

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Maxi Miliaan B.V v. hp x  
Case No. D2026-0396

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Maxi Miliaan B.V, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), represented by BIGNON LEBRAY, France.

The Respondent is hp x, United States of America.

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

The disputed domain name <maxicosioutlet.shop> 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 30, 2026. On February 2, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 4, 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, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 5, 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 February 10, 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 February 11, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 3, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Andrew Brown K.C. as the sole panelist in this matter on March 13, 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 established in Netherlands (Kingdom of the) which specializes in the marketing of products for babies. It commercializes, under the trademark MAXI-COSI, a large variety of car seats, strollers and other baby products.

The Complainant owns trademark rights for the trademark MAXI-COSI (“the MAXI-COSI Trademark”) in many jurisdictions. The relevant registrations include:

Mark	Registration Number	Jurisdiction	Date of Registration	Classes
MAXI-COSI	002401560	European Union	March 24, 2003	12
MAXI-COSI	880073	International	January 27, 2006	12 and 18
MAXI-COSI	1791784	International	February 5, 2024	9, 11, 12 and 20

The Complainant owns many other registrations for this mark.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 4, 2026. At the time of filing the Complaint, the landing page located at the disputed domain name displayed the Complainant’s MAXI-COSI Trademark and logo and offered for sale baby products similar to the Complainant’s products.

#### 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 trademark rights to the MAXI-COSI Trademark in respect of goods in classes 9, 11, 12, 18 and 20 – most particularly products for babies. It claims that its reputation and rights in the MAXI-COSI Trademark date from well before registration of the disputed domain name on January 4, 2026.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name completely incorporates its MAXI-COSI Trademark. It further contends that previous Panels have found that where a disputed domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark or where at least a dominant feature of the relevant mark is recognizable in the disputed domain name, then the disputed domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that trademark for the purpose of UDRP standing. Further, the Complainant states that the addition of other terms in the disputed domain name may not affect a finding that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark. Here the disputed domain name differs from the Complainant’s MAXI-COSI Trademark only by the addition of “outlet”.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. In this regard the Complainant states that:

- (a) although the disputed domain name is registered in the name of a privacy service, and so the name of the Respondent is not known, the Complainant can certify that it has not authorized, licensed or otherwise permitted any third party to use its MAXI-COSI Trademark;
- (b) the use of a privacy service equates with a lack of legitimate interest;

- (c) the Respondent has not been commonly known by the disputed domain name nor has the Respondent since acquired any rights by way of trademark or service mark in the MAXI-COSI Trademark;
- (d) there has been no evidence of the Respondent's use of or demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name, or a name corresponding with the disputed domain name, in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name has been registered in bad faith. It states that its trademark registrations for the MAXI-COSI Trademark predate the disputed domain name by at least 25 years and that the Complainant has accrued substantial goodwill and recognition in that trademark since its establishment in 1962. It states that anyone who has access to the Internet can find the Complainant's MAXI-COSI Trademarks on public trademark databases. The Complainant's MAXI-COSI Trademark is listed as the first hit on popular search engines such as Google.

As to bad faith use, the Complainant relies on the fact that the website at the disputed domain name is a replica of the Complainant's official website. The Complainant states that this "systematically reproduces" its MAXI-COSI Trademark, logo, product catalogue, images and visual design elements. The Complainant states that the impersonating landing page at the disputed domain name displays the same product catalogue as the Complainant, uses the same product categories (car seats, strollers, nursery items) and uses identical product descriptions. Furthermore, the landing page offers 54% - 65% reductions in price on the products offered for sale and presents itself as an "outlet" store. The Complainant says that it does not operate any outlet store itself nor does it promote promotions outside official sales periods.

The Complainant states that elements of the landing page at the disputed domain name have been deliberately assembled to create a counterfeited website designed to deceive consumers into believing they are purchasing genuine MAXI-COSI products at discounted prices through an official outlet channel operated by or affiliated by the Complainant.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent is intentionally attempting to take advantage of its trademarks in order to deceive users by collecting their personal information and credit card numbers; while letting them believe they are associated with the Complainant.

## **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 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 also finds that the Complainant has established unregistered trademark or service mark rights for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.3.

The Panel further finds that the Complainant's MAXI-COSI Trademark is clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name despite the missing hyphen "-" in the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here “outlet”), may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such a 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, in this case impersonation/passing off as the Complainant through the creation of a genuine-looking website at the disputed domain name to give the impression of association with the Complainant’s business and designed to scam consumers, 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 finds that the disputed domain name has been registered in bad faith for the following reasons:

- (a) the Complainant has clearly demonstrated its rights to the MAXI-COSI Trademark and that this trademark was well-known and had a reputation well prior to registration of the disputed domain name on January 4, 2026. The Complainant’s MAXI-COSI trademark registrations and its use of those marks well predate the registration of the disputed domain name;
- (b) the landing page created by the Respondent at the disputed domain name comprises images and content taken from the official site of the Complainant, demonstrating clear knowledge of the Complainant and its MAXI-COSI Trademark;
- (c) the Panel finds that the Respondent knew of the Complainant’s MAXI-COSI Trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name incorporates this trademark with the suffix or addition of “outlet” - clearly suggesting that the reference to the Complainant’s trademark was fully intended. This is confirmed by the landing page created by the Respondent at the disputed domain name upon registration which offers purported MAXI-COSI products for sale at discounted prices;

- (d) any good faith search of the Internet by the Respondent before registration of the disputed domain name would have revealed to the Respondent the Complainant's trademark rights in and existing use of its MAXI-COSI Trademark.

In the present case, the Panel also finds that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name in bad faith for the following reasons:

- (a) the Complainant has provided evidence that the disputed domain name has been used to attract consumers through a landing page offering purported MAXI-COSI branded products;
- (b) the landing page at the disputed domain name includes images and contents taken from the Complainant's official website and displays the MAXI-COSI Trademark and logo;
- (c) the Respondent's landing page intentionally seeks to take advantage of the Complainant's MAXI-COSI Trademark in order to deceive Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant for commercial gain and potentially collect users' personal information and credit card numbers from users believing that they are dealing with the Complainant;
- (d) Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed copycat sites, impersonation/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 disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.
- (e) the Panel is entitled to draw and does draw adverse inferences from the failure of the Respondent to respond to the Complaint and to the factual allegations of the Complainant.

The Panel therefore 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 <maxicosioutlet.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Andrew Brown K.C./*

**Andrew Brown K.C.**

Sole Panelist

Date: March 27, 2026