

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Julie Vos Designs, LLC v. Maci Woyat
Case No. D2026-0150

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Julie Vos Designs, LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Tucker & Latifi, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Maci Woyat, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <julevoss.com> is registered with Dominet (HK) Limited (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 14, 2026. On January 15, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 16, 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 (Dominet (HK)Limited, 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 21, 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 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 12, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 17, 2026.

The Center appointed Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa as the sole panelist in this matter on February 20, 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 designs and markets jewelry in the United States and internationally. It is the proprietor of several trademark registrations, including the following:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 5197423 for  JULIE VOS (device mark), registered on May 2, 2017 for goods and services in classes 14 and 35;
- International Trademark Registration No. 1491284 for  JULIE VOS (device mark), registered on August 8, 2019 for goods and services in classes 14 and 35.

The Complainant operates an e-commerce website at the domain name <julievos.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 3, 2025. At the time of the Complaint and of this Decision, it resolved to a website stating “JULIE VOS. EXTRA 70% OFF”, displaying images of jewelry purported to be offered for sale at discount prices.

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 was established by the jewelry designer Julie Vos in 2006, and that its jewelry has been featured in several publications. The disputed domain name differs from the Complainant's mark by only a few letters. It is being used for a website that alleges to offer for sale JULIE VOS branded goods at discounted prices. The website displays the Complainant's mark and images from the Complainant's website. The goods allegedly being offered are believed to be either counterfeit or non-existent.

The Complainant requests transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the UDRP requires the Complainant to make out all three of the following:

- (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 Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Under paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, “[a] Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable”.

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 or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the Complainant’s JV JULIE VOS mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7. In comparing the Complainant’s mark with the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the JV JULIE VOS trademark as it is a deliberate misspelling of the Complainant’s trademark. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9.

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 the composition of the disputed domain name, which comprises a deliberate misspelling of the Complainant’s JV JULIE VOS mark. The Panel finds that the nature of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation to the Complainant that cannot constitute fair use. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

The Panel notes there is no evidence that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name or has any right to use the Complainant’s mark. There is no evidence that the Respondent has made a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Rather, the record indicates that the disputed domain name is being used for a website that purports to offer the Complainant's goods for sale at discounted prices. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, claimed sale of counterfeit goods, passing off, or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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.

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 mark. The Panel notes that the Complainant's rights in its JV JULIE VOS mark predate the registration of the disputed domain name by several years. Together with the use to which it has been put, the disputed domain name, which comprises a deliberate misspelling of this mark and is nearly identical to the domain name used by the Complainant for its e-commerce website, implies a link with the Complainant. On this record, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, claimed sale of counterfeit goods, passing off, or other types of fraud) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. The record contains evidence that the disputed domain name resolves to a website displaying the Complainant's mark and purporting to offer for sale the Complainant's products at discounted prices. Such conduct is clearly indicative of bad faith use of the disputed domain name. On this record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute 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 <julevoss.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa/

Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa

Sole Panelist

Date: March 5, 2026