

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Penney OpCo LLC, d/b/a JCPenney, on behalf of itself and Penney IP LLC v.
Vadym Bayev
Case No. D2026-2192

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Penney OpCo LLC, d/b/a JCPenney, on behalf of itself and Penney IP LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Jackson Walker, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Vadym Bayev, Ukraine.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lizclaiborneclothing.com> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 21, 2026. On May 21, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 22, 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 (Registration Private, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 22, 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 amendment to the Complaint on May 26, 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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 2, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 22, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 23, 2026.

The Center appointed Edoardo Fano as the sole panelist in this matter on June 26, 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.

The Panel has not received any requests from the Complainant or the Respondent regarding further submissions, waivers or extensions of deadlines, and the Panel has not found it necessary to request any further information from the Parties.

Having reviewed the communication records in the case file provided by the Center, the Panel finds that the Center has discharged its responsibility under the Rules, paragraph 2(a) "to employ reasonably available means calculated to achieve actual notice to [the] Respondent". Therefore, the Panel shall issue its Decision based upon the Complaint, the Policy, the Rules and the Supplemental Rules and without the benefit of a response from the Respondent.

The language of the proceeding is English, being the language of the Registration Agreement, as per paragraph 11(a) of the Rules.

4. Further Procedural Considerations

Under paragraph 10 of the Rules, the Panel is required to ensure that the Parties are treated with equality and that each Party is given a fair opportunity to present its case, and that the administrative proceedings take place with due expedition.

Although the Respondent's mailing address is stated to be in Ukraine, which is subject to an international conflict at the date of this Decision, which may impact case notification, it is appropriate for the Panel to consider, in accordance with its discretion under paragraph 10 of the Rules, whether the proceedings should continue.

The Panel is of the view that they should. Further to the Rules, the Center transmitted written notice of the Complaint to the Respondent. While it is noted that the notification by registered postal mail has not been successfully delivered at the Respondent's physical address as registered with the Registrar, due to the recipient's absence, the Panel notes that the Notification of the Complaint sent via the Respondent's Registrar-confirmed email address was successfully transmitted to the Respondent, as the Center did not receive any notice that the email address used for notification was invalid or that the messages could not be delivered.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name was registered on September 13, 2025, several years after the commencement of the international conflict. This indicates that, at the time of registration, the Respondent was able to set up an active website, and therefore appears capable of controlling both the disputed domain name and the related content. Moreover, given that the Respondent evidently has Internet access, it is reasonable to conclude that the Respondent has received at least electronic notice of these proceedings. Furthermore, the website associated with the disputed domain name is in the English language, which may suggest that the Respondent is not actually located in Ukraine.

The Panel moreover notes (albeit in the absence of any Response) that it is clear the Complainant has been targeted and that this is not a coincidental domain name registration, as is further described herein.

The Panel concludes that the Parties have been given a fair opportunity to present their case, and so that the administrative proceedings take place with due expedition the Panel will proceed to a Decision accordingly.

5. Factual Background

The Complainant Penney OpCo LLC, d/b/a JCPenney, is a United States retail company that exploits the LIZ

CLAIBORNE brand, which has been in use since at least 1976, in connection with clothing, accessories, and home goods. The Complainant is the exclusive licensee of its affiliate Penney IP LLC. Penney IP LLC is the owner of several United States trademark registrations for LIZ CLAIBORNE, including:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 1,167,434 for LIZ CLAIBORNE, registered on September 1, 1981, in the name of Penney IP LLC, and having Penney OpCo LLC indicated as correspondent;
- United States Trademark Registration No. 2,131,395 for LIZ CLAIBORNE, registered on January 20, 1998, in the name of Penney IP LLC, and having Penney OpCo LLC indicated as correspondent; and
- United States Trademark Registration No. 4,063,464 for LIZ CLAIBORNE, registered on the November 29, 2011, in the name of Penney IP LLC, and having Penney OpCo LLC indicated as correspondent.

The Complainant also operates on the Internet, its official website being “www.jcpenney.com”.

The Complainant provided evidence in support of the above.

According to the WhoIs records, the disputed domain name was registered on September 13, 2025, and it is currently inactive. However, when the Complaint was filed, the disputed domain name resolved to a website imitating the official Complainant’s website, featuring the Complainant’s corporate history, displaying the Complainant’s trademark and logo, and purportedly featuring the Complainant’s products with Amazon links and claiming to generate affiliate commissions on resulting purchases. Further, the website under the disputed domain name also included links that redirected to online retail platforms Ebay, Etsy, and ThredUp.

