

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Elite Keeper S.L v. Elite Sport Ltd., Yaron Daniel
Case No. D2025-5146

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Elite Keeper S.L, Spain, internally-represented.

The Respondent is Elite Sport Ltd., Yaron Daniel, Israel, internally-represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <elitekeepershop.com> is registered with Domain The Net Technologies Ltd (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on December 10, 2025. On December 11, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 26, 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 December 26, 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 December 26, 2025.

On December 26, 2025, the Center informed the parties in Hebrew and English, that the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain name was Hebrew. On December 29, 2025, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant's submission.

On December 29, 2025, the Complainant submitted a further amended Complaint to correct an administrative formality.

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 in English and in Hebrew of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on December 29, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 18, 2026. The Response was filed in English with the Center on January 15, 2026.

The Center appointed Jane Seager as the sole panelist in this matter on January 24, 2026. 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 Elite Keeper S.L., a Spanish company. The Complainant designs, manufactures, and sells goalkeeper products under the brand and trademark ELITEKEEPERS, including goalkeeper gloves, football equipment, apparel, and related services. The Complainant offers its goods to consumers in Spain and Europe, as well as in Latin America. The Complainant operates its official online store through domain names that incorporate the ELITEKEEPERS trademark, including the domain name <elitekeepers.com>.

The Complainant is the owner of trademark registrations for ELITEKEEPERS, including:

- Spanish Trademark Registration No. N0409547, ELITEKEEPERS (figurative), registered on May 11, 2020;
- European Union Trade Mark No. 018852802, ELITEKEEPERS (figurative), registered on July 7, 2023; and
- International Trademark Registration No. 1785719, ELITEKEEPERS (figurative), registered on September 2, 2023.

The Respondent is Elite Sport Ltd., together with its owner Mr. Yaron Daniel, located in Israel. The Respondent also offers goalkeeper gloves, apparel, and related accessories. For use in connection with the sale of its products, the Respondent has registered a number of trademarks comprising ELITE SPORT, dating from as early as 2015, e.g., United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. 913676986, ELITE SPORT (figurative), registered on May 12, 2015. The Respondent sells its goods online, including via the websites “www.elitesporteurope.com” and “www.elitesport.soccer”.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 9, 2020. The disputed domain name resolves to a website (the “Respondent’s website”) that serves as an online retail outlet for goalkeeper products. The goods on the Respondent’s website bear the Respondent’s ELITE SPORT trademark. The contents of the Respondent’s website are presented in English and it and targets an international audience.

The Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent on November 30, 2025, and attempted contact via the Respondent’s website, but received no reply.

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.

The Complainant asserts rights in the ELITEKEEPERS trademark and submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent is not authorised or licensed by the

Complainant, is not commonly known by “elitekeepers” or “elitekeepershop”, sells products under a false identity, and misleads customers. Such conduct cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent’s bad faith is demonstrated by copying the Complainant’s brand identity and presentation, using the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant’s official online store, hiding behind a privacy service to avoid identification, ignoring cease-and-desist correspondence, and continuing commercial use to exploit consumer confusion. The Complainant submits that by using the disputed domain name the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark, in bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Complainant requests transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

The Respondent does not directly contest confusing similarity but argues that the disputed domain name was derived from its own long-established Elite Sport brand, with “Elite Keeper” reflecting its core product focus and constituting a natural descriptive extension of its brand identity.

The Respondent contends that it has rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because Elite Sport Ltd. has operated globally since 2013 as a specialized brand for goalkeeper gloves and related equipment, with registered ELITE SPORT trademark rights dating back to at least 2015. The Respondent asserts that the disputed domain name has been used as a bona fide online retail outlet for the Respondent’s own products, integrated into its broader online presence. The Respondent asserts that such use constitutes a bona fide offering of goods under paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy.

