

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Jaded London Limited v. M Burger Kristin, Kristin M Burger, J Bosch Swen, Swen J Bosch, S Lang Silke, Silke S Lang
Case No. D2026-0730

1. The Parties

Complainant is Jaded London Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Lewis Silkin LLP, United Kingdom.

Respondents are M Burger Kristin, Kristin M Burger, J Bosch Swen, Swen J Bosch, and S Lang Silke, Silke S Lang, Germany.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <jadedlondonaustralia.com>, <jadedlondoncanada.com> and <jadedlondonuk.com> (the “Domain Names”) are registered with CNOBIN Information Technology Limited (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 20, 2026. On February 23, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Names. On February 24, 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 communication to Complainant on February 25, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting Complainant to either file separate complaints for the Domain Names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all Domain Names are under common control. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on March 3, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 6, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 26, 2026. Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondents' default on March 27, 2026.

The Center appointed Dinant T. L. Oosterbaan as the sole panelist in this matter on April 1, 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. Consolidation

This case concerns a complaint against three Respondents (referred to as "Respondent").

Complainant requests that the complaint involving the Domain Names against Respondent be consolidated. Complainant submits that the Domain Names are under common control:

- all Domain Names contain Complainant's JADED and JADED LONDON trademarks alongside the name of a country;
- all were registered through the same registrar, CNOBIN Information Technology Limited, on the same date;
- the Domain Names have nearly identical Whois data;
- the Domain Names all resolved to highly similar websites purporting to sell the same products;
- the registrant details all have the same postal address.

5. Factual Background

According to the information provided in the Complaint, Complainant has operated a clothing business under the JADED LONDON sign since 2013 and has become a coveted brand with many celebrities such as Beyoncé, Rita Ora, Cara Delevingne, Taylor Swift, and Ellie Goulding, frequently captured wearing Complainant's branded clothing and accessories. Complainant sells its products bearing the JADED LONDON logo through its core website "www.jadedldn.com" (registered on June 25, 2013) and through concessions in many of the world's largest and exclusive clothing retailers.

According to the evidence submitted, Complainant owns numerous registrations for the trademarks JADED and JADED LONDON, including:

- International Trademark Registration No. 1620672 for the word mark JADED, registration date March 30, 2021, and;
- International Trademark Registration No. 1854228 for the JADED LONDON figurative trademark, registration date August 30, 2024.

In addition, Complainant operates its core website "www.jadedldn.com" incorporating the JADED trademark.

The Domain Names were registered on July 22, 2025. At the time of the decision, the Domain Names do not resolve to an active website. Previously, the Domain Names resolved to websites that copy Complainant's figurative JADED LONDON trademark and the look and feel of Complainant's website.

The trademark registrations of Complainant were issued prior to the registration of the Domain Names.

6. 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.

Notably, Complainant contends that the Domain Names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights. The Domain Names incorporate Complainant's JADED trademark in its entirety. For the purposes of assessing identity and confusing similarity under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, it is permissible to ignore the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD").

Complainant submits that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Names. So far as Complainant is aware, Respondent does not own any registered rights in any trademarks which comprise part or all of the Domain Names. The combined mark JADED LONDON is not descriptive in any way when applied to clothing and fashion accessory products. Complainant has not given its consent to Respondent to use a virtually identical variation of its registered trademarks in domain name registrations. The Domain Names resolved to websites imitating Complainant's fashion retail business. Complainant submits that Respondent was posing as Complainant's business to sell counterfeit products bearing Complainant's registered trademarks. All three websites clearly reproduced Complainant's registered trademarks and offered branded clothing products for sale at prices significantly lower than the recommended retail price. The websites therefore bear all the hallmarks of counterfeit websites. By its very nature, use of the Domain Names in this manner cannot constitute a legitimate non-commercial interest in the Domain Names, nor can it constitute use of the Domain Names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods. The Domain Names no longer resolve to those websites following hosting complaints.

