

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Adanola Limited v. Muhammad Rashid and Rashid Iqbal  
Case No. D2026-0263

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondents are Muhammad Rashid, Pakistan, and Rashid Iqbal, Pakistan.

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

The disputed domain names <adanolaclothing.com> and <adanolatracksuit.com> are registered with CloudFlare, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 22, 2026. On January 23, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On January 26, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response, disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Data Redacted) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 26, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file a separate complaint for the disputed domain name associated with a different underlying registrant or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on January 30, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on February 4, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 24, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents' default February 25, 2026.

The Center appointed Gary Saposnik as the sole panelist in this matter on March 3, 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 that was founded in 2015, and incorporated in 2018. The Complainant designs, manufactures and sells clothing, footwear and accessories under the "Adanola" name. Its product range includes activewear, casual wear, sportswear, and related lifestyle items.

The Complainant is the owner of a global portfolio of registered trademarks for ADANOLA, including the following trademark registrations:

- ADANOLA, United Kingdom Trademark Reg. No. UK00003152822, registered May 27, 2016, in class 25;
- ADANOLA, United Kingdom Trademark Reg. No. UK00003328888, registered October 26, 2018, in class 35;
- ADANOLA, the European Intellectual Property Office Trademark Reg. No. 018310759, registered February 24, 2021, in classes 18, 25, and 35;
- ADANOLA, International Trademark Reg. No. 1823867, registered July 31, 2024, in classes 3, 9, 14, 18, 24, 25, 26, and 35; and
- ADANOLA, United States of America Trademark Reg. No. 7732312, registered March 18, 2025, in classes 18, 25, and 35.

The Complainant distributes its products primarily through its official website at the domain name <adanola.com>, as well as sold through selected retail and e-commerce outlets in the United Kingdom and overseas. The Complainant operates and maintains social media accounts, including on Instagram and TikTok, each of which has a substantial following with more than one million followers or "likes".

Both of the Respondents appear to be located in Pakistan. The disputed domain name <adanolaclothing.com> was registered on August 29, 2024, and the disputed domain name <adanolatracksuit.com> was registered on March 18, 2025. The first disputed domain name resolves to an active website appearing to offer the Complainant's products for sale. The second disputed domain name used to resolve to an active website purporting to offer the Complainant's products for sale. Both websites indicated they were "official" shops. Since around January 2026, the second disputed domain name's website configuration has been modified and now shows an inactive "Site Currently Unavailable" site.

#### **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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to the ADANOLA mark in which the Complainant has rights. The oldest of the Complainant's registrations pre-dates the registration of the disputed domain names by nearly 8 years. The disputed domain names incorporate the Complainant's ADANOLA mark in its entirety, and only differ by the addition of the terms "clothing" and "tracksuit". The addition of these terms does not distinguish the disputed domain names from the Complainant's mark, but rather furthers the likelihood of confusion among Internet users, since the Complainant is a fashion and clothing brand. The Complainant avers that anyone who sees the disputed domain names will likely perceive each as a domain name belonging to the Complainant, or at least an entity related to or endorsed by the Complainant. Therefore, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to their ADANOLA mark.

The Complainant argues that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. The Complainant has found no evidence that the Respondents have been commonly known by "adanola", "adanola clothing" or "adanola tracksuit" prior to or after the registration of the disputed domain names. The Respondents are not licensees of the Complainant and have not received any permission or consent from the Complainant to use its ADANOLA mark. The Respondents are not part of the Complainant's authorized distribution network and have no entitlement to resell the Complainant's products. The Respondents do not own any trademarks incorporating the term "adanola", "adanola clothing" or "adanola tracksuit". Additionally, there is no evidence that the Respondents have ever traded legitimately under the name "adanola", "adanola clothing" or "adanola tracksuit". There is no conceivable use to which the disputed domain names would confer any legitimate interest upon the Respondents.

