

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Renfro LLC v. Liudmyla Veselovska and Auwal Haruna
Case No. D2026-0992

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Renfro LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Enns & Archer LLP, United States.

The Respondents are Liudmyla Veselovska and Auwal Haruna, Ukraine.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The first disputed domain name <kbell-socks.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. and the second disputed domain name <thebellssocks.com> is registered with Dynadot, Inc. (the “Registrars”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 6, 2026. On March 9, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar NameCheap, Inc. a request for registrar verification in connection with the first disputed domain name. On March 10, 2026, the Registrar NameCheap, Inc. transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the first disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (Name Redacted *c/o* Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 11, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar NameCheap, Inc., and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on March 13, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 16, 2026. Thereafter, on March 23, 2026, the Complainant sent a communication to the Center requesting the addition of a second disputed domain name <thekbellsocks.com> to the Complaint. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 5, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on April 8, 2026.

The Center appointed Vincent Denoyelle as the sole panelist in this matter on April 15, 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.

On April 30, 2026, upon request of the Panel, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar Dynadot, Inc. a request for registrar verification in connection with the second disputed domain name. On May 5, 2026, the Registrar Dynadot, Inc. transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the second disputed domain name.

On May 7, 2026, the Panel issued a Procedural Order No. 1 (the "Order"), regarding the Complainant's request to add the second disputed domain name <thekbellsocks.com> to this proceeding. The Order provided the registrant and contact information to the Complainant in order to give it the opportunity to submit further arguments, and granted the Respondents a seven-day period (i.e., through May 19, 2026) to submit their comments, if any, to the submission of the Complainant. The Complainant communicated its submission relating to the second disputed domain name on May 11, 2026. The Respondents did not send any response or communication.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant designs, manufactures and markets socks and legwear products.

The Complainant owns the following K BELL trade mark:

- United States Registration K BELL No. 2440664 registered on April 3, 2001.

The Complainant has registered the domain name <kbellssocks.com> in 1998.

The disputed domain name <kbell-socks.com> was registered on September 18, 2025 and the second disputed domain name <thekbellsocks.com> was registered on March 11, 2026.

The first disputed domain name <kbell-socks.com> used to point to a website fraudulently impersonating the Complainant. Subsequently (after the filing of the Complaint) the first disputed domain name <kbell-socks.com> redirected to the second disputed domain name <thekbellsocks.com> which consists of the same content fraudulently impersonating the Complainant as that initially available at the first disputed domain name.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the K BELL trade mark of the Complainant since they both incorporate the entirety of the Complainant's trade mark with the addition of generic words that do not act to reduce such confusing similarity.

The Complainant highlights the fact that the content associated with the disputed domain names constitutes an attempt to fraudulently impersonate the Complainant and therefore constitutes an intrinsically illegitimate use of the disputed domain names.

The Complainant considers that given (i) its K BELL trade mark significantly predates the registration of the disputed domain names and (ii) the illegitimate use of the disputed domain names, the Respondent must have registered and is using the disputed domain names in bad faith.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Procedural Issue – Location of the Respondents

Under paragraph 10 of the Rules, the Panel is required to ensure that the Parties are treated with equality and that each Party is given a fair opportunity to present its case, and also that the administrative proceedings take place with due expedition.

The location of the Respondents disclosed by the Registrars appears to be in Ukraine, which is subject to an international conflict at the date of this Decision that may impact case notification. It is therefore appropriate for the Panel to consider, in accordance with its discretion under paragraph 10 of the Rules, whether the proceedings should continue.

Having considered all the circumstances of the case, the Panel is of the view that it should.

The Panel notes that the Center notified the Respondents of the proceedings by electronic means to all available email addresses, as well as by fax and postal means. The record suggests that the above mentioned electronic and postal notifications were delivered.

The Panel concludes that the Parties have been given a fair opportunity to present their case, and so that the administrative proceeding takes place with due expedition, the Panel will proceed to a Decision accordingly.

6.2. Addition of a second disputed domain name

The Complainant has requested the addition of a domain name to the Complaint after the Complaint had been notified to the first Respondent and the proceedings had formally started. It is generally accepted, that such requests would be denied, since the addition of a domain name may delay the proceedings, which are expected to be carried out with due expedition.

However, whenever there is sufficient indication that a respondent is trying to frustrate the proceedings, e.g. by registration of an additional domain name subsequent to the notification of a complaint, the subsequent addition of a domain name to pending proceedings may be reasonable and justified. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.12.2.

In the present case, and following the issuance of the Order, the Panel believes that the subsequent addition of the second disputed domain name is exceptionally admissible, as (i) the Respondent of the second disputed domain name shares the same contact details as the Respondent of the first disputed domain name and (ii) the second disputed domain name was registered only a few days after notification of the Complaint to the Registrar NameCheap, Inc., obviously to frustrate the proceedings and to replace the website previously associated to the first disputed domain name.

In light of the above, the Panel believes it to be fair and practical, and not prejudicial to the Respondent for the second disputed domain name to be considered as part of this proceeding.

6.3. Consolidation of Respondents

As neither the Policy nor the Rules explicitly provides provisions for the consolidation of claims against multiple respondents into a single administrative proceeding, UDRP panels generally apply the principles for consolidation as set out at section 4.11 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

Section 4.11.2 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) states the following: “Where a complaint is filed against multiple respondents, panels look at 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. Procedural efficiency would also underpin panel consideration of such a consolidation scenario.” See also, *Speedo Holdings B.V. v. Programmer, Miss Kathy Beckerson, John Smitt, Matthew Simmons*, WIPO Case No. [D2010-0281](#).

In this regard, previous UDRP panels particularly considered the following aspects in determining whether consolidation is appropriate: similarities in or relevant aspects of (i) the registrants’ contact information, (ii) the content or layout of websites corresponding to the disputed domain names, (iii) whether the registrants are targeting a specific sector, and (iv) the relevant language/scripts of the disputed domain names.

The Panel is convinced that both disputed domain names are under common control as (i) both Respondents use the exact same email address and (ii) the first disputed domain name redirects to the second disputed domain name.

Given that none of the Respondents have raised any objection to the Complainant’s consolidation request, the Panel finds that the consolidation of multiple respondents is procedurally efficient, fair, and reasonable to all Parties.

The Panel therefore, for the purpose of this decision, accepts the case to be dealt with in a consolidated Complaint and will refer, whenever appropriate, to the Respondents as “the Respondent” below.

6.4. Substantive Considerations

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 trade mark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the K BELL trade mark is reproduced within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the K BELL trade mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, respectively, “-socks” for the first disputed domain name and “the” and “socks” for the second disputed domain name, 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 names and the K BELL trade 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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed fraudulent impersonation, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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.

The disputed domain names reproduce the exact K BELL trade mark of the Complainant and this is unlikely to be a coincidence given the overall circumstances of the present case including (i) the fact that the disputed domain names were registered relatively recently and many years after the registration of the trade mark K BELL, (ii) the choice of targeted generic word appended to the K BELL trade mark in the disputed domain names, “socks”, which corresponds to the exact type of product sold by the Complainant under the K BELL trade mark, and (iii) the fact that the second disputed domain name was registered after the notification of the Complaint to the Registrar.

The Panel thus finds that the disputed domain names have been registered in bad faith.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed fraudulent impersonation, 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 names 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 names <kbell-socks.com> and <thebellsocks.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Vincent Denoyelle/

Vincent Denoyelle

Sole Panelist

Date: May 27, 2026