

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

SoletLuna Holdings, Inc., LifeWave, Inc. v. Amy Wang  
Case No. D2026-1517

### **1. The Parties**

Complainants are SoletLuna Holdings, Inc., and LifeWave, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by ARC IP Law, P.C, United States.

Respondent is Amy Wang, United States.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <lifewaveofficial.shop> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 9, 2026. On April 10, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 10, 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 (NameSilo, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainants on April 13, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainants to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainants filed an amended Complaint on April 17, 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 20, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 10, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on May 12, 2026. The Center appointed Lorelei Ritchie 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**

Complainants are related corporations based in the United States (collectively, “Complainant”). For at least a decade prior to the registration of the disputed domain name, Complainant has offered wellness products under the mark LIFEWAVE. Complainant (LifeWave, Inc.) is the owner of registrations for its LIFEWAVE mark globally. These registrations include United States Registration No. 5,285,572 (registered September 12, 2017) and International Registration No. 1279038 (registered September 9, 2015).

The disputed domain name was registered on January 13, 2026. According to the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website that mimics Complainant’s website, including prominent display of Complainant’s marks seemingly without any disclaimer of affiliation but displaying a Gmail email address in the Contact Us section.<sup>1</sup> Respondent has no affiliation with Complainant, and no authorization to use Complainant’s marks.

#### **5. Parties’ Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

Complainant contends that (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to Complainant’s trademarks; (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; and (iii) Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Specifically, Complainant contends that it owns rights to the LIFEWAVE mark based on its “longstanding use” for wellness products and global registrations therefore. Complainant contends that the disputed domain name clearly references Complainant’s LIFEWAVE mark, with the addition only of the term “official” which Respondent included “intending to misleadingly divert consumers” from Complainant’s actual official site.

Complainant asserts that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name, and rather has registered and is using it in bad faith, presumably for Respondent’s own commercial gain, by creating a website aimed at impersonating Complainant’s official retail webpage, with discounted products and no disclaimer of affiliation.

##### **B. Respondent**

Respondent did not reply to Complainant’s contentions.

#### **6. Discussion and Findings**

##### **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 of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), section 1.7. Complainant has shown rights in respect of the LIFEWAVE mark, for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Panel notes that due to an apparent clerical error, the email address available on the website at the time of the notification of the Complaint was not used for the purposes of notifying this Complaint. The Panel further notes, however, that Complainant copied this email address at the time of the filing of the Complaint, and that the Amended Complaint was amended to reflect only the contact information for the Respondent as per the Registrar’s email. Accordingly, the Panel finds that any discrepancy was harmless error, and that appropriate notice was given to Respondent in this proceeding.

The Panel finds that the LIFEWAVE mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name is identical to a trademark in which Complainant has rights in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

## **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which 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 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.

Prior UDRP panels have indicated that a reseller may be considered to have rights or legitimate interests in a mark, provided certain requirements are met. These generally include that: (i) the site is actually offering the goods at issue; (ii) the site is used only to sell the trademarked goods; (ii) the site accurately and prominently discloses the registrant’s relationship to the mark holder; and (iii) respondent does not try to “corner the market” in domain names that reflect the mark. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.8; see also *Ok! Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#).

The Panel finds that these qualifications are not fulfilled by the website associated with the disputed domain name. Rather, to the extent that any legitimate goods or services may be offered via the disputed domain name, the associated website does not appear to include a disclaimer of affiliation or endorsement by Complainant, and rather includes unauthorized display of Complainant’s marks.

Furthermore, the nature of the disputed domain name reproducing the term “official” together with Complainant’s LIFEWAVE mark (without being an “official” website or officially affiliated with Complainant) and the website at the disputed domain name highly resembling Complainant’s website, lead the Panel to consider that Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name to take an unfair advantage of the implied affiliation with Complainant.

The Panel finds that Complainant has provided sufficient evidence of Respondent’s lack of “rights or legitimate interests” in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy which Respondent has not rebutted.

## **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

There are several ways that a complainant can demonstrate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith. As noted in Section 4 of this Panel’s Decision, the record includes evidence that Respondent has used the URL associated with the disputed domain name to resolve to a website that mimics Complainant’s own official website, with prominent display of Complainant’s marks, and with no disclaimer of affiliation. The Panel thus finds sufficient evidence that Respondent was aware of Complainant’s rights and Complainant’s marks at the time of registering the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

The Panel finds sufficient evidence that Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith for purposes 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 <lifewaveofficial.shop> be transferred to Complainant.

*/Lorelei Ritchie/*

**Lorelei Ritchie**

Sole Panelist

Date: June 2, 2026