

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Alex Mill Company, LLC v. huapusjmn huapusjmn and Risawa Atsutomu
Case No. D2026-1336

1. The Parties

Complainant is Alex Mill Company, LLC, United States of America ("United States" or "U.S."), represented by Tucker & Latifi, LLP, United States.

Respondent is huapusjmn huapusjmn and Risawa Atsutomu, United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <alexmillstudio.shop> and <thealexmill.shop> (the "Domain Names") are registered with Spaceship, Inc.

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on March 27, 2026. On March 30, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Names. On March 31, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names, which differed from the named Respondent (Spaceship, Inc) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on March 31, 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 April 8, 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 April 17, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for the Response was May 7, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on May 8, 2026.

The Center appointed John C. McElwaine as the sole panelist in this matter on May 19, 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 United States-based company engaged in the design, manufacture, and retail sale of high-quality apparel and accessories. The ALEX MILL brand was established in 2012 by Alex Drexler. Complainant holds trademark registrations for the ALEX MILL mark in the United States and in over 30 countries worldwide, covering various goods and services, including but not limited to clothing, accessories, footwear, jewelry, and online retail services.

Relevant to this matter, Complainant owns the following trademark registrations:

- ALEX MILL, U.S. Reg. No. 5,949,657, registered on December 31, 2019, in International Classes 14, 18, and 35;
- ALEX MILL, U.S. Reg. No. 4,71,786, registered on January 21, 2014, in International Class 25; and
- ALEX MILL (stylized), U.S. Reg. No. 5,949,658, registered on December 31, 2019, in International Classes 14, 18, 25, and 35.

Collectively, these registered trademark rights are referred to as the “ALEX MILL Mark”. Complainant maintains and operates at the domain name <alexmill.com> as its primary retailing site on the Internet.

The disputed domain name <alexmillstudio.shop> was registered on February 3, 2026, to registrant Huapusjmn Huapusjmn, with contact details in the United States. The disputed domain name <thealexmill.shop> was registered on March 23, 2026, to registrant Risawa Atsutomu, with contact details in the United States. Both Domain Names are registered with the same registrar, Spaceship, Inc. Both Domain Names utilize Cloudflare nameservers and implement 301 permanent redirects. Both Domain Names resolve to active commercial websites that prominently use Complainant’s trademarks and branding, including the ALEX MILL Mark and Complainant’s distinctive branding elements.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain names.

With respect to the first element of the Policy, Complainant contends that the Domain Names are identical or confusingly similar to trademarks in which Complainant has rights. Complainant asserts that it has longstanding trademark rights in ALEX MILL Mark through use and registration, and argues that the Domain Names effectively capture these marks in their entirety. According to Complainant, the Domain Name <alexmillstudio.shop> incorporates the entirety of Complainant’s trademark ALEX MILL with the addition of the descriptive word “STUDIO,” and the Domain Name <thealexmill.shop> incorporates the entirety of the mark with the addition of the article “the.” Complainant asserts that the inclusion of the additional terms does not change the meaning or significance of the ALEX MILL Mark; rather, it only serves to lure legitimate customers away from the original source of ALEX MILL goods.

With respect to the second element of the Policy, Complainant contends that Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Names. Complainant states that it has never authorized or licensed Respondents to use the ALEX MILL Mark in any manner, nor are Respondents otherwise affiliated with Complainant. Complainant notes that Respondents are not commonly known by the Domain Names;

indeed, the registrant names “Huapusjmn Huapusjmn” and “Risawa Atsutomu” have no evident connection to the terms “alexmillstudio” or “thealexmill” or the name “Alex Mill.” According to Complainant, Respondents’ only reason for choosing the Domain Names was to trade on Complainant’s well-known brand and deceive customers.

In support of this assertion, Complainant provides evidence that Respondents’ websites are copycat storefronts designed to impersonate Complainant. Specifically, Respondents’ websites closely replicate Complainant’s official site in appearance and layout, prominently feature Complainant’s ALEX MILL Mark, display numerous photographs and product images copied directly from Complainant’s website, and offer for sale a range of products identical to those sold by Complainant, using Complainant’s own trademarks to identify those products. Complainant argues that this conduct constitutes impersonation or passing off, and that such brazen misuse of its identity can never be considered a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Names.

