the gTLD ".shop".

The gTLD is irrelevant here as it is a standard registration requirement. See section 1.11.1 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)").

The subtraction of the definite article from a trademark consisting of four words of which three are quite distinctive does not prevent the disputed domain name from being confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark.

For this reason, the Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

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

The Respondent is not called "holisticguidetowellness" or anything similar. There is no evidence that the Complainant has ever authorised the Respondent to use its trademarks. A screenshot of the Respondent's website on October 21, 2025 indicates that the Respondent was selling a book entitled "The Holistic Guide to

Health and Wellness” which is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark, involving just the insertion of “health and” before “wellness”.

For these reasons, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has met this element. See section 2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

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

The disputed domain name is very similar to the Complainant’s distinctive trademark and is identical to the Complainant’s domain name except for the gTLD “.shop”, as opposed to “.com”. The website, to which the disputed domain name resolved on October 21, 2025, appeared to be selling a book whose title strongly resembled the Complainant’s trademark and book. It contains links to other stories with themes similar to the Complainant’s website. The November 16, 2025 version of the Respondent’s website also seems to be selling merchandise connected to the Complainant’s book and trademark. The contact page gives the Respondent’s contact details as “Holistic Guide To Wellness” and the email address as the same with a gmail account.

This all indicates that the Respondent knew of the Complainant’s business, its book, its principal domain name and the themes of its website when it registered the disputed domain name. The Respondent did this either primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of the Complainant; or to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent’s web site by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent’s web site or location or of a product or service there. This is all evidence of bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name according to paragraph 4(b)(iii) and (iv) of the Policy.

For these reasons, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith and that the third element of the Policy has been proved.

### **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 <holisticguidetowellness.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Adam Samuel/*

**Adam Samuel**

Sole Panelist

Date: December 23, 2025