ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Naturewell LLC v. Vincenzo Godiva
Case No. D2026-0701

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Naturewell LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by FOUNDATION LAW GROUP LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Vincenzo Godiva, Cambodia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <naturewellmelrose.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 18, 2026. On February 19, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 19, 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 Respondents (Domains By Proxy, LLC; Naturewell 2 Organic Juice Bar LLC; Vahe Martirosyan; and Arevig Gevorkian) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 20, 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 26, 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 March 2, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 22, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 23, 2026.

The Center appointed Assen Alexiev as the sole panelist in this matter on March 27, 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 Los Angeles-based juice bar offering freshly-prepared juices, smoothies, lemonades and acai bowls. The Complainant's official website is located at the domain name <naturewelljuice.com>.

The Complainant is the owner of the United States trademark NATUREWELL (word) with registration No. 5885321, registered on October 15, 2019, for goods and services in International Classes 32 and 43, with claimed date of first use in March 2006 (the "NATUREWELL trademark").

The disputed domain name was registered on May 24, 2020. It resolves to a website that displays the logo:



The website has the title "Organic Juice Bar Near You in LA - Naturewell Melrose" and offers smoothies, juices and similar goods. The website indicates an address in Los Angeles, California, and a phone number with a code for the same area.

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 states that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its NATUREWELL trademark, because it incorporates the entirety of this trademark. The Complainant adds that the disputed domain name is substantially similar to the Complainant's domain name <naturewelljuice.com>, and the content posted at the website at the disputed domain name by the Respondent offers competing and infringing juice goods and services.

The Complainant submits that it commenced an infringement action against the entities Naturewell 2 Organic Juice Bar LLC, Vahe Martirosyan and Arevig Gevorkian, and on September 17, 2024, it entered into a settlement agreement with these entities, whereby they agreed not to use the disputed domain name for any purpose. The defendants in the infringement action took down the website at the disputed domain name immediately following the conclusion of the settlement, but then started using the disputed domain name again around September 2025, posting new infringing content. The Complainant adds that it sent a notice of the current infringement and a takedown notice to these entities on January 13, 2026. A response was received on January 22, 2026, that they will "be in touch shortly", but no further response was received and the infringing content at the disputed domain name remained active as of the date of filing of the Complaint.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, because it does not use it in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, but attempts to divert the Complainant's customers to the Respondent's juice business for commercial gain. The Complainant notes that the website at the disputed domain name offers juice and juice bar goods and services competing with the Complainant and infringing its trademark.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. According to it, after the Respondent had initially used the disputed domain name to infringe the Complainant's trademark, it then agreed to cease all use of the disputed domain name following a settlement of a filed lawsuit claiming such infringement. However, around September of 2025 the Respondent again placed infringing content on the disputed domain name, and is currently using it in breach of the settlement agreement and in bad faith to reroute the Complainant's customers to the Respondent's website, creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's company and website.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions. The Panel notes that the Complainant included within the section about the Respondent in the Amended Complaint information concerning Naturewell 2 Organic Juice Bar LLC, Vahe Martirosyan and Arevig Gevorkian, which are identified later on in the Amended Complaint as "Naturewell 2 Organic Juice Bar LLC", (owners of the infringing content seen at the URL). While it may be that these (individually or conjunctively) are actually using the disputed domain name, it is unclear what is the relationship between these and the registrant of the disputed domain name (i.e. Vincenzo Godiva with an address purportedly in Cambodia). The Panel notes the definition of Respondent as per the Rules, and will proceed considering the Registrar's confirmed registrant of the disputed domain name (i.e. Vincenzo Godiva) as the Respondent. However, the Panel further notes that references to the registration and use by the Respondent shall be construed to include the final holder of the disputed domain name (if there is any difference to the Respondent).

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 the NATUREWELL trademark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the NATURELWELL mark is recognisable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the NATUREWELL trademark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, "melrose") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such 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 recognised 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 disputed domain name incorporates the entirety of the Complainant's NATUREWELL trademark in combination with the element "melrose", which is the name of the avenue in Los Angeles, where the Respondent's store is located. This is also the same city where the Complainant operates, and the composition of the disputed domain name creates an appearance that it is one of the official locations of the Complainant. This appearance is further strengthened by the content of the Respondent's website, which offers the same goods as the Complainant and does not identify the provider of these goods. As stated by the Complainant and not denied by the Respondent, the Complainant filed an infringement action against the persons operating its website and the associated physical store, who then entered into a settlement with the Complainant and agreed to not to use the disputed domain name, but then started using it again to compete with the Complainant. While the Complainant referred to Naturewell 2 Organic Juice Bar LLC within the Respondent's section of the Amended Complaint, the Panel considers that the existence of such company (even if related to the Respondent) would not in itself give rise to rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name under the Policy, particularly noting that the Complainant was operating in the same business field and city as the Respondent but before the Respondent registered the disputed domain name. Furthermore, the Panel notes the Complainant's unrebutted contention that "use of the domain has been to re-route Complainant's legitimate customers, those looking for Complainant's juice store and website, through direct links on the URL to Respondent's new juice business named MELROSE SQUEEZE". Such use would not give rise to rights or legitimate interests under the Policy.

Considering the above, and in the absence of any denial or contrary evidence, the Panel finds that the Respondent has targeted the Complainant and its trademark with the registration and use of the disputed domain name to carry out competing commercial activities. Such conduct cannot give rise to rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel therefore finds that 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 disputed domain name incorporates the entirety of the Complainant's NATUREWELL trademark and the evidence in the case shows that it has been used for offering of the exact same goods as the Complainant. It is unlikely this to be a coincidence. After the operator of the website at the disputed domain name agreed to stop using it in order to settle the infringement action bought against it by the Complainant, it nevertheless recommenced using it to compete with the Complainant. All this supports a conclusion that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark and in an attempt to receive commercial gain by confusing and attracting Internet users to its website to offer them competing goods. This supports a conclusion of registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith under Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel therefore finds that the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 <naturewellmelrose.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Assen Alexiev/
Assen Alexiev
Sole Panelist
Date: April 10, 2026