

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Melaleuca, Inc. v. Jack Shaw
Case No. D2026-2126

1. The Parties

Complainant is Melaleuca, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), internally represented.

Respondent is Jack Shaw, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <melaleuca-inc.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 18, 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 19, 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 Complainant on May 20, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on May 25, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 May 28, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 17, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on June 18, 2026.

The Center appointed Clark W. Lackert 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

Complainant has offered wellness, home cleaning, and personal care goods and services in the United States under the MELALEUCA mark (the “Mark”) since at least as early as September 1985 and now offers such goods and services under the MELALEUCA mark in many countries, including but not limited to the United States, Canada, and Japan, across a variety of goods and services. Complainant also owns the <melaleuca.com> domain name, registered on December 11, 2001, through which the goods and services are offered.

Complainant has prominently and extensively used, promoted, and advertised the Mark and domain name for over thirty years. By virtue of these efforts, the Mark has become well recognized by consumers as designating Complainant as the source of the goods and services so marked. Accordingly, the Mark and domain name are extremely valuable to Complainant.

Complainant is the owner of all rights in and to the following registrations for the Mark:

Trademark	Country	Registration No.	Registration Date
MELALEUCA	United States	1917518	September 12, 1995
MELALEUCA	Canada	TMA492065	March 30, 1998
MELALEUCA	Japan	4242215	February 19, 1999
MELALEUCA THE WELLNESS COMPANY (design)	United States	2958954	June 7, 2005

The aforementioned registrations are valid and subsisting under their respective national laws.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 12, 2026. The disputed domain name redirects to the Complainant’s website at the domain name <melaleuca.com>. The Complainant argues that the disputed domain name has been used to send fraudulent emails.

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.

The domain name(s) is(are) identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights:

The disputed domain name <melaleuca-inc.com> is confusingly similar to Complainant’s Mark. The disputed domain name incorporates the Mark in its entirety and merely adds the corporate identifier “inc”. The addition of a corporate designation does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under UDRP precedent. The addition of the corporate identifier “inc” increases confusion because Complainant’s corporate name is Melaleuca, Inc. Where a domain name incorporates a complainant’s mark in its entirety, confusing similarity is typically found.

Prior UDRP panels have already found that domain names combining the Mark with the corporate identifier “inc” are confusingly similar to Complainant’s mark. See *Melaleuca, Inc. v. Donald Morgan*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-1103](#) (finding the domain name <melaleucainc.com> confusingly similar to the Mark notwithstanding the addition of “inc”).

Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name(s):

Respondent registered the disputed domain name on May 12, 2026, long after Complainant registered the Mark with the United States Patent and Trademark Office and long after Complainant began using the Mark. Respondent does not provide its own independent website at the disputed domain name. Rather, an Internet user who visits the disputed domain name, is misled, and redirected to Complainant's website at <melaleuca.com>. Complainant has not authorized Respondent to use the Mark in any manner, including as part of a domain name or to redirect web traffic.

Respondent is not making a bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of Policy paragraph 4(c)(i), as the disputed domain name simply redirects Internet users to Complainant's official website, thereby reinforcing the false impression that the disputed domain name is affiliated with or authorized by Complainant. Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of Policy paragraph 4(c)(ii), and there is no evidence that Respondent has acquired any trademark or service mark rights in the Mark.

Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name within the meaning of Policy paragraph 4(c)(iii), as the website is commercial in nature and intended to divert Internet users seeking Complainant. Upon information and belief, Respondent registered the disputed domain name to create confusion with Complainant and to mislead Internet users seeking Complainant. Its conduct raises a risk of phishing or other fraudulent activity directed at consumers seeking Complainant. In short, Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, which is confusingly similar to Complainant's Mark.

The domain name(s) was/were registered and is/are being used in bad faith:

The very nature of Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name evidences bad faith. Upon information and belief, Respondent knowingly registered the disputed domain name incorporating an exact reproduction of the well-known Mark, with the corporate identifier "inc", to capitalize on consumer recognition of the Mark and its association with the categories of goods and services listed on the website. Given the longstanding use, international trademark registrations, and Respondent's use of the disputed domain name in impersonation emails referencing Complainant and its personnel, and misdirecting web traffic, Respondent plainly had actual knowledge of Complainant and its rights in the Mark at the time of registration. Respondent's use of the disputed domain name creates the false impression that the disputed domain name is owned or operated by Complainant, or an authorized agent.

Respondent's conduct falls squarely within Policy paragraph 4(b)(iv), as Respondent has intentionally used the disputed domain name to create a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's Mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of communications originating from the disputed domain name, including impersonation emails directed to vendors and prospective business partners. Panels have consistently found bad faith where disputed domain names are used for impersonation, phishing, or fraudulent email schemes. See *Melaleuca, Inc. v. Donald Morgan*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-1103](#) (finding bad faith where respondent used a confusingly similar domain name to send impersonation emails using Complainant's mark, logo, and address and redirected the domain to Complainant's official website).

Respondent is prominently advertising using Complainant's registered Mark and registered logo to mislead vendors. Additionally, a misleading email from Respondent includes the name of an employee of Complainant to create further confusion. Upon information and belief, Respondent registered the disputed domain name to create the false appearance of an official website, and to mislead consumers and vendors into believing that communications originating from the disputed domain name are authorized by Complainant. The disputed domain name is being used in connection with impersonation emails directed to vendors and prospective business partners in an apparent attempt to induce commercial transactions under false pretenses.

The bad faith allegations set out in the paragraphs above, combined with Respondent's lack of interest or rights in the disputed domain name, should lead the Panelist to the only reasonable conclusion that there is no plausible circumstance under which Respondent could legitimately register or use the disputed domain name and that, therefore, the disputed domain name was registered and is being used by Respondent in bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent is in default and 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.

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 confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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 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 relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

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 Respondent intentionally attempted to create confusion with Complainant's mark, since it copied Complainant's trademark in its entirety, and used the disputed domain name to redirect to Complainant's website and on phishing email to confuse Complainant's customers into believing that it was Complainant or an authorized agent of Complainant.

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, claimed phishing/identity theft, false impersonation, and passing off, 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 <melaleuca-inc.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Clark W. Lackert/

Clark W. Lackert

Sole Panelist

Date: July 6, 2026