

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Penney OpCo LLC, d/b/a JCPenney, on behalf of itself and Penney IP LLC  
v. wang jinglu  
Case No. D2026-0069

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Penney OpCo LLC, d/b/a JCPenney, on behalf of itself and Penney IP LLC, United States of America, represented by Jackson Walker, LLP, United States of America.

The Respondent is wang jinglu, China.

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

The disputed domain name <lizclaibornes.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 January 8, 2026. On January 9, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 12, 2026, 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, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 13, 2026, 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 January 15, 2026.

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 January 19, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 8, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 9, 2026.

The Center appointed Benoit Van Asbroeck as the sole panelist in this matter on February 16, 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, Penney OpCo LLC, d/b/a JCPenney, is a United States retail company that exploits the LIZ CLAIBORNE brand in connection with consumer products, including clothing and accessories. The Complainant's principal place of business is 6501 Legacy Drive, Plano, Texas 75024.

Penney IP LLC is the owner of several United States trademark registrations for LIZ CLAIBORNE, including:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 1167434 for LIZ CLAIBORNE, registered on September 1, 1981, in the name of Penney IP LLC, and having Penney OpCo LLC indicated as correspondent.
- United States Trademark Registration No. 2131395 for LIZ CLAIBORNE, registered on January 20, 1998, in the name of Penney IP LLC, and having Penney OpCo LLC indicated as correspondent.
- United States Trademark Registration No. 1480350 for CLAIBORNE, registered on the May 27, 1986, in the name of Penney IP LLC, and having Penney OpCo LLC indicated as correspondent.

The disputed domain name <lizclaibornes.com> was registered on June 3, 2025, with a Whois privacy service, masking the registrant's identity at the time of the initial Complaint filing.

The disputed domain name resolved to an active website presenting itself as an "official" Complainant's site, displaying promotional content and affiliate links to the Amazon platform. The website also displayed an address supposedly located at "4674 Clover Drive, Colorado Springs, CO," but that address does not exist.

#### **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 it has standing as exclusive licensee of Penney IP LLC, consistent with WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.4. Penney IP LLC holds several United States federal trademark registrations for LIZ CLAIBORNE (Annex 4 to the Complaint) and has also acquired common law rights in the mark dating back to at least 1976.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is an obvious intentional misspelling of the LIZ CLAIBORNE mark — incorporating it in its entirety with merely the addition of a terminal "s" — constituting typosquatting within the meaning of [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, relying on [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1. The Complainant argues that an unauthorised party cannot claim a legitimate interest in a domain name confusingly similar to a complainant's mark, as its activities cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Complainant further submits that the disputed domain name was only recently registered on June 3, 2025, that use which intentionally trades on the fame of another cannot constitute a bona fide offering, and that it has thereby established a prima facie case. The Respondent is also precluded from claiming any right or legitimate interest as it had at least

constructive notice of the LIZ CLAIBORNE Marks — registered since 1981 — before any use of the disputed domain name, the clear purpose of which was to misappropriate those marks and confuse the public. The Respondent cannot claim to be commonly known by the disputed domain name under paragraph 4(c)(ii), having no connection to or business relationship with the Complainant and no trademark rights in the term “LIZ CLAIBORNE.” The Respondent equally cannot claim a legitimate noncommercial or fair use under paragraph 4(c)(iii), as it is clearly carrying out a typosquatting scheme amounting to impersonation, which pursuant to [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13, can never confer rights or legitimate interests.

