

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Stokomani SAS v. Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC
Case No. D2026-0683

1. The Parties

Complainant is Stokomani SAS, France, represented by Ebrand France, France.

Respondent is Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC, Saint Kitts and Nevis.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <stokomanie.com> and <stokomanie-fr.com> (the “Domain Names”) are registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 17, 2026. On February 18, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Names. On February 18, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Names which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email to Complainant on February 20, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on February 20, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on February 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 15, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on March 16, 2026.

The Center appointed Robert A. Badgley as the sole panelist in this matter on March 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

Complainant alleges:

“Stokomani is a French chain of brand outlet stores. Founded in 1961, the brand had 151 stores in 2024. Its product range is divided into six categories: fashion, health and beauty, home decor, household goods, toys, and seasonal products.”

Complainant holds various trademark registrations, including International Reg. No. 1720706 for the figurative mark STOKOMANI, DES MARQUES, DES PRIX, registered on February 13, 2023, and French Reg. No. 3927695 for the word mark STOKOMANI, registered on June 28, 2013.

Complainant also owns the domain names <stokomani.com> and <stokomani.fr>, both registered on December 28, 1999. The latter domain name resolves to Complainant’s main commercial website.

The Domain Name <stokomanie.com> was registered on January 14, 2026, and the Domain Name <stokomanie-fr.com> was registered on January 29, 2026. The Whois information for both Domain Names indicates that the same entity registered both Domain Names.

According to Complainant:

“The disputed domain name <stokomanie.com> was redirecting to a webpage that was impersonating Stokomani. This site was a mirror page of the Complainant’s official website, replicating its graphic identity.”

Annexed to the Complaint is a screenshot corroborating this allegation. Complainant states that on January 27, 2026, it sent a letter to the Registrar requesting that this website be taken down. The Domain Name <stokomanie.com> currently resolves to an error page. It does not appear from the record that the Domain Name <stokomanie-fr.com> has ever resolved to an active website.

Respondent did not deny any of the foregoing allegations.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Names.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant’s contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists the three elements which Complainant must satisfy with respect to each of the Domain Names:

- (i) the Domain Names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Names; and
- (iii) the Domain Names have been registered and are 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 Complainant's trademark and the Domain Names. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Panel finds that Complainant has rights in the trademark STOKOMANI through registration and use demonstrated in the record. The Panel also finds that the Domain Names are confusingly similar to that mark. Both Domain Names entirely incorporate the trademark and add the letter "e" to the end of the mark. One of the Domain Names adds to this a hyphen and "fr". Notwithstanding these minor differences, the STOKOMANI mark remains clearly visible within the Domain Names.

Complainant has established Policy paragraph 4(a)(i).

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

For each of the Domain Names, pursuant to paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, Respondent may establish its rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name, among other circumstances, by showing any of the following elements:

- (i) before any notice to you [Respondent] of the dispute, your use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or
- (ii) you [Respondent] (as an individual, business, or other organization) have been commonly known by the Domain Name, even if you have acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or
- (iii) you [Respondent] are making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

The Panel concludes that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Names. Respondent has not come forward in this proceeding to articulate any bona fide basis for registering the Domain Names. The undisputed record shows that Respondent used one of the Domain Names to create a website essentially identical to Complainant's site, in what appears to be a clear case of impersonation. The fact that STOKOMANI is not a dictionary term creates a powerful likelihood that the Domain Names, with their additional "e", are classic instances of typosquatting. The addition of "fr" to one of the Domain Names further suggests that Respondent was aware of Complainant and its mark, since Complainant is best known in the country of its founding, France. On the record here, the Panel finds it obvious that Respondent targeted Complainant and its mark in order to impersonate Complainant and thereby derive illegitimate financial gain from such consumer confusion.

Complainant has established Policy paragraph 4(a)(ii).

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

For each of the Domain Names, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides that the following circumstances, "in particular but without limitation," are evidence of the registration and use of the Domain Names in "bad faith":

- (i) circumstances indicating that Respondent has registered or has acquired the Domain Names primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the Domain Names registration to Complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of its documented out of pocket costs directly related to the Domain Names; or
- (ii) that Respondent has registered the Domain Names in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that Respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) that Respondent has registered the Domain Names primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) that by using the Domain Names, Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to Respondent's website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of Respondent's website or location or of a product or service on Respondent's website or location.

The Panel concludes, on the undisputed record here, that Respondent has registered and used the Domain Names in bad faith. The Panel incorporates its discussion above in the "Rights or Legitimate Interests" section. The Panel concludes that Respondent registered the Domain Names in order to target Complainant and its trademark for improper commercial gain, in violation of the above-quoted Policy paragraph 4(b)(iv).

Complainant has established Policy paragraph 4(a)(iii).

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 Domain Names <stokomanie.com> and <stokomanie-fr.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Robert A. Badgley/

Robert A. Badgley

Sole Panelist

Date: March 25, 2026