ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Adanola Limited v. stokesk stokesk
Case No. D2026-1222

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Adanola Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Com Laude Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is stokesk stokesk, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <adanolawear.com> is registered with TuringSign Inc. d/b/a Cosmotown (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on March 20, 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 22, 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 23, 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 24, 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 26, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 15, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on April 16, 2026.

The Center appointed Lorenz Ehrler as the sole panelist in this matter on April 22, 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 company that was founded in 2015 and incorporated in 2018. It is active in the fields of design, manufacture and sale of clothing, footwear and accessories. It distributes its products internationally, primarily through its official website at "www.adanola.com". It has grown considerably over the last years and reached, in 2024, USD 112 million in sales worldwide.

The Complainant holds in particular the following trademarks:

- United Kingdom trademark ADANOLA, no. UK00003152822, registered on May 27, 2016, in class 25;

- European Union trademark ADANOLA, no. 018310759, registered on February 24, 2021, in classes 18, 25 and 35; and

- United States trademark ADANOLA, no. 7732312, registered on March 18, 2025, in classes 18, 25 and 35.

The Complainant holds the domain name <adanola.com> and operates an online boutique at the corresponding web address, "www.adanola.com", offering and selling its products worldwide.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name <adanolawear.com> on February 28, 2026. The disputed domain name resolves to an online boutique that prominently features the Complainant's Adanola trademark and offers Adanola-branded products for sale at very competitive prices.

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.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its ADANOLA trademarks. It stresses the fact that the additional element "wear" in the disputed domain name does not reduce the risk of confusion.

Furthermore, the Complainant states that the Respondent is not affiliated or related to it in any way, and that it did not authorize the Respondent to use the trademark in question. The Complainant considers that the Respondent, not being an authorised reseller, is not entitled to use the ADANOLA trademark in the disputed domain name that resolves to an online boutique on which ADANOLA products are offered for sale.

Lastly, the Complainant contends that the Respondent used the disputed domain name and the website to which they resolved in a way to create confusion with the Complainant's trademark ADANOLA, which in its view constitutes bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that:

(i) the disputed domain name registered by the Respondent 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

The Complainant holds several trademarks for ADANOLA which are registered, in particular, in international class 25 (clothing) in the United Kingdom, the European Union, the United States and in many other countries. The trademarks put forward by the Complainant are sufficient to found the Complaint.

Under the UDRP, the identity or confusing similarity requirement under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires identity or confusing similarity between the complainant's trademarks and the respondent's domain name. There is no requirement of similarity of goods and/or services (e.g., *AIB-Vincotte Belgium ASBL, AIB-Vincotte USA Inc./Corporation Texas v. Guillermo Lozada, Jr.,* WIPO Case No. D2005-0485).

The existence of a confusing similarity within the meaning of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy makes no doubt in the present case. Taking into account that the trademark ADANOLA is contained entirely in the disputed domain name, the other element of the disputed domain name, i.e. the word "wear" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

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

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant contends that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant has shown that it owns ADANOLA trademarks, and it has explicitly contested having granted the Respondent any right to use its trademarks. The Complainant has thus made a prima facie showing that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. In line with previous UDRP panel decisions, this means, in principle, that the burden of production shifts to the Respondent (e.g., *Belupo d.d. v. WACHEM d.o.o*, WIPO Case No. D2004-0110; and *Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. D2003-0455).

However, as results from the case file, the Respondent offers for sale clothing goods identical or similar to those offered by the Complainant, by using the distinctive sign ADANOLA. Even though it is unclear whether the goods offered on the Respondent's website which is operated under the disputed domain name are genuine products or counterfeits, and even though the Respondent did not identify itself on its website, the Panel must consider the hypothetical (but rather unlikely) case that the goods offered are genuine, and therefore examine whether the website meets the Oki Data criteria (*Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. D2001-0903).

While the Complainant (possibly) meets the first two requirements, namely that (i) it must be offering the goods or services at issue; and (ii) that it must use the website to exclusively offer goods under the trademark contained in the disputed domain name, it clearly fails to overcome the hurdle of the third requirement. The third requirement is that the website must accurately disclose the Respondent's relationship with the Complainant. In the present case, this is far from being the case, as the Respondent's website does not contain any indications whatsoever clarifying the identity and the relationship of the Respondent with the Complainant (e.g., as an authorised distributor). To the contrary, its website creates the false impression that the Internet user is on the trademark owner's website, thus causing confusion.

The word string "adanolawear" actually constitutes an indication that clothing goods of the Complainant's can be purchased on or through the Respondent's website, and therefore even increases the risk of confusion (*Rockefeller & Co., Inc. v. All Value Network a/k/a AVN*, WIPO Case No. D2011-1957). As a result, the Oki Data principles do not show any legitimate use made by the Respondent as a distributor of (possibly) genuine ADANOLA clothing goods.

Since no other legitimate use is likely, the Panel reaches the conclusion that the Complainant has made a prima facie showing that the Respondent does not use the disputed domain names for legitimate commercial or fair use purposes.

The Respondent having failed to respond to the Complaint, this Panel concludes that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy provides that the Complainant must, in addition to the matters set out above, demonstrate that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. The undisputed prima facie evidence establishes that the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has no license or other authorisation to use the Complainant's trademark or name.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name well after the Complainant's mark was in use and became known within its specific product market. The Panel finds that the Respondent must have known about the Complainant's trademark and business when registering the disputed domain name. Given the use to which the Respondent put the disputed domain name, it seems impossible to this Panel that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's trademark at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent's choice of the disputed domain name, which incorporates the ADANOLA trademark, and its offering of clothing goods identical or similar to the Complainant's under the latter's trademark ADANOLA, shows indeed that the Respondent was aware of the existence of the Complainant's trademark ADANOLA.

Even in the unlikely event that the Respondent offered genuine ADANOLA clothing goods (e.g. as a non-authorised reseller) rather than counterfeits, the misleading of Internet users and consumers into thinking that the Respondent is, in one way or another, connected to, sponsored by or affiliated with the Complainant and its business, or that the Respondent's activities are approved or endorsed by the Complainant, indicates bad faith (*Swarovski Aktiengesellschaft v. bingbing chen*, WIPO Case No. D2011-1524). In the present case, the Respondent actually intended to impersonate the Complainant by creating the impression that the website at the disputed domain name was the Complainant's. It is thus clear that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks (*Tottenham Hotspur Limited v. [Name redacted] and Maurice Buckhanna*, WIPO Case No. D2025-2937). Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Respondent has not submitted any evidence to rebut the Complainant's claims and assertions. In the absence of such evidence and based on the evidence submitted by the Complainant and having regard to all the relevant circumstances, the Panel accepts the Complainant's contentions that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith within the meaning 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 <adanolawear.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Lorenz Ehrler/
Lorenz Ehrler
Sole Panelist
Date: May 5, 2026