ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
EE Holding Group LLC v. Michelle Genntry
Case No. D2026-0903

1. The Parties

The Complainant is EE Holding Group LLC, United States of America ("USA" or "US"), represented by The Sladkus Law Group, US.

The Respondent is Michelle Genntry, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ericofficialstore.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 28, 2026. On March 3, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 4, 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 (Redacted for Privacy / Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 4, 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 March 4, 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 9, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 29, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on April 2, 2026.

The Center appointed Fabrizio Bedarida 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

The Complainant in this administrative proceeding, EE Holding Group, LLC, is the holding company that owns all the intellectual property of the ERIC EMANUEL brand, including all trademark rights, and is the current owner of its global trademark portfolio.

Eric Emanuel is an independent sportswear designer. He rose to fame in the fashion industry by designing custom python basketball jerseys, which became popular among world-famous musical artists like Travis Scott, A$AP Rocky, Future, and others.

Today, his sportswear collection is widely recognized for its signature EE mesh shorts, which are made in the USA, and ongoing sneaker and apparel collaborations with brands like Adidas, Reebok, and New Era.

Authentic ERIC EMANUEL brand goods are sold retail-only through the brand's official website at "www.ericemanuel.com", at one of five bricks-and-mortar ERIC EMANUEL retail stores located in New York, Miami, and Las Vegas, and through other authorized retailers with whom the brand has partnered.

The Complainant owns various trademarks including ERIC EMANUEL, EE, and the stylized EE design mark (the "EE Logo").

The Complainant is, inter alia, the owner of:

US Trademark Registration number 8025275 for ERIC EMANUEL (word), filed on September 22, 2023, and registered on November 11, 2025.

US Trademark Registration number 6721224 for ERIC EMANUEL (word), filed on December 3, 2020, and registered on May 24, 2022.

US Trademark Registration number 7310338 for EE (two letters combined in stylized form), filed on February 24, 2023, and registered on February 20, 2024.

International Trademark Registration number 1762468 for ERIC EMANUEL (word), filed and registered on October 11, 2023.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 14, 2023. Currently, the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive webpage displaying the message "401 Authorization Required". From submissions provided by the Complainant, it appears that previously (at least, on February 26, 2026), the disputed domain name directed to a webpage displaying the title "Eric Emanuel Original Clothing Store / Eric Emanuel ®" and offering purported ERIC EMANUEL branded goods for sale under the EE Logo and brand.

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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name consists of the ERIC EMANUEL trademarks together with the generic terms "official" and "store" and the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com". The Complainant thus asserts that for the purposes of the first element of the Policy, the partial reproduction of the Complainant's trademark combined with other generic terms in the domain name is sufficient to find confusingly similarity and satisfy the Complainant's burden of proof. See *EE Holding Group LLC v. Yi Shan \u5ee3*, WIPO Case No. D2025-5459; *EE Holding Group LLC v. THE Media*, WIPO Case No. D2024-1315; and *EE Holding Group LLC v. Mudassar Malik, newtech*, WIPO Case No. D2024-2213.

The Complainant, quoting *EE Holding Group LLC v. THE Media*, WIPO Case No. D2024-1315, further claims that "in some instances, panels have taken note of the content of the website associated with a domain name to confirm confusing similarity whereby it appears prima facie that the respondent seeks to target a trademark through the disputed domain name".

The Complainant thus affirms that owing to the fact that the disputed domain name resolves to a website with a title that includes 'Eric Emanuel' and that offers for sale branded goods with the Complainant's EE device trademark, the Respondent is clearly targeting the Complainant's trademark. The Respondent's fraudulent website and counterfeiting alone is sufficient to prove that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Finally, concerning the Respondent's bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name, the Complainant claims that using the disputed domain name to host a website selling a variety of counterfeit ERIC EMANUEL branded clothing is evidence of bad faith use. In addition, considering the Respondent's incorporation of the Complainant's distinctive trademark into the disputed domain name, and the content of the related website, it appears that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademark rights at the time it registered the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

In order for the Complainant to obtain a transfer of the disputed domain name, paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that the Complainant must demonstrate to the Panel that:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
(ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
(iii) the disputed domain name has been 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 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 disputed domain name reproduces the element "ERIC" of the ERIC EMANUEL trademark, together with the dictionary words "official" and "store".

As cited by the Complainant, UDRP panels have found that the overall facts and circumstances of a case (including relevant website content) may support a finding of confusing similarity, particularly where it appears prima facie that the respondent seeks to target a trademark through the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.15.

In the present case, the disputed domain name resolved to a website with a title that includes the ERIC EMANUEL trademark and that offered for sale branded goods with the Complainant's EE device trademark. It therefore appears that the Respondent seeks to target the Complainant's trademarks through the disputed domain name, and that the Respondent presumably registered the disputed domain name because it believed that it was confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks.

The Panel thus finds the mark is recognizable 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, "official" and "store", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal and illegitimate activities, here claimed as the sale of counterfeit goods and impersonation/passing-off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1.

The disputed domain name previously resolved to a website with a title which included the Complainant's ERIC EMANUEL trademark, and which offered for sale branded goods with the Complainant's EE device trademark. According to the Complainant, these goods are counterfeit. The Respondent has not submitted a Response nor denied the Complainant's claims. The Panel therefore accepts that the goods offered for sale on the Respondent's website are not authorized and presumably counterfeit. Such use of the disputed domain name cannot give rise to rights or legitimate interests in it.

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.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.1.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent used the disputed domain name to host a website claiming to be "Eric Emanuel Original Clothing Store / Eric Emanuel ®", and offering for sale EE-branded goods unauthorized by the Complainant. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal and illegitimate activities, here claimed as the sale of counterfeit goods and impersonation/passing off constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under 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 <ericofficialstore.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Fabrizio Bedarida/
Fabrizio Bedarida
Sole Panelist
Date: April 20, 2026