With respect to the third element of the Policy, Complainant contends that the Domain Names were registered and are being used in bad faith. Complainant’s ALEX MILL Mark is a distinctive trademark that has been used in commerce for many years prior to Respondents’ registration of the Domain Names in 2026. Complainant argues that the only plausible explanation for Respondents’ choice of these Domain Names is that Respondents were well aware of Complainant and its marks and deliberately registered them to exploit Complainant’s reputation. Complainant maintains that Respondents’ conduct falls within several of the indicia of bad faith listed in paragraph 4(b) of the Policy. In particular, Respondents’ websites purport to offer the very same category of goods that Complainant sells (apparel and accessories) under Complainant’s trademarks, thereby unfairly diverting potential customers away from Complainant’s official channels.

Complainant emphasizes that Respondents’ websites are sham operations engaged in passing themselves off as Complainant, by using Complainant’s trademarks and displaying identical product images. By using the Domain Names in this manner, Respondents are intentionally attempting to attract for commercial gain Internet users to Respondents’ websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the ALEX MILL Mark to falsely create the impression that Respondents’ websites and the goods and services being offered on Respondents’ websites are actually those of Complainant or somehow affiliated with the ALEX MILL-branded goods of Complainant.

Lastly, Complainant requests consolidation of the proceedings concerning both Domain Names, asserting that they are under common control despite the nominally different registrant information.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant’s contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. Complainant alleges that the Domain Name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The registrants of the Domain Names did not comment on Complainant’s request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 4.11.2. Regarding common control, the Panel notes the following indicia supporting a finding of consolidation:

Both Domain Names are registered with the same Registrar, Spaceship, Inc. The disputed domain name <alexmillstudio.shop> was registered on February 3, 2026, and the disputed domain name <thealexmill.shop> was registered approximately seven weeks later on March 23, 2026. This proximity in registration dates, combined with identical registration infrastructure, strongly suggests coordinated activity. Both domain names also utilize Cloudflare nameservers for DNS resolution and implement 301 permanent redirects.

Both websites that resolve from the Domain Names prominently display the "ALEX MILL" trademark, use virtually identical layouts and design elements, feature the same product offerings purportedly from Complainant's catalog, display copied images and text from Complainant's official website, offer unrealistic discounts (70% off), and contain footer copyright notices claiming "Alex Mill". The visual and functional similarity of both websites indicates they were created by the same entity or coordinated actors. In addition, both websites employ the same fraudulent business model by impersonating Complainant's legitimate e-commerce operation, using Complainant's branding and copyrighted materials without authorization, offering alleged ALEX MILL products at deep discounts, and operating with the apparent intent to deceive consumers.

Both Domain Names have a similar naming convention incorporating Complainant's distinctive ALEX MILL mark with only minor variations ("studio" and "the"), both use the ".shop" gTLD which was specifically designed for retail e-commerce, and both were registered after Complainant's well-established trademark rights were in place. This coordinated targeting pattern is consistent with common control.

The totality of these circumstances, which includes the identical registrar, privacy service, registration timeframe, website design, impersonation scheme, technical infrastructure, and targeting pattern, compels a finding that the Domain Names are under common control, notwithstanding the nominally different registrant names disclosed by the Registrar.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any party. Respondents have been given full notice and opportunity to respond. The consolidation serves judicial economy and prevents Respondents from potentially escaping liability through the use of different nominee registrant identities. Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "Respondent") in a single proceeding.

