

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

PWHL Holdings, LLC v. henris henris  
Case No. D2026-0732

### **1. The Parties**

Complainant is PWHL Holdings, LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Day Pitney LLP, United States

Respondent is henris henris, United States.

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

The disputed domain name <thepwhlstore.com> is registered with Cosmotown, Inc. (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 disputed domain name. On February 25, 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 (Unknown Registrant) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on February 26, 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 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 4, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 24, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 27, 2026.

The Center appointed Lorelei Ritchie as the sole panelist in this matter on April 10, 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 is a limited liability corporation based in the United States. Since 2024, Complainant has offered sports entertainment services via the Professional Women's Hockey League as well as related clothing and merchandise under the mark PWHL. Complainant is the owner of several registrations for its PWHL mark, whose filings and registration dates predate Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name. These registrations include United States Registration Nos. 7755764 (registered April 8, 2025) and 7820920 (registered June 3, 2025).

The disputed domain name was registered on January 22, 2026. Respondent has used the URL associated with the disputed domain name to resolve to a website that mimics Complainant's website, including prominent display of Complainant's marks without any disclaimer of affiliation. Respondent has no affiliation with Complainant, and no authorization to use Complainant's marks.

#### **5. Parties' Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

Complainant contends that (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to Complainant's trademarks, (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; and (iii) Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Specifically, Complainant contends that it owns rights to the PWHL mark. Complainant contends that it has used the "well-known" PWHL mark for its services as "the premier professional women's ice hockey league in North America" and for related merchandise, including clothing. Complainant contends that the disputed domain name clearly references Complainant's PWHL mark, with the addition only of the dictionary terms "the" and "store" which were "specifically chosen with the intention of being confusingly similar" to the online store services offered by Complainant via the website located at "http://shop.thepwhl.com".

Complainant asserts that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and rather has registered and is using it in bad faith, presumably for Respondent's own commercial gain, in an attempt at "blatantly impersonating Complainant's official retail webpage". Complainant further asserts that Respondent does not appear to be selling goods but rather to be operating a "scam" website to defraud consumers seeking Complainant's goods and services.

##### **B. Respondent**

Respondent did not reply to 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.

Complainant has shown rights in respect of the PWHL mark, for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1. The Panel finds that the PWHL mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which Complainant has rights in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

## **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 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.

Prior UDRP Panels have indicated that a reseller may be considered to have rights or legitimate interests in a mark, provided certain requirements are met. These generally include that: (i) the site is actually offering the goods at issue; (ii) the site is used only to sell the trademarked goods; (iii) the site accurately and prominently discloses the registrant’s relationship to the mark holder; and (iv) respondent does not try to “corner the market” in domain names that reflect the mark. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.8; see also *Ok! Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#).

The Panel finds that these qualifications are not fulfilled by the website associated with the disputed domain name. Rather, to the extent that any legitimate goods or services may be offered via the disputed domain name, the associated website does not appear to include a disclaimer of affiliation or endorsement by Complainant, and rather includes unauthorized display of Complainant’s marks and the legend “The Official US Shop of the PWHL”. Respondent has not put forward any claims or evidence that would suggest rights or legitimate interests for the purposes of the Policy.

The Panel finds that Complainant has provided sufficient evidence of Respondent’s lack of “rights or legitimate interests” in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy which Respondent has not rebutted.

## **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

There are several ways that a complainant can demonstrate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith. As noted in Section 4 of this Panel’s decision, the record includes evidence that Respondent has used the URL associated with the disputed domain name to resolve to a website that mimics Complainant’s own website, with prominent display of Complainant’s marks, and with no disclaimer of affiliation. The Panel thus finds sufficient evidence that Respondent was aware of Complainant’s rights and Complainant’s marks at the time of registering the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

The Panel finds sufficient evidence that Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith for purposes of paragraph (4)(a)(iii) 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 <thepwhlstore.com> be transferred to Complainant.

*/Lorelei Ritchie/*

**Lorelei Ritchie**

Sole Panelist

Date: April 20, 2026