

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

AMINA CORP v. kayleighs kayleighs

Case No. D2026-1345

1. The Parties

The Complainant is AMINA CORP,¹ France, represented by Coblence Avocats, France.

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

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <aminamuaddistyle.shop> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on March 30, 2026. On March 30, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 31, 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 (Unknown / Redacted for Privacy Purposes, 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 31, 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 amendment to the Complaint on April 2, 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 April 7, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5,

¹ The Panel notes that in the Complaint the Complainant has identified itself with a minor typographical error as "Anima Corp". However, Annex A clearly identifies the Complainant as "Amina Corp". The Panel notes that this does not rise to the level of a material error requiring the Complainant to provide clarifications or amend the Complaint. The Panel understands the Complainant to be "Amina Corp."

the due date for Response was April 27, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on April 28, 2026.

The Center appointed Mireille Buydens as the sole panelist in this matter on May 5, 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 French company specialized in the sale of luxury shoes and accessories (leather goods, jewelry, etc.) for women under the brand AMINA MUADDI.

The Complainant (or its founder) is the owner of registered trademarks covering the sign AMINA MUADDI (hereafter the "Trademark" or the "AMINA MUADDI Trademark"), including:

- the International Trademark Registration no. 1371021 for AMINA MUADDI (word mark) registered on July 27, 2017;
- the International Trademark Registration no. 1766707 for AMINA MUADDI (word mark), registered on April 5, 2023, notably designating United States; and
- the United States trademark registration no. 5639954 for AMINA MUADDI (word mark), registered on January 1, 2019.

The Complainant has registered the domain name <aminamuaddi.com> and operates its official website under this domain name.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 8, 2026. According to the Complaint, it resolves to a website with a header "Amina Muaddi Luxury Shoes" which does not contain any images (the display of images apparently being unavailable) but purportedly offers the same type of products as the Complainant's official website, using the same products' names, at discounted prices. At the date of this Decision, this is still the case.

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.

First, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the AMINA MUADDI Trademark, as it includes the Trademark in its entirety. The only differences are the addition of the term "style" and the removal of the space between the two verbal elements, which cannot prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Complainant's AMINA MUADDI Trademark and the disputed domain name. Further, the use of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".shop" is irrelevant and cannot be taken into consideration in determining whether there is a confusingly similarity.

Second, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. To the Complainant's knowledge, the Respondent has never registered "AMINA MUADDI" trademarks and has never acquired any common law rights in this wording. Furthermore, the Respondent is in no way affiliated with the Complainant and has not been authorized by the Complainant to use its AMINA MUADDI Trademark or to proceed with the registration of a domain name including the Complainant's AMINA MUADDI Trademark. Moreover, the Respondent has not made a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name as the latter directs to a website where the Complainant's AMINA MUADDI Trademark is reproduced as well as its products names for offering identical products at discounted prices.

Besides, the disputed domain name in itself carries a risk of implied affiliation and cannot constitute a fair use as it effectively suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant and is well suited to mislead Internet users.

The Complainant finally contends that the Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain name in bad faith. Concerning the registration in bad faith, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent could not have been unaware of the Complainant's prior rights to the AMINA MUADDI Trademark when it registered the disputed domain name because (1) the disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's AMINA MUADDI Trademark, with the mere addition of the term "style", which directly relates to the Complainant's field of activity, given that the Complainant's founder is a designer; (2) the AMINA MUADDI Trademark has a significant reputation; and (3) a simple trademark search, or even an Internet search prior to registration of the disputed domain name would have informed the Respondent of the existence of the Complainant's prior AMINA MUADDI Trademark.

Concerning the use in bad faith, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name resolves to a website displaying no images but explicitly referring to "Amina Muaddi" models and offering them at lower prices, which strongly suggests that the Respondent is seeking to take unfair advantage of the Complainant's reputation and to deceive Internet users into believing that the website at issue is in some way associated with the Complainant and its AMINA MUADDI Trademark.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that the Complainant proves each of the following three elements in order to succeed in its Complaint:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or 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 was 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.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the entirety of the AMINA MUADDI Trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. The only difference between the AMINA MUADDI Trademark and the disputed domain name is the addition of the term "style". Although the addition of this term may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

Further, the gTLD ".shop" is a standard registration requirement and does not prevent the disputed domain name from being confusingly similar to the AMINA MUADDI Trademark.

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 Respondent is not licensed by, nor affiliated with, the Complainant in any way. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor is there any evidence of use or demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name for a bona fide offering of goods or services. There is no evidence of legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, either. On the contrary, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name reproduces the AMINA MUADDI Trademark in its entirety with the mere addition of the term “style”, which can refer to an aspect of the products proposed by the Complainant (namely shoes and accessories, contributing to the style of the person wearing them).

Moreover, the Panel also notes the impersonating nature of the content exhibited on the website at the disputed domain name: the website displays the AMINA MUADDI Trademark, offers for sale the same type of products (shoes), reproduces some of the Complainant’s product names, all without disclosing its lack of relationship with the Complainant. As a result, the Respondent induces Internet users into falsely believing that the disputed domain name resolves to a website operated or endorsed by the Complainant.

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 has composed the disputed domain name by combining the Complainant’s AMINA MUADDI Trademark with the term “style”. As noted above, the Panel takes the view that by registering the disputed domain name the Respondent intended to confuse Internet users into believing that the disputed domain name is affiliated with, or endorsed by, the Complainant. In the circumstances, and in the absence of any explanation from the Respondent for its choice of the disputed domain name, the Panel can only reasonably infer that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in the knowledge of the Complainant’s prior AMINA MUADDI Trademark and with the intention of taking unfair advantage of the goodwill attached to it by creating a likelihood of confusion among Internet users.

Besides, the Panel notes that a quick search for the term “AMINA MUADDI” online, would have revealed to the Respondent the existence of the Complainant and its Trademark (which is notably also registered in United States where the Respondent is purportedly located). As a result, the Panel finds that the Respondent was more likely than not aware of the Complainant’s AMINA MUADDI Trademark at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2.²

Furthermore, as noted above, the disputed domain name resolves to a website displaying at several places the AMINA MUADDI Trademark, selling the same type of products as the Complainant (shoes) at discounted prices, and using some of the Complainant’s product names, without indicating its lack of relationship with the Complainant. Besides, this website does not contain any information allowing Internet users to identify the company operating the website. Instead, the copyright is reserved in the name of “Amina Muaddi Luxury Shoes.” In light of this, it seems inconceivable that the Respondent would have registered and used the disputed domain name for a reason other than seeking to unduly benefit from the Complainant’s AMINA MUADDI Trademark and associated goodwill.

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 <aminamuaddistyle.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mireille Buydens/

Mireille Buydens

Sole Panelist

Date: May 13, 2026

²The Panel notes that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record if it would consider such information useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.8).