

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Radical22 Limited v. Nguyen Van Doan

Case No. D2026-1530

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Radical22 Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Stobbs IP Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Nguyen Van Doan, Viet Nam.

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

The disputed domain name <dualipamerchandise.shop> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 10, 2026. On April 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On April 14, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Dynadot Privacy Service Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 15, 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 April 16, 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 April 20, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 10, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 11, 2026.

The Center appointed Nicholas Smith as the sole panelist in this matter on May 18, 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 United Kingdom company that owns and uses intellectual property connected with the well-known United Kingdom singer Dua Lipa, who has released numerous successful singles and albums under her name since her debut album in 2017. Amongst its other activities the Complainant offers musical records, clothing, and other merchandise relating to Dua Lipa under the trademark DUA LIPA (the “DUA LIPA Mark”) including from its website at “www.dualipa.com”<sup>1</sup> (the “Complainant’s Website”).

The Complainant has registered the DUA LIPA Mark as a trademark in numerous jurisdictions including in the United Kingdom for goods and services in classes 3, 9, 16, 25, and 41 (Registration Number UK00003204883, registered March 24, 2017).

The Domain Name was registered on September 29, 2025. The Domain Name is presently inactive but prior to the commencement of the proceeding resolved to a website (“the Respondent’s Website”) that reproduced the DUA LIPA Mark and images of Dua Lipa. The Respondent’s Website purported to offer the Complainant’s clothing and merchandise products or counterfeit versions of the Complainant’s clothing and merchandise products under the Complainant’s DUA LIPA Mark. The Respondent’s Website also (incorrectly) stated that it is “the OFFICIAL Merchandise Store for Dua Lipa fans” and “Officially Licensed Dua Lipa Merch Store 2026”.

#### **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 Domain Name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that:

- a) The Complainant is the owner of the DUA LIPA Mark, having registered the DUA LIPA Mark in the United Kingdom, United States of America and other jurisdictions. The Domain Name reproduces the DUA LIPA Mark and adds the term “merchandise” and the “.shop” generic Top-Level Domain.
- b) There are no rights or legitimate interests held by the Respondent in respect of the Domain Name. The Respondent is not commonly known as the Domain Name nor does the Respondent have any authorization from the Complainant to register the Domain Name. The Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial fair use of the Domain Name. Rather the Respondent is using the Domain Name to create a website that purports to be an official website of the Complainant but actually sells counterfeit versions of the Complainant’s products, such use not being bona fide.
- c) The Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. By using the Domain Name for a website that reproduces the DUA LIPA Mark and offers counterfeit products while falsely asserting to be “the OFFICIAL Merchandise Store for Dua Lipa fans” the Respondent is clearly aware of the DUA LIPA Mark and is using it to deceive consumers as to its affiliation with the Complainant. Such conduct amounts to registration and use of the Domain Name in bad faith.

---

<sup>1</sup> Technically from an online storefront located at “www.ukshop.dualipa.com”

## **B. Respondent**

The Respondent did not reply to the 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 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 is reproduced within the Domain Name. Accordingly, the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, "merchandise" may bear on 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 Domain Name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

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 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 Domain Name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel considers that the record of this case reflects that:

- before any notice to the Respondent of the dispute, the Respondent did not use, nor has it made 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. Paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.2.

- the Respondent (as an individual, business, or other organization) has not been commonly known by the Domain Name. Paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.3.
- the Respondent is not 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. Paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.4.
- the record contains no other factors demonstrating rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in the Domain Name.

The Respondent has used the Domain Name to operate a website to sell clothing and other merchandise that purport to be the Complainant's legitimate products. The Complainant makes the uncontested assertion that such products are counterfeit. If the clothing and other merchandise sold on the Respondent's Website are not genuine products produced by the Complainant, the Respondent's use of the Domain Name does not grant it rights or legitimate interests since it is using the Complainant's DUA LIPA Mark for a site purportedly selling counterfeit products.

Even if the Respondent is offering genuine products from the Respondent's Website, such use does not automatically grant it rights and legitimate interests. The principles that govern whether a reseller of genuine goods has rights or legitimate interests have been set out in a variety of UDRP decisions, starting with the case of *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#).

The [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.8, summarizes the consensus views of UDRP panels in assessing claims of nominative (fair) use by resellers or distributors in the following manner:

"[...] Panels have recognized that resellers, distributors, or service providers using a domain name containing the complainant's trademark to undertake sales or repairs related to the complainant's goods or services may be making a bona fide offering of goods and services and thus have a legitimate interest in such domain name. Outlined in the 'Oki Data test', the following cumulative requirements will be applied in the specific conditions of a UDRP case:

- (i) the respondent must actually be offering the goods or services at issue;
- (ii) the respondent must use the site to sell only the trademarked goods or services;
- (iii) the site must accurately and prominently disclose the registrant's relationship with the trademark holder; and
- (iv) the respondent must not try to "corner the market" in domain names that reflect the trademark.

The "Oki Data test" does not apply where any prior agreement, express or otherwise, between the parties expressly prohibits (or allows) the registration or use of domain names incorporating the complainant's trademark."

In this case, the Respondent's Website does not accurately or prominently disclose the Respondent's relationship with the Complainant, in particular that it is not an authorized dealer or does not have any particular connection with the Complainant. Rather, its prominent display of the DUA LIPA Mark and the false assertions that it is "the OFFICIAL Merchandise Store for Dua Lipa fans" and "Officially Licensed Dua Lipa Merch Store 2026", results in the misleading impression that the Respondent's Website is an official website of the Complainant. Even in the event that the Respondent is reselling genuine products, its use of the Domain Name for the Respondent's Website does not grant it rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name in these circumstances.

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 finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's DUA LIPA Mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's Website or location or of a product or service on the Respondent's Website. Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

The Respondent registered the Domain Name for the purposes of operating a website that passes off as being an official website of the Complainant, specifically to sell either the Complainant's products or counterfeit products that compete with the Complainant's clothing and merchandise. The Respondent is using a Domain Name that is confusingly similar to the DUA LIPA Mark to sell products, be they genuine or otherwise, in competition with the Complainant and without the Complainant's approval and without meeting the Oki Data test.

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 <dualipamerchandise.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Nicholas Smith/*

**Nicholas Smith**

Sole Panelist

Date: May 20, 2026