ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Maneuver Marketing Pte. Ltd. v. Radiancy Store
Case No. D2026-0587

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Maneuver Marketing Pte. Ltd., Singapore, represented by Polsinelli PC, United States of America ("United States").

The Respondent is Radiancy Store, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <getradiancy.com> is registered with Namecheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 11, 2026. On February 16, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 16, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that the 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 18, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 10, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 11, 2026.

The Center appointed Jane Seager as the sole panelist in this matter on March 19, 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 private limited company organized and existing under the laws of Singapore. The Complainant is a health and nutrition company engaged in the manufacture, marketing, distribution, and sale of dietary and nutritional supplements, including its probiotic supplements sold under the "Radiancy" brand. The Complainant first began offering its Radiancy product in or around April 2020. The Complainant's products are sold via its website at "www.thebbco.com", Amazon.com, and other channels. According to the Complainant, it has sold over 350,000 units of its Radiancy products since its launch in 2020 and has garnered nearly 700 global product reviews on Amazon.com. The Complainant also markets its Radiancy products through its Instagram and TikTok pages, with a combined total of over 110,000 followers.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 21, 2025. The disputed domain name resolves to a website (the "Respondent's website") that purports to offer the Complainant's Radiancy products for sale, displaying the Complainant's promotional images and content. The Respondent's website does not contain any disclaimer-like statements clarifying its non-affiliation with the Complainant.

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.

The Complainant claims that it has established common-law rights in "RADIANCY" through substantial sales, marketing, and continuous use since April 2020. The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its RADIANCY mark.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant argues that the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Complainant alleges that the Respondent's sole interest in the disputed domain name is to profit from confusion with the Complainant's RADIANCY mark. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has not been commonly known by the disputed domain name, that the listing of "Radiancy Store" in the registration information for the disputed domain name is indicative of a false name, and that the Respondent is not, and has never been, a representative of the Complainant or licensed to use the RADIANCY mark. The Complainant maintains that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name cannot be considered legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent was well aware of the Complainant and its RADIANCY mark when registering the disputed domain name, as evidenced by the disputed domain name's composition and the mimicking of the Complainant's product listing pages. The Complainant contends that the Respondent's use of a false name for registration, failure to respond to pre-Complaint cease-and-desist letters, and the deceptive nature of the Respondent's website all indicate bad faith. The Complainant further alleges that the Respondent has sought to capitalize on and exploit the Complainant's rights in the RADIANCY mark by creating confusion among consumers, in bad faith.

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

In order to prevail, the Complainant must demonstrate that it has satisfied the requirements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy:

(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 disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 Panel finds the Complainant has established unregistered trademark or service mark rights for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.3.

The Complainant has engaged in substantial sales, marketing, and continuous use of the RADIANCY mark since April 2020. The Complainant's products are sold online, including on Amazon.com. The Complainant maintains a significant social media presence. The Panel finds these factors demonstrate that the RADIANCY mark has acquired secondary meaning as a source identifier for the Complainant's products, sufficient to establish common law or unregistered trademark rights for the purposes of the Policy.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced 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.

Although the addition of other terms, here "get", 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.

As noted above, the Complainant alleges that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name does not meet the requirements for a bona fide offering of goods or services under the Policy. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent is not an authorized reseller or distributor, is not affiliated with or licensed by the Complainant, and is using the domain name to mimic the Complainant's website, sell products identical in appearance to the Complainant's products, and exploit the Complainant's rights and goodwill in the RADIANCY mark. The Complainant further alleges that the Respondent's website uses the Complainant's promotional images and content, thereby creating a false impression of association or endorsement.

Even if the Panel were to treat the Respondent's offering as genuine, the Panel notes that the Respondent's website does not accurately and prominently disclose its relationship (or lack thereof) with the Complainant. Rather, the Respondent's website gives an overall impression of being operated by the Complainant. The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent is not making legitimate use of the disputed domain name as an unauthorized reseller of the Complainant's products, and does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services pursuant to paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy. See *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. D2001-0903. See also WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.8. Indeed, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed as a copycat site and passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1.

The Panel finds that the mere listing of "Radiancy Store" in the registration information for the disputed domain name does not in itself support a claim of being commonly known by the disputed domain name as contemplated by paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name is manifestly commercial in nature. The Respondent is not making any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy.

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.

The composition of the disputed domain name, which incorporates the entirety of the Complainant's RADIANCY mark with the addition of the term "get", together with the timing of the registration after the Complainant had established goodwill and recognition in the mark, as well as the Respondent's subsequent use of the disputed domain name as described above, indicate that the Respondent was well aware of the Complainant and its rights at the time that it registered the disputed domain name. The Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the intent to create a misleading impression of association with the Complainant and to derive commercial gain by exploiting the Complainant's goodwill, in bad faith.

The Respondent's conduct in operating a website that uses the Complainant's promotional images and content demonstrates an intent to mislead consumers into believing that the Respondent's website is operated by or otherwise affiliated with the Complainant. The Panel finds that by using the disputed domain name in the manner described above, 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 RADIANCY mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website and products offered therein, in bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of 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 <getradiancy.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Jane Seager/
Jane Seager
Sole Panelist
Date: April 2, 2026