ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Boll & Branch LLC v. dantangchun
Case No. D2026-1199

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Boll & Branch LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Keating Muething & Klekamp PLL, United States.

The Respondent is dantangchun, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <boll-branch.com> is registered with Bangning Digital Technology Co.,Ltd (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on March 19, 2026. On March 20, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 21, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 24, 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 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 27, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 16, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on April 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Philippe Gilliéron as the sole panelist in this matter on April 24, 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 limited liability company active in the textile industry that was established in 2014. The Complainant notably sells high-quality luxury bedding products and apparel.

The Complainant owns several word trademarks consisting of the terms BOLL & BRANCH, such as:

- United States trademark No. 4769218 that was registered on July 7, 2015 in class 24 of the Nice Classification;
- United States trademark No. 5585449 that was registered on October 16, 2018 in classes 20 and 24 of the Nice Classification;
- United States trademark No. 7812249 that was registered on May 27, 2025 in class 20 of the Nice Classification.

The Complainant further holds the domain name <bollandbranch.com> to carry out its online activities.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 17, 2025. The disputed domain name leads to a website that claims to sell bedding products and apparel under the Complainant's trademark at significantly discounted prices. The copyright notice in the footer of the website refers to "2025 Boll & Branch Living Store" and the website reproduces photographs of the Complainant's products from a prior version of the Boll & Branch official website.

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 is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark as it entirely incorporates it.

The Complainant further affirms that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not commonly known by the domain name. The Respondent did not acquire any trademark or service mark rights in the name. Further, the Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use its trademark in any way. The use made of the disputed domain name cannot be considered a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Finally, the Complainant is of the view that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. In light of the fact that the Respondent copied Complainant's logo and product images on the website attached to the disputed domain name, there is no doubt that the Respondent was well aware of the Complainant's trademark when it registered the disputed domain name. The use made of the disputed domain name, which is meant to impersonate the Complainant, amounts to a use in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to "[…] decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable".

Pursuant to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove each of the following three elements to obtain an order that the disputed domain name should be cancelled or transferred:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or a service mark in which the Complainant has rights;

(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 entirety of the mark, save for the ampersand, is reproduced 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.

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.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name is used for a website offering for sale the Complainant's products at significantly discounted prices, reproducing the Complainant's trademark and "2025 Boll &

Branch Living Store" in the copyright notice in the footer, all without indicating its lack of relationship with the Complainant, which does not amount to a bona fide offering.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent was obviously aware of the Complainant's trademark when it registered the dispute domain name, as evidenced by the copying of the Complainant's trademark and product images on the website attached to the disputed domain name.

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.

The Panel finds the use of the disputed domain name indicates the Respondent's intention to mislead Internet users into believing that the website is operated by the Complainant, which constitutes bad faith. 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 <boll-branch.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Philippe Gilliéron/
Philippe Gilliéron
Sole Panelist
Date: April 30, 2026