Complainant submits that the Domain Names were registered and are being used in bad faith. The Domain Names were registered over 10 years after Complainant acquired rights in the first of the JADED trademarks. Complainant submits that Respondent was aware of the reputation of Complainant's business under its JADED trademarks at the time the Domain Names were registered. Indeed, their awareness of Complainant's rights is confirmed by the fact that the Domain Names resolve to counterfeit websites containing Complainant's trademarks.

Complainant asserts that the Domain Names are being used in bad faith insofar as they resolved to websites that copied Complainant's trademarks and offered apparently counterfeit clothing and fashion accessory products for sale under the trademarks in a manner that is designed to create, for financial benefit, a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's rights. Complainant asserts that use of the Domain Names in this manner is the very essence of use in bad faith.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

7. Discussion and Findings

A. Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. Complainant alleges that the registrants of the Domain Names are under common control. Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the three registrants of the Domain Names pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The registrants of the Domain Names did not comment on 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 Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the 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 in particular notes that all three Domain Names contain Complainant's JADEL and JADEL LONDON trademarks alongside a country designation ("Australia", "Canada" and "UK"), and all three websites under the Domain Names copied Complainant's figurative JADEL LONDON trademark and the look and feel of Complainant's website. In the Panel's view, it is unlikely that these facts are coincidences but rather more likely that all Domain Names were registered and used by, and are under the control of the same person.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different registrants of the Domain Names in a single proceeding.

B. 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.

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 entirety of the JADEL and JADEL LONDON marks are reproduced within the Domain Names. Accordingly, the Domain Names are confusingly similar to the marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, "Australia", "Canada" and "UK" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such geographical terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Names and the marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

The gTLD ".com" is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.10](#), section 1.11.1.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

C. 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 Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names. Respondent has not rebutted Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise. Complainant has stated that Respondent does not own any registered rights in any trademarks which comprise part or all of the Domain Names. Based on the undisputed submission and evidence provided by Complainant, the Domain Names resolved to websites which uses Complainant's distinctive figurative trademark, copies without authorization the look and feel of Complainant's website and appears to sell counterfeit goods. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity such as impersonation/passing off and the sale of counterfeit goods can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

Moreover, the composition of the Domain Names together with the construction of the websites under the Domain Names are misleading and carry the risk of implied affiliation, which does not provide any indication as to how Respondent could possibly be seen as making a bona fide use of the Domain Names. Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Names, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert Internet users or to tarnish the trademarks of Complainant. The Panel does not consider such use a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name. Respondent is also not commonly known by the Domain Names nor has it acquired any trademark or service mark rights.

D. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, there is evidence of registration and use of a domain name in bad faith in the event Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the trademark of Complainant as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of Respondent's website or location or of a product or service offered on Respondent's website or location.

The Panel finds that the Domain Names have been registered and are being used in bad faith. Noting the status of the JADE and JADE LONDON marks and the overall circumstances of this case, the Panel finds it more likely than not that Respondent knew or should have known Complainant's JADE and JADE LONDON marks when registering the Domain Names. The registration of the Domain Names in awareness of the JADE and JADE LONDON trademarks and in the absence of rights or legitimate interests amounts under these circumstances to registration in bad faith.

The Panel notes that the Domain Names, which incorporate Complainant's JADE and JADE LONDON trademarks in their entirety, resolved to websites which copies without authorization the distinctive figurative JADE LONDON trademark of Complainant and the look and feel of Complainant's website, which indicates, in the circumstances of this case, that Respondent registered and used the Domain Names with the intention to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the trademarks of Complainant as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its websites or location or of a service on its websites or location, which constitutes registration and use in bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. In addition, the Panel takes into account that previous panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity such as impersonation/passing off and the sale of counterfeit goods constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. The fact that the Domain Names do not currently resolve to an active website does not prevent a finding of bad faith.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds Respondent's registration and use of the Domain Names constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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

8. 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, <jadedlondonaustralia.com>, <jadedlondoncanada.com> and <jadedlondonuk.com>, be transferred to Complainant.

/Dinant T. L. Oosterbaan/

Dinant T. L. Oosterbaan

Sole Panelist

Date: April 15, 2026