

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Tommy Hilfiger Licensing LLC v. Noel, Alice Sims, Newman, and Dakota
Case No. D2026-1830

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Tommy Hilfiger Licensing LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Lipkus Law LLP, Canada.

The Respondents are Noel, Finland, Alice Sims, Germany, Newman, France, and Dakota, Finland.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <tommyhilfigergreeceoutlet.com>, <tommyhilfigeroutletargentina.com>, <tommyhilfigersko.com>, and <tommyhilfiger-southafrica.com> are registered with Paknic (Private) Limited (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 29, 2026. On April 29, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On April 30, 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 (Whois Agent, Web Domains By Proxy) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 4, 2026, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on May 5, 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 May 8, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 28, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 29, 2026.

The Center appointed Anne-Virginie La Spada as the sole panelist in this matter on June 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

Founded in 1985, the Complainant is a corporation based in the United States of America that designs, sources, distributes, sells and markets fashion apparel, accessories and other products throughout the world.

The Complainant owns the following registrations for the trademark TOMMY HILFIGER, among others:

- United States trademark registration no. 1398612, registered on June 24, 1986 in class 25;
- South African trademark registration no. 1999/00861 registered on January 21, 1999 in class 25;
- Argentinian trademark registration no. 2614481 registered on December 2, 2013 in class 25;
- European Union trademark registration no. 018597898 registered on June 30, 2022 in classes 3, 9, 14, 16, 18, 24, 25, 35, 41 and 42 (the latter trademark being registered in the name of an affiliated company, namely Tommy Hilfiger Licensing B.V. in the Netherlands).

The Complainant owns a number of domain names including <tommyhilfiger.com> registered on December 14, 1998 and <tommy.com>, registered on December 1, 1998.

The disputed domain names <tommyhilfigergreeceoutlet.com>, <tommyhilfigeroutletargentina.com> and <tommyhilfigersko.com> were registered on September 28, 2022. The disputed domain name <tommyhilfiger-southafrica.com> was registered on September 14, 2023.

At the time of filing of the Complaint, the four disputed domain names were inactive, but they previously used to resolve to websites purportedly offering for sale goods of the Complainant and reproducing the trademark TOMMY HILFIGER in a prominent fashion. Whereas the landing pages of the four websites had different layouts, all websites featured an identical or very similar login screen with the same layout prompting returning customers to enter their email and password and inviting new customers to create an account.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the four disputed domain names are under the common control of a single registrant and requests a consolidation of the proceedings. On the merits, the Complainant represents that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are similar to the Complainant's TOMMY HILFIGER trademark. Three of the disputed domain names combine such trademark with a geographical indicator (namely "greece", "argentina" and "southafrica"), which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The Complainant considers further that the addition of the word "outlet" in two of the disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The same is true of the word "sko", which is a clothing-related term as it means "shoe" in Danish. The Complainant argues that the use of the terms "outlet" and "sko" intensifies the confusion a consumer would experience because the Complainant operates outlet stores globally where consumers can purchase the Complainant's products and "sko" ("shoe"

in Danish).

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names for the following reasons: (i) the Complainant's marks predate any use that the Respondent may have made of the disputed domain names; ii) the Respondent has not received any any license or authorization from the Complainant to use any domain names featuring its trademark; (iii) the Respondent has not used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; and iv) the Respondent is not commonly known under the disputed domain names. The disputed domain names furthermore used to resolve to websites that featured a login screen with the same layout prompting returning customers to enter their email and password and inviting new customers to create an account. This indicates that the Respondent was previously attempting to collect personal information from visitors. Panels have found that the collection of user credentials under the guise of an official website can constitute phishing or data harvesting, and such activity negates any claim to rights or legitimate interest in a domain name.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has used and registered the disputed domain names in bad faith. Given that the Complainant's rights predate the registration of the disputed domain names and given the Complainant's online presence, it is likely, according to the Complainant, that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademark rights at the time of registration of the disputed domain names. The Complainant contends that that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain names to attract internet users to the Respondent's websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the Respondent's domain name satisfies the conditions of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, a complainant must assert and prove each of the following:

- (i) the domain name registered by the respondent 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 domain name; and
- (iii) the domain name registered by the respondent has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

6.1 Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The Panel will first address the Complainants' consolidation request.

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

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the 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 the 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.

As regards common control, the Panel notes the following factors that strongly suggest common control in the present case: (i) the disputed domain names display a similar building pattern: three of them combine the trademark TOMMY HILFIGER with a geographical indicator (namely "southafrica", "greece" and "argentina") and in two cases with the term "outlet", while the fourth one combines such trademark with a generic term meaning "shoe" in Danish; (ii) three of the four disputed domain names were created on the same date, namely September 28, 2022, while the fourth disputed domain name was created a year later on September 14, 2023; (iii) the four disputed domain names are registered with the same Registrar; (iv) all four disputed domain names are using the same privacy shield located in the city of Jhang, Pakistan; and v) all four disputed domain names are currently inactive but previously resolved to online stores purportedly selling the Complainant's goods and featuring a nearly identical login screen.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

6.2 Substantive issues

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 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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are 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, "greeceoutlet", "outletargentina", "sko", and "southafrica") 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 disputed 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 disputed domain names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel indeed observes that the three of the disputed domain names carry a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant, as they combine the Complainant's trademark with the name of a geographic location, thus suggesting sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner and/or that the disputed domain name in question corresponds to the Complainant's official website for the country at issue. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

Furthermore, while the Respondent uses the disputed domain names in connection with commercial websites purportedly offering for sale TOMMY HILFIGER branded products. The landing page of each website features the Complainant's trademark in a prominent fashion that gives the impression of an official or authorized website. The Panel further notes that the Respondent's websites do not appear to feature any disclaimer concerning the relationship between the Respondent and the Complainant. In the Panel's view, this demonstrates an obvious attempt on the part of the Respondent to mislead Internet users seeking the Complainant's goods and online locations. Such being the case, the Respondent cannot be considered to be making a bona fide commercial use of the disputed domain names.

Furthermore, the four websites feature a login screen having the same layout, inviting visitors to provide contact details, which strongly suggests a phishing scheme.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, passing off and/or phishing, 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent used on its websites the Complainant's trademark TOMMY HILFIGER, which have been widely used before the registration of the disputed domain names. The Panel accepts therefore that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademark at the time of registering the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names were registered in bad faith.

Under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, the use of a disputed domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to a website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of a website or location or of a product or service on the website or location, amounts to evidence of registration and use in bad faith.

In the present case, the Respondent used the disputed domain names in connection with websites displaying prominently the Complainant's trademark. Such use was apt to create the false impression that the Respondent's website was operated or endorsed by the Complainant. The absence of any disclaimer on the Respondent's website regarding the lack of a relationship with the Complainant was apt to increase the

risk of confusion. The use of the Complainant's trademark was in all likelihood a means to collect personal data of users in the context of a phishing scheme.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, passing off and/or phishing, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. 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 names <tommyhilfigergreeceoutlet.com>, <tommyhilfigeroutletargentina.com>, <tommyhilfigersko.com>, and <tommyhilfiger-southafrica.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Anne-Virginie La Spada/

Anne-Virginie La Spada

Sole Panelist

Date: June 21, 2026