Furthermore, the Complainant contends that the Respondents are not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names. The Complainant avers that the Respondents cannot claim a legitimate "fair use" as the nature of the disputed domain names carries a risk of implied affiliation. Certain additional terms to a complainant's brand within the trademark owner's field of commerce or indicating services related to the brand can trigger "an inference of affiliation". WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 2.5.1. Since the Complainant operates as a clothing brand and retailer, the terms "clothing" and "tracksuit" used in the disputed domain names fall within the Complainant's field of commerce. Their inclusion therefore implies a false affiliation between the Respondents and the Complainant.

Additionally, there is no nominative fair use as a reseller or distributor. The Respondents have not received permission or consent from the Complainant to: 1) act as an authorized distributor of their goods, including but not limited to ADANOLA products; 2) use the Complainant's name and mark in the disputed domain names; or 3) use its copyrighted product photographs on the associated websites (or previous website, respectively).

Even if the Respondents were genuine resellers of the Complainant's products, the Respondents cannot claim nominative fair use as a reseller or distributor under [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.8.1, as they would fail the Oki Data test (*Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#)). The Respondents are not part of the Complainant's distribution network, and as such, the Complainant's goods that are offered are likely to be either counterfeit, parallel import, or grey market goods. Although the Respondents' websites appear to only offer the Complainant's goods, the Respondents' websites do not disclose their relationship (or non-relationship) with the Complainant. Therefore, by using the Complainant's name and mark and reproducing its product images, the Respondents give the misleading impression of authorization or endorsement. The Complainant notes that it would be challenging for the Respondents to register enough domain names incorporating the Complainant's name and mark to "corner the market". Consequently, the Complainant contends that the Respondents' websites fail the Oki Data test on at least grounds (i) and (iii), and the Respondents cannot claim that they are making nominative fair use of the Complainant's mark, even if the Respondents were genuine resellers of the Complainant's products.

The Complainant further alleges that the disputed domain names are not used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, as the Respondents' website associated with the first disputed domain name purports to be operated by or associated with the Complainant as evidenced by: 1) the use of the Complainant's logotype at the top of the website; 2) the use of the Complainant's ADANOLA brand and name throughout; 3) the inclusion of product photographs directly copied from the Complainant's official website; 4) the use of a similar minimalist black and white color scheme; and 5) the prominent display of the ADANOLA mark in connection with all goods offered for sale. The Complainant avers that similar observations apply to the previous website associated with the second disputed domain name. The Complainant therefore contends that the Respondents' purpose is to deceive Internet users into believing that the websites are operated by or associated with the Complainant. As previously noted, the attendant websites do or did not contain any disclaimers or make clear the non-relationship between the Parties. The Complainant alleges that the use of the disputed domain names for impersonation or passing off of the Complainant's website cannot confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondents. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

The Complainant argues that additional indicia of lack of legitimate interest includes the fact that the Respondents' website of the first disputed domain name provides no basic company information, such as contact details, company name, registration number, or place of business. The absence of such information is inconsistent with what would ordinarily be expected of a bona fide business.

The Complainant notes that the second disputed domain name currently does not resolve to an active website, and that such passive holding is not a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Lastly, the Complainant avers that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. The Respondents have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to their websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's ADANOLA name and mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of their websites. Adding the descriptive terms "clothing" and "tracksuit" to the Complainant's mark would confusingly lead Internet users seeing the disputed domain names in search engine results to reasonably assume that they are operated by or endorsed by the Complainant. Upon arriving at the Respondents' websites, the content is inherently confusing as the website at the first disputed domain name (and the second disputed domain name's previous website) is: using the Complainant's logotype at the top of the website; using the Complainant's ADANOLA brand and name throughout; the websites include product photographs directly copied from the Complainant's official website located at the domain name <adanola.com>; the websites are using a similar black and white color scheme; the websites prominently display ADANOLA in connection with all of the goods offered.

Given that the Respondents are not authorized to operate a website under the Complainant's brand, the websites increase the potential for confusion among consumers. The Respondents have failed to display any kind of disclaimer or undertake any other reasonable steps to avoid consumer confusion between the Respondents' websites and the Complainant. Therefore, the Respondents have attempted to attract Internet users to their websites for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source or affiliation of their websites and the offered products.

