

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Tea Forté, Inc. (dba Jacobs Douwe Egberts USA) v. Bill Blom, Albert Reyes,
Host Master, Transure Enterprise Ltd
Case No. D2026-1975

1. The Parties

Complainant is Tea Forté, Inc. (dba Jacobs Douwe Egberts USA), United States of America (“United States”), represented by Ploum, The Netherlands.

Respondents are Bill Blom, United States; Albert Reyes, United States; and, Host Master, Transure Enterprise Ltd, United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <teafort.com> (“Domain Name 1”) is registered with Above.com Pty Ltd. and the disputed domain names <teafortemarket.shop> (“Domain Name 2”) and <teaforteofficial.shop> (“Domain Name 3”) (collectively, the “Domain Names”) are registered with Dynadot Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 7, 2026. On May 7, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Names. On May 8, 2026, and May 11, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Names which differed from the named Respondent (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on May 15, 2026, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting Complainant to either file separate complaints for the 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. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on May 20, 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 26, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 15, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 16, 2026.

The Center appointed Kimberley Chen Nobles as the sole panelist in this matter on June 23, 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 2003, Complainant sells a wide variety of whole leaf teas and rough-cut herbal blends in over 35 countries to consumers as well as hotels, restaurants, resorts, and retailers. Complainant's signature pyramid bag with tea leaves won numerous awards and accolades.

Complainant owns numerous registered trademarks with the TEA FORTÉ mark, including:

- International trademark registration number 950871 for the TEA FORTÉ word mark, registered on September 18, 2007;
- International trademark registration number 895022 for the TEA FORTÉ figurative mark, registered on August 9, 2006; and
- International trademark registration number 1240044 for the TF TEA FORTÉ word and design mark, registered on December 23, 2014.

Complainant also owns and operates its official website at the domain name <teaforte.com> and uses the email extension "@teaforte.com" as its official email address.

Domain Names 1, 2 and 3 were registered on May 8, 2007, April 24, 2026, and April 21, 2026, respectively. Domain Name 1 resolved to a parked page titled "TOTALAV" that offers antivirus software and was configured for email capabilities based on Domain Name 1; Domain Names 2 and 3 each resolved to websites that reflect Complainant's products, trademarks and the overall look-and-feel of Complainant's official website, providing detailed information on Complainant's products using Complainant's copyrighted (art)works.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Names.

Notably, Complainant contends that (i) the Domain Names are confusingly similar to Complainant's trademarks; (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names; and (iii) Respondent registered and is using the Domain Names in bad faith.

In particular, Complainant contends that it has trademark registrations and rights for TEA FORTÉ and that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Names with the intention to confuse Internet users looking for bona fide and well-known TEA FORTÉ products and services.

Complainant notes that it has no affiliation with Respondent, nor authorized Respondent to register or use domain names, which includes Complainant's trademarks, and that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the registration and use of the Domain Names. Rather, Complainant contends that Respondent has acted in bad faith in acquiring and setting up the Domain Names, when Respondent clearly knew of Complainant's rights.

Specifically, Complainant argues that Respondent used Domain Name 1 by creating an email address with a domain name that is nearly identical to the Complainant's official domain name and the email addresses it uses for email capabilities based on Domain Name 1.

Complainant also argues that Respondent used Domain Names 2 and 3 to create a false association with Complainant, so as to deceive Internet users into believing that its website is operated by or associated with Complainant.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed Complainant must satisfy the Panel that:

- (i) the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights;
- (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Section 4.3 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)") states that failure to respond to a complainant's contentions would not by itself mean that the complainant is deemed to have prevailed; a respondent's default is not necessarily an admission that the complainant's claims are true.

Thus, although in this case Respondent has failed to respond to the Complaint, the burden remains with Complainant to establish the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy by a preponderance of the evidence.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Complainant has provided evidence of its rights in the TEA FORTÉ trademark, as noted above. Complainant has therefore proven that it has the requisite rights in the TEA FORTÉ trademarks.

With Complainant's rights in the TEA FORTÉ trademark established, the remaining question under the first element of the Policy is whether the Domain Names, typically disregarding the Top-Level Domain in which each Domain Name was registered (in this case, ".com" and ".shop"), are identical or confusingly similar to Complainant's trademark.

Here, the Domain Names are confusingly similar to Complainant's TEA FORTÉ trademark. The TEA FORTÉ trademark is recognizable in the Domain Names. In particular, with regards to Domain Name 1, the absence of a space between "TEA" and "FORTÉ" and the absence of the letter "é" after Complainant's TEA FORTÉ trademark in Domain Name 1 does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the TEA FORTÉ trademark. See section 1.7 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#). Likewise, with regards to Domain Names 2 and 3, the absence of a space between "TEA" and "FORTÉ", the absence of the letter "é" after Complainant's TEA FORTÉ trademark and the addition of the respective terms "market" and

“official” does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the TEA FORTÉ trademark.