6. 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 states that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark LIZ CLAIBORNE, as the disputed domain name wholly incorporates the Complainant’s trademark.

Moreover, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name since it has not been authorized by the Complainant to register the disputed domain name or to use its trademark within the disputed domain name, it is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and it is not making either a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name resolved to a website in which the Complainant’s trademark and logo were reproduced, in order to impersonate the official Complainant’s website and misdirect consumers for financial gain.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in bad faith, since the Complainant’s trademark LIZ CLAIBORNE is well known in the fields of clothing, accessories, and home goods. Therefore, the Respondent targeted the Complainant’s trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name and the Complainant contends that the use of the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant and thereby fraudulently deceive consumers, attempting to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark, qualifies as bad faith registration and use.

B. Respondent

The Respondent has made no reply to the Complainant’s contentions and is in default. In reference to paragraphs 5(f) and 14 of the Rules, no exceptional circumstances explaining the default have been put

forward or are apparent from the record.

A respondent is not obliged to participate in a proceeding under the Policy, but if it fails to do so, reasonable facts asserted by a complainant may be taken as true, and appropriate inferences, in accordance with paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, may be drawn. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), section 4.3.

7. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists three elements, which the Complainant must satisfy in order to succeed:

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

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.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 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.

While the addition of other terms, here “clothing”, 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 Complainant’s trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

It is also well-accepted that a generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”), in this case “.com”, is typically disregarded when assessing the confusing similarity between a trademark and a domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Based on the available record, 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.

While 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 often impossible 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. 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.

The Complainant in its Complaint, and as set out above, has established a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. It asserts that the Respondent, who is not currently associated with the Complainant in any way, is not using the disputed domain name for a legitimate noncommercial or fair use or in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The prima facie case presented by the Complainant is enough to shift the burden of production to the Respondent to demonstrate that it has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. However, the Respondent has not presented any evidence of any rights or legitimate interests it may have in the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name resolved to a website in which the Complainant's trademark, logo, and corporate history were reproduced, with the attempt to pass itself off as the official Complainant's website and mislead consumers for financial gain.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel therefore concludes that the disputed domain name is not being used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Finally, the Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name (incorporating the Complainant's trademark in its entirety with the addition of the term "clothing", connected to the Complainant's field of activity) coupled with the use of the disputed domain name to resolve to a website in which the Respondent tries to pass itself off as the Complainant, affirms the Respondent's intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant as to the origin or affiliation of the website.

Based on the available record, 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, regarding the registration in bad faith of the disputed domain name, the reputation of the Complainant's trademark LIZ CLAIBORNE in the fields of clothing, accessories, and home goods is clearly established, and the Panel finds that the Respondent must have known of the Complainant, and deliberately registered the disputed domain name in bad faith, especially because the disputed domain name resolved to a website in which the Complainant's trademark, logo and corporate history were reproduced, with the attempt to impersonate the official Complainant's website and mislead consumers for financial gain.

As regards the use in bad faith of the disputed domain name, the Panel notes that the Respondent was trying to attract Internet users to its website by creating likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the website's source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement, an activity clearly detrimental to the Complainant's business.

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.

The above suggests to the Panel that the Respondent intentionally registered and was using the disputed domain name in order both to disrupt the Complainant's business, in accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iii) of the Policy, and to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website in accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

As regards the current use of the disputed domain name, being inactive, panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or “coming soon” page) would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the record, the Panel notes the reputation of the Complainant’s trademark in the fields of clothing, accessories, and home goods, the nature of the disputed domain name (wholly incorporating the Complainant’s trademark with the addition of the term “clothing”, connected to the Complainant’s field of activity), the prior use of the disputed domain name, and the failure of the Respondent to submit a response, and finds that in the circumstances of this case, the current passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Furthermore, the Panel considers that the nature of the disputed domain name, which incorporates the Complainant’s trademark in its entirety with the addition of the term “clothing”, connected to the Complainant’s field of activity, further supports a finding of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

8. 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 <lizclaiborneclothing.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Edoardo Fano/

Edoardo Fano

Sole Panelist

Date: July 3, 2026