The Respondent argues that the disputed domain name was registered on August 9, 2020, while the Complainant did not file its European Union Trade Mark application for ELITEKEEPERS until March 2023. Therefore, the Respondent claims there is no plausible basis for bad faith registration, as the Complainant’s trademark did not exist as a registered right at the time. The Respondent also points to a prior commercial relationship, where the Complainant functioned as a distributor of the Respondent’s products until around June 2019, and asserts that the Complainant had actual knowledge of the Respondent’s brand and goodwill before adopting its own branding. The Respondent suggests the Complaint may not be consistent with the purposes of the Policy, given the full factual context and prior relationship.

The Respondent requests that the Complaint be denied.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Hebrew. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that English be the language of proceedings because the disputed domain name is composed of Latin characters and English words, the Respondent operates the website at the disputed domain name using English-language content and targets an international audience, the Respondent has demonstrated sufficient familiarity with English through its commercial activities, and requiring the Complainant to translate the Complaint and all annexes into Hebrew would cause unnecessary delay and disproportionate cost.

The Respondent did not make any specific submissions with respect to the language of the proceeding. The Panel notes that the Response was submitted in English.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.5.1).

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

6.2. Substantive Matters

In order to prevail the Complainant must demonstrate on the balance of probabilities that it has satisfied the requirements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy:

- (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 was registered and is 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 Panel finds that the Complainant has shown rights in respect of the ELITEKEEPERS trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1. To the extent that design (or figurative/stylized) elements would be incapable of representation in domain names, these elements are largely disregarded for purposes of assessing identity or confusing similarity under the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.10.

The disputed domain name comprises the textual components of the Complainant's ELITEKEEPERS trademark, altered only by the addition of the letters "hop" (placed after the Complainant's trademark to suggest the term "shop"). Despite such addition, the Panel finds the Complainant's trademark to be recognizable in the disputed domain name. The Panel finds that the addition of the letters "hop" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark 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

As noted above, the disputed domain name resolves to a website offering for sale goalkeeper products bearing the Respondent's ELITE SPORT trademark.

The Panel acknowledges that the Respondent operates a legitimate business under the Elite Sport brand and holds corresponding trademark rights. However, the disputed domain name is not identical to the Respondent's own brand nor, in the Panel's opinion, a natural extension of it. Rather, it incorporates the Complainant's distinctive ELITEKEEPERS trademark, which is associated with the Complainant's goalkeeper products and related goods. The record indicates that the founders of the Parties' respective

companies had a prior commercial relationship with the Respondent acting as a supplier to the Complainant prior to 2019. In these circumstances, the Panel infers that the Respondent could not reasonably deny knowledge of the Complainant and associated business when registering the disputed domain name. The Panel further considers that Internet users encountering the disputed domain name are likely to assume an affiliation with, or endorsement by, the Complainant. The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name therefore creates a significant risk of confusion. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent's use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy.

There is also no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name or by "elitekeeper" or "elitekeepershop", independently of the Complainant's rights in the ELITEKEEPERS trademark, as contemplated by paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

The Respondent's website is manifestly commercial in nature, and there is no indication of any legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Accordingly, paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy does not apply.

In light of the above, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Panel therefore finds that 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.

Further to the matters outlined in the factual background above as well as the Panel's findings under the preceding element, the Panel finds it more likely than not that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its ELITEKEEPERS trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. The Respondent's knowledge of the Complainant's business, combined with the choice of a domain name that is highly similar to the Complainant's trademark, supports an inference of targeting and intent to exploit the Complainant's goodwill. The Panel finds, on balance, that the Respondent's reason for selecting the disputed domain name was to create confusion with the Complainant's ELITEKEEPERS trademark. The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's distinctive ELITEKEEPERS trademark and is being used to direct Internet users to a commercial website offering goalkeeper products that compete in the same market as the Complainant. The use of the disputed domain name in this manner is likely to mislead Internet users into believing that the Respondent's website is operated by, affiliated with, or endorsed by the Complainant, thereby taking unfair advantage of the Complainant's reputation and goodwill. The Panel finds that by using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's ELITEKEEPERS trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website and the goods offered therein, in bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of 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 name <elitekeepershop.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Jane Seager/

Jane Seager

Sole Panelist

Date: February 17, 2026