Thus, the Panel finds that Complainant has satisfied the first element of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, a complainant must make a prima facie showing that a respondent possesses no rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), Section 2.1. Once a complainant makes such a prima facie showing, the burden of production shifts to the respondent, though the burden of proof always remains on the complainant. If the respondent fails to come forward with relevant evidence showing rights or legitimate interests, the complainant will have sustained its burden under the second element of the UDRP.

From the record in this case, it is evident that Respondent was, and is, aware of Complainant and its TEA FORTÉ trademark and does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Complainant has confirmed that Respondent is not affiliated with Complainant, or otherwise authorized or licensed to use the TEA FORTÉ trademark or to seek registration of any domain name incorporating this trademark. Respondent is also not known to be associated with the TEA FORTÉ trademark and there is no evidence showing that Respondent has been commonly known by the Domain Name.

In addition, Respondent has not used Domain Name 1 in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Rather, at the time of the filing of the Complaint, Domain Name 1 resolved to a website that offers antivirus software and was configured for email capabilities with a domain name that is nearly identical to the Complainant’s official domain name and the email addresses it uses for email capabilities based on Domain Name 1.

With regards to Domain Names 2 and 3, each resolved to websites that reflect Complainant’s products, trademarks and the overall look-and-feel of Complainant’s official website, providing detailed information on Complainant’s products using Complainant’s copyrighted (art)works.

Respondent also uses an email address, “[...]@teafort.com”, which is very similar to Complainant’s TEA FORTÉ Trademark and official email address, which uses the email extension “@teaforte.com”. Thus, Respondent can send phishing emails from an email address that is nearly identical to the Complainant’s TEA FORTÉ Trademark and its official email address.

Such use by Respondent does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use and cannot under the circumstances confer on Respondent any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name.

Moreover, the nature of the Domain Names, incorporating the entirety of Complainant’s trademark with the minor differences and additions of generic terms as noted above, indicates Respondent’s intent to capitalize off of Complainant’s trademark, and thus, does not support a finding of rights or legitimate interests.

Accordingly, Complainant has provided evidence supporting its prima facie showing that Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Respondent has failed to produce countervailing evidence of any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Thus, the Panel concludes that Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name and Complainant has met its burden under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel finds that Respondent's actions indicate that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides a non-exhaustive list of circumstances indicating bad faith registration and use on the part of a respondent, namely:

“(i) circumstances indicating that you have registered or you have acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of your documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or

(ii) you have registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that you have engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) you have registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the domain name, you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your 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 your website or location or of a product or service on your website or location.”

The Panel finds that Complainant has provided ample evidence to show that registration and use of the TEA FORTÉ trademark predate the registration of the Domain Name. Complainant is also well established and known; indeed, the record shows that Complainant's TEA FORTÉ trademark and related products and services are known and recognized for purposes of the Policy. Therefore, and also noting the use analysis below, Respondent was clearly aware of the TEA FORTÉ trademark when it registered the Domain Name.

The Panel therefore finds that Respondent's awareness of Complainant's trademark rights at the time of registration suggests bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), Section 3.2.2.

Moreover, Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name to confuse and mislead consumers looking for bona fide and well-known TEA FORTÉ products and services of Complainant's. In particular, the record shows that the Domain Name 1 resolved to a website that offers antivirus software and was configured for email capabilities with a domain name that is nearly identical to the Complainant's official domain name and the email addresses it uses for email capabilities based on Domain Name 1.

With regards to Domain Names 2 and 3, each resolved to websites that reflect Complainant's products, trademarks and the overall look-and-feel of Complainant's official website, providing detailed information on Complainant's products using Complainant's copyrighted (art)works. In particular, each of these websites refer to Complainant's TEA FORTÉ mark and uses Complainant's design trademarks, reflecting Complainant's products and the look and feel of Complainant's official website, as well as detailed information on Complainant's products.

Therefore, by using Domain Names 2 and 3 on websites featuring Complainant's trademarks, and then further to promote the products using content with a similar look and feel of Complainant's website, as shown by evidence in the record – to attract members of the public to the website associated with the Domain Name, Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's TEA FORTÉ marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of Respondent's website.

Respondent also uses an email address, “[...]@teafort.com”, which is confusingly similar to Complainant’s Forté Trademark and official email address “[...]@teaforte.com”. Thus, Respondent can send phishing emails from an email address that is nearly identical to the Complainant’s TEA FORTÉ Trademark and its official email address.

UDRP panels have consistently held that a respondent’s use of a domain name to trade off goodwill in a complainant’s well-known trademark and impersonate complainant, as here, constitutes bad faith.

Moreover, such use of the Domain Name may potentially result in tarnishing Complainant’s reputation and goodwill.

Finally, the Panel also notes the failure of Respondent to submit a response. In the present circumstances, considering the reputation of the TEA FORTÉ trademark, and the use of the Domain Names, the Panel finds that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Names in bad faith.

Therefore, the Panel finds that Complainant succeeds under the third element of paragraph 4(a) 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 Domain Names <teafort.com>, <teafortemark.shop>, and <teaforteofficial.shop> be transferred to Complainant.

/Kimberley Chen Nobles/

Kimberley Chen Nobles

Sole Panelist

Date: July 2, 2026