ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Adanola Limited v. sultan Jafri
Case No. D2026-0109

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Adanola Limited, United Kingdom ("UK"), represented by Com Laude Limited, UK.

The Respondent is sultan Jafri, Pakistan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <adanolaclothings.com> is registered with Nicenic International Group Co., Limited (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on January 12, 2026. On January 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 14, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 16, 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 19, 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 20, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 9, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on February 10, 2026.

The Center appointed Simone Huser as the sole panelist in this matter on February 18, 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 UK headquartered company in the business of designing, manufacturing and selling clothing, footwear and accessories.

The Complainant holds the domain name <adanola.com> which hosts its main website through which the Complainant distributes its products.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations in several jurisdictions, including:

- ADANOLA, UK Trademark Registration No. UK00003152822, registered on May 27, 2016, in international class 25; and
- ADANOLA, European Union Trademark Registration No. 018310759, registered on February 24, 2021, in international classes 18, 25, 35.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 20, 2025.

According to the evidence submitted with the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolves to a website highly similar to the Complainant's official website and which appears to offer the Complainant's products for sale.

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 as follows:

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the registered trademark in which the Complainant has rights, because it incorporates the Complainant's ADANOLA name and mark in its entirety, and only differs by the addition of the adornment "clothings".

The trademark ADANOLA has been extensively used to identify the Complainant and its products. The Respondent has not been authorized by the Complainant to use this trademark and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Respondent's website is intended to deceive Internet users into believing it is connected with the Complainant. The absence of any disclaimer reinforces this misleading impression. Common browsers such as Microsoft Edge block users from accessing the website associated with the disputed domain name which indicates potential malicious use of the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name was registered in bad faith because it is inconceivable that the Respondent did not have the Complainant and its trademark ADANOLA in mind when it registered the disputed domain name.

The Respondent is using the disputed domain name in bad faith, as the Respondent's website offers products purportedly produced by or, at least, appearing to be endorsed by the Complainant. By diverting Internet users away from the Complainant's official website to its own site for commercial gain, the Respondent is disrupting the Complainant's business.

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 trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, 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 ADANOLA trademark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, "clothings", 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 3.1, 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 that 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 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.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name resolves to a website featuring products that are the same as the Complainant's products and that the website is allegedly operated by "Adanola Limited" without disclosing its lack of relationship to the Complainant. The Panel also notes that the Complainant's trademark and logo ADANOLA is prominently reproduced on the website under the disputed domain name and that the website is using a similar minimalist black and white colour scheme as the Complainant's official website.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and used to mislead unsuspecting Internet users into thinking that the website is owned by, affiliated with or endorsed by the Complainant.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, such as impersonation/passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1.

Based on the available record, 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 3.1, section 3.2.1.

In the view of the Panel, noting that that the Complainant's trademark rights predate the registration of the disputed domain name, and considering the reputation and online visibility of the ADANOLA trademark and that the disputed domain name resolves to a website featuring the Complainant's trademark ADANOLA, it is inconceivable that the Respondent could have registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant's trademark. In the circumstances of this case, this is evidence of registration in bad faith.

In the view of the Panel, the impression given by the website under the disputed domain name would cause Internet users to believe that the Respondent is somehow associated with the Complainant when, in fact, it is not. The Panel holds 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 mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website in the sense of Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv).

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here claimed impersonation/passing off, constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4.

Noting the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark and the failure of the Respondent to submit a response, 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 <adanolaclothings.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Simone Huser/
Simone Huser
Sole Panelist
Date: March 2, 2026