

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Adanola Limited v. Lincoln Corner, FLORALS DEAN LTD  
Case No. D2025-5247

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Adanola Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Com Laude Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Lincoln Corner, FLORALS DEAN LTD, United Kingdom.

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

The disputed domain name <adanolahoodie.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 16, 2025. On December 16, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 18, 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 (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 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 December 22, 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 December 23, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 12, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 14, 2026.

The Center appointed Gareth Dickson as the sole panelist in this matter on January 22, 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 a company incorporated in the United Kingdom. It was founded in 2015 and incorporated in 2018. It is engaged in the design, manufacture and sale of clothing, footwear and accessories, including activewear, casual wear, outerwear and sportswear. The Complainant distributes its products primarily through its official website at “www.adanola.com” and through selected retail and e-commerce outlets in the United Kingdom and internationally.

The Complainant relies on registered trade mark rights in the term ADANOLA (the “Mark”). The Complainant owns a number of trade mark registrations for the Mark, including:

- United Kingdom trade mark registration number UK00003152822 for ADANOLA, registered on May 27, 2016.
- United Kingdom trade mark registration number UK00003328888 for ADANOLA, registered on October 26, 2018.
- European Union trade mark registration number 018310759 for ADANOLA, registered on February 24, 2021.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 27, 2025. It resolves to an active website offering products purporting to be the Complainant’s goods and makes extensive use of the Mark alongside the Complainant’s branding and visual presentation. The website does not carry any disclaimer clarifying that it is unaffiliated with the Complainant.

#### **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 submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Mark, as it wholly incorporates the Mark together with the descriptive term “hoodie”, which the Complainant states refers directly to one of its core product categories and increases the likelihood that Internet users will assume an association with the Complainant.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant states that it has not authorised, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the Mark, that there is no commercial or contractual relationship between the parties, and that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Complainant further asserts that the Respondent is not making a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant claims that the overall presentation of the website to which the disputed domain name directs Internet users gives the impression that it is operated by, or affiliated with, the Complainant, and that the website does not clearly disclose the absence of any relationship with the Complainant.

The Complainant further contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant asserts that, given the prior registration and use of the Mark, the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its trade mark rights at the time of registration. According to the Complainant, the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name to intentionally attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and the goods offered thereon.

## **B. Respondent**

The Respondent did not reply to the 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 trade mark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark 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 confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here "hoodie", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term 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**

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here impersonation/passing off in order to sell goods purporting to be those of the Complainant, 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; and that 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 the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in a manner that appears, on the evidence before the Panel, to intentionally attempt to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Mark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here claimed impersonation/passing off in order to sell goods purporting to have been put on the market by the Complainant or with its consent, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes 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 name <adanolahoodie.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Gareth Dickson/*

**Gareth Dickson**

Sole Panelist

Date: February 5, 2026