

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Koninklijke Douwe Egberts B.V. v. Xu LI and LIM Me
Case No. D2025-5072

1. The Parties

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

The Respondents are Xu LI, United States of America ("United States"), and LIM Me, United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <senseostore.shop> and <tassimocoffeeworld.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 December 5, 2025. On December 8, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On December 8, 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 December 10, 2025 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file a separate complaint for the disputed domain name associated with a different underlying registrant or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on December 15, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on December 22, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 11, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents' default on January 12, 2026.

The Center appointed Fabrizio Bedarida as the sole panelist in this matter on January 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 in these administrative proceedings is a private limited liability company, set up under the law of Netherlands (Kingdom of the). The Complainant is part of Jacobs Douwe Egberts, which 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, one of the world's largest pure-play coffee and tea companies, headquartered in the Netherlands (Kingdom of the). The group's coffee and tea portfolio is available in over 100 countries around the world and is sold in, inter alia, Europe and North America.

The Complainant has a number of registrations for the SENSEO and TASSIMO trademarks.

The Complainant is, inter alia, the owner of the following:

- European Union trademark registration number 003073731 for the SENSEO (word) trademark registered on November 18, 2004;
- International Trademark Registration number 716530 for the SENSEO (device) trademark registered on June 25, 1999;
- United States trademark registration number 78526813 for the SENSEO (word) trademark registered on September 26, 2006;
- European Union trademark registration number 005416458 for the TASSIMO (word) trademark registered on August 20, 2007;
- International Trademark Registration number 782380 for the TASSIMO (word) trademark registered on June 18, 2002; and
- International Trademark Registration number 1356617 for the TASSIMO (device) trademark registered on April 21, 2017.

The Complainant also owns and operates the websites at the domain names <senseo.com> and <tassimo.com>.

The disputed domain names <senseostore.shop> and <tassimocoffeeworld.shop> were registered on October 16, 2025, and October 23, 2025, respectively.

The disputed domain names currently resolve to inactive websites. However, based on the evidence provided by the Complainant, it appears that the Complainant's trademarks were in the past prominently displayed on those websites and that, on the respective sites, purported SENSEO- and TASSIMO-branded goods were offered for sale alongside competing products, namely differently branded coffee 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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks, that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names, that the Respondents' use of the disputed domain names for websites displaying the Complainant's trademarks, in an apparent attempt to impersonate the Complainant or to suggest an

affiliation with the Complainant, does not give rise to rights or legitimate interests, and that it is implausible that the Respondents were unaware of the Complainant's renowned trademarks when they registered the disputed domain names.

The Complainant further asserts that the disputed domain names were registered using seemingly false addresses and non-existent telephone numbers. The Complainant therefore infers that the disputed domain names were registered with incomplete or false registrant information.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

Regarding the Respondents' identity, the Complainant has requested a consolidation of disputes against multiple disputed domain name registrants.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 4.11.2.

With respect to the issue of common control, the Panel finds, on the balance of probabilities, that the disputed domain names identified in the Complaint are registered by the same domain name holder or are at least under common control. This conclusion is based on the following factors.

The registrants of the disputed domain names have provided incorrect, if not outright false, addresses in the registration details, which prevented the courier from delivering the Center's written communications. Specifically, the Complainant has provided evidence showing that the Respondents' addresses correspond to deserted locations, namely a construction site and a parking lot, indicating that the addresses are fictitious, while the supplied telephone numbers appear to be non-existent.

The disputed domain names target the Complainant's trademarks in a very similar manner. The websites associated with the disputed domain names prominently feature the Complainant's device trademarks, in black-and-white versions, in the top left corner.

The disputed domain names have been registered within a relatively short period, i.e., between October 16, 2025, and October 23, 2025.

The websites to which the disputed domain names resolve have identical online checkout areas.

The websites to which the disputed domain names resolve both use an email address that starts with “customer”.

The disputed domain names have been registered with the same Registrar.

The disputed domain names have been registered with seemingly false addresses.

The registrants’ email addresses originate from the same domain name, namely [...]@angeegg.com.

The disputed domain names have both been registered with false telephone numbers, i.e., the phone number for <senseostore.shop> is comprised of 11 digits instead of 10, while the phone number for <tassimocoffeeworld.shop> is one digit short of resembling a valid phone number.

Based on these cumulative factors, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain names are more likely than not under common control.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as “the Respondent”) in a single proceeding.

6.2. Substantive Issues

In order for the Complainant to obtain a transfer of the disputed domain names, paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that the Complainant must demonstrate to the Panel that:

- (i) the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and
- (iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

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 respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Complainant’s trademarks SENSO and TASSIMO are reproduced in their entirety and recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here, “store”, “coffee” and “world”, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

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.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that, on the balance of probabilities, the Respondent was aware of the Complainant’s trademark registrations and rights to the SENSEO and TASSIMO trademarks when it registered the disputed domain names. The disputed domain names contain the Complainant’s registered trademarks in their entirety, without any authorization or approval.

The disputed domain names were registered nearly two decades after the Complainant registered its trademarks. In addition, taking into account the use of the disputed domain names to resolve to websites where the Complainant’s trademarks were prominently displayed and where purported SENSEO- and TASSIMO-branded goods were offered for sale alongside competing products, as well as the absence of a rebuttal from the Respondent to the Complainant’s claims, this Panel believes that it is more likely than not that the Respondent, when registering the disputed domain names, had knowledge of the Complainant’s earlier rights in the SENSEO and TASSIMO trademarks.

Further, by using the Complainant’s marks to offer for sale competing products of other commercial origin, the Panel notes that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademarks. Such use constitutes bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

It also appears that the Respondent has provided, at best, incomplete or inaccurate registrant information, which further supports a finding of bad faith.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitute bad faith under the Policy.

Finally, the disputed domain names currently resolve to inactive websites. However, panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's trademarks, the composition and previous use of the disputed domain names, and finds that in the circumstances of this case, the current passive holding of the disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has 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 names <senseostore.shop> and <tassimocoffeeworld.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Fabrizio Bedarida/

Fabrizio Bedarida

Sole Panelist

Date: January 30, 2026