

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Maxi Miliaan B.V v. dantangchun
Case No. D2026-2103

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Maxi Miliaan B.V, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), represented by Bignon Lebray, France.

The Respondent is dantangchun, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <maxi-cosi-shop.com> is registered with Bangning Digital Technology Co.,Ltd (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 15, 2026. On May 18, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 20, 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 (Redacted for privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 20, 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 May 22, 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 27, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 16, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 22, 2026.

The Center appointed Dawn Osborne as the sole panelist in this matter on June 24, 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, a Dutch consumer goods company specialising in the marketing of goods for babies, is the owner of the mark MAXI-COSI registered, inter alia, as European Union trade mark no. 2401560 for safety seats for babies since March 24, 2003.

The disputed domain name registered on April 27, 2026, has been used for a site using the Complainant's mark in its logo form as a masthead and copying elements from the Complainant's web site to impersonate the Complainant.

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 disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that:

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's prior trade mark adding only a dictionary word "shop", a hyphen and the generic Top-Level Domain ".com", none of which prevent said confusing similarity.

The Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, is not commonly known by it and is not authorised by the Complainant.

The disputed domain name has been used for a web site using the Complainant's mark in its logo form as a masthead and copying elements from the Complainant's web site to impersonate the Complainant and for likely phishing purposes. This is not a bona fide offering of goods or services or a noncommercial or legitimate fair use. It is registration and use in opportunistic bad faith misleading Internet users for commercial gain in full knowledge of the Complainant and its rights.

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 trade mark 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 trade mark 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 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 “shop” may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term 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. Nor does the addition of a hyphen.

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 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 disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Respondent is not authorised by the Complainant or commonly known by the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name has been used for a web site in the English language using the Complainant’s mark in its logo form as a masthead and copying elements from the Complainant’s web site to impersonate the Complainant and purporting to offer the Complainant’s goods in USD. The site does not make it clear there is no association between it and the Complainant and this is deceptive and confusing and so cannot be a bona fide offering of goods or services. The site is commercial and so cannot be a noncommercial legitimate or fair use.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here, impersonation and passing off, 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 has used the disputed domain name for a site using the Complainant's mark in its logo form as a masthead and copying elements from the Complainant's web site to impersonate the Complainant. The use of the Complainant's logo and elements copied from the Complainant's site shows that the Respondent is aware of the Complainant and its business. The Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract for commercial gain Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark, thereby disrupting the Complainant's business.

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, but other circumstances may be relevant 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here passing off, 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 name <maxi-cosi-shop.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Dawn Osborne/

Dawn Osborne

Sole Panelist

Date: June 24, 2026