6.2 Substantive Matters

Even though Respondent has defaulted, paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that, in order to succeed in this UDRP proceeding, Complainant must still prove its assertions with evidence demonstrating:

- (i) the Domain Names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights;
- (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Names; and
- (iii) the Domain Names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

Because of Respondent's default, the Panel may accept as true the reasonable factual allegations stated within the Complaint and may draw appropriate inferences therefrom. See *St. Tropez Acquisition Co. Limited v. AnonymousSpeech LLC and Global House Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1779](#); *Bjorn Kassoe Andersen v. Direction International*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-0605](#); see also paragraph 5(f) of the Rules ("If a Respondent does not submit a response, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel shall

decide the dispute based upon the complaint”). Having considered the Complaint, the Policy, the Rules, the Supplemental Rules, and applicable principles of law, the Panel’s findings on each of the above-cited elements are as follows.

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 Complainant’s trademark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Complainant has shown rights in respect of the ALEX MILL trademark for the purposes of the Policy through its long-established use since 2012 and its registered trademark rights in the United States and over 30 countries worldwide. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that Complainant’s ALEX MILL mark is recognizable within both Domain Names. The disputed domain name <alexmillstudio.shop> incorporates the entirety of the ALEX MILL mark with the addition of the descriptive term “studio.” The disputed domain name <thealexmill.shop> incorporates the entirety of the mark with the addition of the article “the.” Although the addition of other terms such as “studio” and “the” may bear on the 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 mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8

Accordingly, the Domain Names are confusingly similar to the ALEX MILL mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Under the Policy’s second element, paragraph 4(a)(ii), Complainant has the burden of establishing that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names. Complainant needs to make a prima facie showing on this element, at which point the burden of production shifts to Respondent to present evidence that it has rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names. If Respondent has failed to do so, Complainant is deemed to have satisfied its burden under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy. See *Vicar Operating, Inc. v. Domains by Proxy, Inc. / Eklin Bot Systems, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2010-1141](#).

In this case, Complainant has put forward a compelling prima facie case that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names. Complainant states that it has never authorized or permitted Respondent to use the ALEX MILL Mark, and there is no evidence of any relationship between the parties that would give rise to any license or permission for Respondent to use these trademarks. Respondent is not known by either of the Domain Names nor by any name corresponding to “Alex Mill” or “Allex Mill Studio”. Indeed, the only names associated with Respondent are “huapusjmn huapusjmn” and “Risawa Atsutomu”, which have no connection to the term “Alex Mill” or the Domain Names. As discussed below, there is likewise no evidence that Respondent has acquired any trademark or service mark rights in “Alex Mill”¹ or any similar term, by operation of the websites at the Domain Names.

Respondent has not rebutted Complainant’s prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names, such as those enumerated in the Policy¹ or otherwise. Instead, the record demonstrates that Respondent has engaged in conduct that negates any claim to legitimate interests. Specifically, Respondent has operated websites that

¹ The Policy, paragraph 4(c), provides a non-exhaustive list of circumstances in which a respondent could demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name: “(i) before any notice to you of the dispute, your use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the domain name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or (ii) you (as an individual, business, or other organization) have been commonly known by the domain name, even if you have acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or (iii) you are making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.”

impersonate Complainant by adopting identical logos and branding and copied images of Complainant's products to sell such products without authorization, thereby misleading Internet users into believing there is an affiliation or authorization by Complainant. Such impersonation is inconsistent with bona fide use and constitutes clear evidence of an intent to capitalize on Complainant's reputation. Panels have consistently held that impersonation of a complainant or its business through a domain name and associated website negates any claim to rights or legitimate interests. See *On AG, On Clouds GmbH v. Nguyen Luu, Withheld for Privacy Purposes, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf, Vuong Hoang, AN NGUYEN, NEO CORP., and Ngoc Tam Nguyen*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-1714](#) ("a [disputed domain name's] use cannot be deemed bona fide if the disputed domain names constitute trademark infringement"), citing *Sai Machine Tools Pvt. Ltd. v. Mr. Sudhir Jaiswal, Shree Sai Extrusion Technik Pvt. Ltd*, WIPO Case No. [D2018-2560](#) ("bona fide use is predicated on honest adoption of the name" and respondent failed to show such honest adoption; rather, respondent's use was infringing and therefore not bona fide).

