

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Intellectus Dominus, LLC v. Cierra June  
Case No. D2026-1536

### **1. The Parties**

Complainant is Intellectus Dominus, LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by ESCA Legal LLC, United States.

Respondent is Cierra June, United States.

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

The Disputed Domain Name <maxl.site> 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 10, 2026. On April 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On April 13, 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 (Privacy User, PrivacyGaurdian.org) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on April 14, 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 15, 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 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Michael A. Albert as the sole panelist in this matter on May 20, 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, Intellectus Dominus, LLC, is a product development and e-commerce company in the automotive cleaning and detailing spaces. Complainant is the rightful owner of the MAXL registered trademark with the United States Patent and Trademark Office (United States Trademark Registration No. 7,076,248, registered June 6, 2023, in class 3) among others. The Disputed Domain Name uses the entirety of Complainant's MAXL word mark.

Complainant has operated since 2020 in the car care industry. Its products include (but are not limited to) MAXL ONETM Spray, which is an all-in-one cleaning, protection and maintenance spray for a variety of surfaces and materials in the home and vehicles, such as car wheels, trim, windows, grills, stainless steel appliances, countertops, fixtures, showers, etc., and the MAXEasy Triphene Instant Coating product, which is a spray-on cleaner, detailer and coating that protects surfaces from water, dirt and grime. Complainant sells these products on direct-to-consumer website at the domain name <maxl.com> and through third party e-commerce platforms such as Amazon.com and TikTok Shop.

Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name on March 30, 2026.

#### **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 Name.

In particular, Complainant contends that Respondent uses the website at the Disputed Domain Name to sell counterfeit versions of Complainant's MAXL ONETM Spray product, bearing the MAXL mark. The website is nearly identical to Complainant's official website, making use of Complainant's official product images as well as of its registered MAXL mark. Respondent thereby attempts to confuse customers of Complainant who are attempting to access Complainant's website to purchase its products.

Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. Respondent's use of the Disputed Domain Name is clearly intended to impersonate Complainant, and at the very least, confuse the public by suggesting a relationship with Complainant such as approval or affiliation with Complainant, which Respondent does not have. Respondent has not utilized the Disputed Domain Name for any legitimate business purpose, such as the creation and maintenance of a website in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Disputed Domain Name was indisputably registered, and is being used, in bad faith by Respondent. The Disputed Domain Name also resolves to a page that makes sales of counterfeit MAXL ONETM Spray product and has content that directly targets Complainant's trademarks by prominently displaying the MAXL mark without authorization. Additionally, the webpage is similar to Complainant's official website, making use of Complainant's product photos from its official amazon storefront listings.

##### **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 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 Disputed Domain Name. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The applicable Top-Level Domain ("TLD") in a domain name (here, ".site") is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.

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 under which a 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 Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. Respondent has not rebutted Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Respondent has also not made, nor is it presently making, any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name. The Disputed Domain Name resolves to a website that extensively reproduces, without the authorization of Complainant, Complainant's MAXL mark, without any disclaimer of association with Complainant. The website also indicates that Respondent is operating under the name "MAXL" and features the well-known MAXL word mark in the sales of what appear to be counterfeit MAXL ONETM Spray products. Panels have frequently held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity – here, the apparent sale of counterfeit goods – can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, and other circumstances may be relevant as well in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

In the present case, the Panel notes that Respondent is making use of Complainant's product photos from its official Amazon storefront listings, which appears to be an attempt by Respondent to "pass off" its goods as Complainant's. The Disputed Domain Name resolves to a page that offers for sale what appear to be counterfeit MAXL ONETM Spray products and has content that directly targets Complainant's trademarks by prominently displaying the MAXL mark. Additionally, the webpage is similar to Complainant's official website, even though Respondent is not affiliated with Complainant. In short, Respondent's conduct plainly evidences Respondent had Complainant's mark in mind while registering the Disputed Domain Name and therefore had actual notice of Complainant's business as well as its MAXL trademark and is deliberately attempting to trade on Complainant's marks and goodwill while misleading consumers. Accordingly, Respondent has engaged in bad-faith conduct as described in Policy Paragraph 4(b)(iv) (intentional attraction for commercial gain through confusion).

The record further reflects that Respondent has been a respondent in nine other UDRP disputes, in each of which Respondent has attempted to impersonate the respective complainants' websites and trade on their trademark rights, similar to the facts of the present dispute. In such cases, previous Panels have recognized Respondent's history of abusive registrations as bad faith and have ordered the transfer of the disputed domain names to the respective complainants. Accordingly, Respondent has engaged in bad-faith conduct as described in Policy Paragraph 4(b)(ii) (pattern of abusive registrations).

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for the illegal activity here, namely the sale of what appear to be counterfeit goods, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds Respondent's registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that 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 <maxl.site> be transferred to Complainant.

*/Michael A. Albert/*  
**Michael A. Albert**  
Sole Panelist  
Date: June 5, 2026