Given the use of the disputed domain names, it is inconceivable that the Respondents did not have the Complainant firmly in mind when they registered the disputed domain names. The fact that the disputed domain names incorporate the Complainant's ADANOLA mark plus the descriptive terms "clothing" and "tracksuit" respectively, reinforces the bad faith intentions of the Respondents. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

Regarding the second disputed domain name, the Complainant notes the passive holding of the disputed domain name at the time of the filing of the Complaint. The Complainant's mark is distinctive and has been well known, as well as the ADANOLA mark has been used for many years prior to the registration of the second disputed domain name. The Respondent's failure to submit a response and the prior use of this disputed domain name may also be indicative of bad faith. Combined, such passive holding constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3.

Further evidence of bad faith is claimed to be false or incomplete contact information for the disputed domain names. The address provided for the first disputed domain name does not correspond to any identifiable location in Pakistan, and the address provided for the second disputed domain name does not include any house number. Cumulatively with the other evidence provided, the disputed domain names were registered and used in bad faith under the Policy.

## **B. Respondents**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **Consolidation: Multiple Respondents**

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the disputes against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that both of the disputed domain names appear to target the Complainant by reflecting its ADANOLA mark within the chosen domain names. Both of the domain names were registered with the Registrar. The Whois details reveal Pakistan as the Respondents' location. Both of the disputed domain names are configured with the nameservers owned by the Registrar. Both of the disputed domain names are similar in construction, with the Complainant's ADANOLA mark plus a product related term, namely, "adanola clothing" or "adanola tracksuit". Additionally, both of the disputed domain names either currently resolve or used to resolve to websites which appear to offer the Complainant's products and use the Complainant's branding, pretending to be "official" Complainant's stores.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party. Neither named Respondent has responded to the Complaint nor objected to the consolidation of the disputed domain names.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

### **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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of ADANOLA as a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the entirety of the ADANOLA mark is reproduced within each of the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, “clothing” and “tracksuit” respectively, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names 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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel notes that the first disputed domain name resolves to a website featuring products and images that are the same as the Complainant’s products and images from the Complainant’s website, and that the website is allegedly operated by “ADANOLA OFFICIAL”, without disclosing its lack of a relationship to the Complainant. The Panel also notes that the Complainant’s trademark and ADANOLA logo is prominently reproduced on the website, and that the website is using a similar minimalist black and white color scheme to the Complainant’s official website.

Although the second disputed domain name does not currently resolve to content, it previously resolved to a website displaying similar content as the first disputed domain name, namely products and images of the Complainant’s products, with the claim that the website is the “Official ADANOLA Clothing Store”. It also does not disclose its lack of relationship to the Complainant. The Panel also notes that the Complainant’s trademark ADANOLA is prominently displayed. Even though not currently in use, the prior use does not amount to a bona fide offering and the Respondent has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain names have been registered and used to mislead unsuspecting Internet users into thinking that the websites are owned by, affiliated with or endorsed by the Complainant.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed as applicable to this case: passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1. See also *Adanola Limited v. sultan Jafri*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-0109](#).

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.

The disputed domain names incorporate the Complainant's mark plus additional terms that correspond to the Complainant's products. As opined above, the Respondent has a clear absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with no credible explanation for the Respondent's choice of the disputed domain names. Additional indicia of bad faith include the Respondent's providing seemingly incomplete contact details for each disputed domain name, and its failure to submit a response to the Complainant's allegations.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names after the Complainant attained trademark rights in its distinctive ADANOLA mark. As the resolving websites reflected through their content, the Panel finds that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark.

Both domain names resolve(d) to websites prominently displaying the Complainant's trademark, along with the Complainant's products and images. Neither site indicated a disclaimer or lack of a relationship with the Complainant. Rather, both sites contended that they were the "official" ADANOLA site.

Although the second disputed domain name is no longer active, panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, including the Respondent's prior usage of the second disputed domain name, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the second disputed domain name, and lack of response, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the current passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed as passing off, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the first disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy. This Panel finds that the Respondent's registration and prior use of the second disputed domain name also constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

Based on a totality of the evidence submitted, 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 names <adanolacloting.com> and <adanolatracksuit.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Gary Saposnik/*

**Gary Saposnik**

Sole Panelist

Date: March 17, 2026