The Complainant submits that its rights in the LIZ CLAIBORNE Marks long predate the Respondent's registration, and that the Respondent, knowing of those marks and lacking any licence, registered the disputed domain name in bad faith. Pursuant to [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4, the mere registration of a domain name comprising a typo of a well-known mark by an unaffiliated entity creates a presumption of bad faith, demonstrating an intentional attempt to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion. Bad faith is further evidenced by the content of the website, which imitates the official LIZ CLAIBORNE brand, features Amazon affiliate links with the identifier “tag=lizclaibornes-20”, and expressly acknowledges participation in the Amazon Associates Programme — thereby monetizing the Complainant's reputation through affiliate commissions, in violation of Section 3(d) of Amazon's Associates Program Policies. Finally, the Respondent's use of a Whois privacy shield, while not objectionable in itself, contributes to the accumulation of elements pointing to bad faith, as it appears designed to conceal the Respondent's cybersquatting and fraudulent activities.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **6.1 Procedural issues**

The Complaint states that “[t]he Complainant is authorized to bring this proceeding on its own behalf as licensee of the LIZ CLAIBORNE trademark, as well as on behalf of its licensor affiliate Penney IP LLC which owns the LIZ CLAIBORNE trademark”. The Complainant relies on section 1.4 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), which provides that an exclusive licensee or closely related affiliate entity is considered to have rights sufficient for UDRP standing, and that a complaint may be brought by one related party on behalf of other interested parties.

In accordance with its powers articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, the Panel has conducted limited independent research for the purpose of verifying the Complainant's standing to initiate this proceeding. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.8. Having done so, the Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has the standing to bring this proceeding on behalf of the trademark owner, Penney IP LLC.

### **6.2 On the merit**

#### **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 of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1. Penney IP LLC owns United States Trademark Registration No. 1167434 for LIZ CLAIBORNE, registered on September 1, 1981, and United States Trademark Registration No. 2131395 for LIZ CLAIBORNE, registered on January 20, 1998, both with Penney OpCo LLC as correspondent. The Panel has already established

above that the Complainant can bring this proceeding on behalf of itself and Penney IP LLC. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.4.

The entirety of the trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7. The disputed domain name contains an obviously intentional misspelling of the LIZ CLAIBORNE trademarks and exploits a common typo: the addition of the letter “s” at the end of the mark.

As for the applicable generic Top-Level Domain (“.com”), the Panel holds that this can be disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

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 3.1](#), 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 responded to the Complaint and therefore failed to rebut 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.

Long before the Respondent registered the disputed domain name on June 3, 2025, the Respondent should have known of the LIZ CLAIBORNE trademarks.

In addition, the Panel notes the evidence on record does not contain any evidence of the Respondent being commonly known as “lizclaibornes” prior to or after the registration of the disputed domain name. Furthermore, the Panel has taken note of the Complainant’s confirmation that they have not licensed, authorized, or permitted the Respondent to register domain names incorporating the Complainant’s trademarks and has not seen any evidence that would suggest the contrary. In the absence of any license or permission from the Complainant to use their trademarks, the composition of the disputed domain name, and the fact that the disputed domain name resolves to a website that uses the Complainant’s trademarks and contains similar products, no actual or contemplated bona fide or legitimate use of the disputed domain name could reasonably be claimed.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's marks (paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy). As the Panel found above under the first element, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks. As the evidence submitted by the Complainant shows, the disputed domain name resolves to a website containing the same kind of goods as the ones offered by the Complainant. These circumstances, in combination with the Respondent's clear absence of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, are strong indicators of bad faith.

Moreover, the Complainant's evidence shows that its trademarks were registered many years before registration of the disputed domain name. The Respondent's knowledge of the Complainant and its trademarks and therefore its registration in bad faith of the disputed domain name may accordingly also be inferred from these circumstances. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2.

Furthermore, panels have consistently found bad faith in cases where a respondent impersonates a complainant and leverages its mark to attract users for commercial gain via Amazon affiliate links (see, *Inc. v. Isaac Cheung*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-0893](#)).

Finally, the fact that the Respondent failed to submit a response or to provide any evidence of good faith intentions further supports a finding of bad faith (see *Awesome Kids LLC and/or Awesome Kids L.L.C. v. Selavy Communications*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0210](#)).

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 <lizclaibornes.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Benoit Van Asbroeck/*

**Benoit Van Asbroeck**

Sole Panelist

Date: February 24, 2026