Respondent, having defaulted, has not submitted any evidence to rebut Complainant's prima facie case. There is nothing in the record to suggest that any of the circumstances enumerated in Policy paragraph 4(c) (or any other basis for rights or legitimate interests) would apply. Respondent's use of the Domain Name is not in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, but rather in connection with a deceptive e-commerce site that infringes Complainant's rights, and Respondent is not making any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name, but instead is seeking to mislead Internet users for commercial gain. The Panel concludes that Complainant's un rebutted evidence establishes that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the second element of the Policy is satisfied.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, Complainant must show that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith. The Policy provides a non-exhaustive list of circumstances that shall be considered evidence of bad faith (Policy, paragraph 4(b)). Two of these illustrative circumstances are directly relevant here. First, paragraph 4(b)(iii) considers it evidence of bad faith if a respondent has registered a domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor. Second, paragraph 4(b)(iv) provides that bad faith is demonstrated where a respondent, by using the domain name, has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website or of a product or service on that website.

Bad faith registration can be found where a respondent "knew or should have known" of a complainant's trademark rights and nevertheless registered a domain name in which it had no rights or legitimate interests. See *Accor v. Kristen Hoerl*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-1722](#). The ALEX MILL mark is a distinctive mark that has been used in commerce since 2012, many years prior to Respondent's registration of the Domain Names in early 2026. The mark is not a dictionary word or generic term that Respondent could credibly claim to have registered for its dictionary meaning. Rather, it is a unique brand identifier strongly associated with Complainant's apparel and retail business. The disputed domain name <alexmillstudio.shop> was registered on February 3, 2026, more than 13 years after Complainant established its trademark rights. The disputed domain name <thealexmill.shop> was registered on March 23, 2026, shortly after the first domain. Both registrations occurred long after Complainant had established substantial goodwill and recognition in the ALEX MILL mark.

Respondent's choice of the Domain Names was not by coincidence. Both were intended to give Internet users the false impression that the Domain Names and corresponding websites are owned by, operated by, or affiliated with Complainant. In the view of the Panel, Respondent's deliberate impersonation of Complainant demonstrates that Respondent registered the Domain Name with Complainant's trademark firmly in mind and with the intention of exploiting it. This supports a finding of bad faith registration. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2 (noting that panels may find bad faith where a respondent knew or should have known of a complainant's mark and nevertheless registered a domain name incorporating that mark).

There is no explanation for Respondent to have chosen to register the Domain Name other than to intentionally trade off the goodwill and reputation of Complainant's trademark or otherwise create a false association with Complainant. With no response from Respondent, Complainant's claim concerning Respondent's scheme is undisputed.

Turning to the use of the Domain Name, by operating an online store that closely imitates Complainant website, Respondent has shown an intent to confuse and mislead consumers for commercial gain. Both websites at the Domain Names prominently display the "ALEX MILL" trademark in their headers and throughout the site, use layouts and design elements that closely mimic Complainant's official website, and create an overall impression designed to make consumers believe they are visiting Complainant's authorized retail channels. The websites reproduce product photographs, images, and descriptive text copied directly from Complainant's official website without authorization, further reinforcing the false impression of legitimacy and affiliation. Also, the websites purport to offer ALEX MILL-branded apparel and accessories at unrealistic discounts (70% off), which Complainant contends are counterfeit or nonexistent products.

This amounts to bad faith use of a domain name within the meaning of Policy paragraph 4(b)(iv). In addition, such conduct also inevitably disrupts Complainant's business (e.g., by diverting potential sales or damaging customer trust), which is evidence of bad faith under Policy paragraph 4(b)(iii). See also [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1 (evidence of mimicking the complainant's website is evidence that a respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark).

As detailed above, the Panel finds on the record before it that Respondent's intention in registering the Domain Names was to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the ALEX MILL Mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website or location or of a product or service on its website or location, and its use has the likely effect of disrupting Complainant's business. Thus, the Panel holds that Complainant has met its burden of providing sufficient evidence that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iii) and (iv) 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 Domain Names <alexmillstudio.shop> and <thealexmill.shop> be transferred to Complainant

/John C McElwaine/

John C McElwaine

Sole Panelist

Date: May 31, 2026