

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Curio Brands, LLC and The Thymes, LLC v. 好笑, huapusjmn huapusjmn
and 云云 张, bwhd
Case No. D2026-2233

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Curio Brands, LLC (“Curio”), United States of America (“United States”), and The Thymes, LLC, United States, represented by Fredrikson & Byron, PA, United States.¹

The Respondents are 好笑, United States (“First Respondent”), huapusjmn huapusjmn, United States (“Second Respondent”), and 云云 张, bwhd, United States (“Third Respondent”).

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <thymesshop.sbs> and <thymesshop.it.com>² are registered with Dynadot LLC (the “First Registrar”). The disputed domain name <thymeshome.shop> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the “Second Registrar”, and together with the First Registrar, the “Registrars”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 22, 2026, for the disputed domain name <thymesshop.sbs>. On May 26, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the First Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name <thymesshop.sbs>. On May 29, 2026, the First Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response, disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name <thymesshop.sbs> which differed from the named Respondent (John/Jane Doe / Redacted for privacy (DT), Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email

¹ The Amended Complaint defines “Complainant” (singular) as Curio Brands, LLC, and separately defines The Thymes, LLC, a wholly owned subsidiary of Curio Brands, LLC and the owner of the mark, as “Trademark Owner.” The Panel refers to Curio Brands, LLC and The Thymes, LLC collectively as “the Complainants” where the Amended Complaint’s contentions or actions are attributed to both, and individually by name where the point concerns one entity specifically, such as ownership of the mark.

² The Panel notes that the <thymesshop.it.com> is a third-level domain name falling under the .it.com Dispute Resolution Policy which provides that the registrants agree to abide by the results of a UDRP proceeding if informal resolution in coordination with IT.com Domains is unsuccessful. The Complainant has provided evidence that it filed an abuse complaint with IT.com Domains, and the Panel has received no confirmation that any settlement had taken place under the it.com Dispute Resolution Procedure. The Panel will accordingly proceed to a decision under the UDRP.

communication to the Complainants on the same date, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the First Registrar, and inviting the Complainants to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainants filed an amendment to the Complaint on June 1, 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 First Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 3, 2026. On June 8, 2026, the Complainants submitted a Supplemental Filing requesting the addition of the domain names <thymeshome.shop> and <thymesshop.it.com> (the “Additional Domain Names”) to the proceedings. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 23, 2026. The First Respondent did not submit any response, and the Center notified Respondent’s default on June 24, 2026.

The Center appointed William F. Hamilton 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.

On July 8 and July 10, 2026, upon the Panel’s instruction, the Center transmitted by email to the concerned Registrars, Spaceship, Inc. and Dynadot LLC, a request for registrar verification in connection with the Additional Domain Names. On July 9 and July 13, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses, disclosing registrant and contact information for the Additional Domain Names. On July 14, 2026, the Panel issued Procedural Order No. 1, directing the Complainants to file, by July 19, 2026, an amended Complaint adding the Additional Domain Names and the disclosed registrant information, together with any further arguments in view thereof, and affording the Second and Third Respondents until July 24, 2026 (i) to make submissions regarding the Complainants’ request for consolidation, and (ii) to file a Response in respect of the Additional Domain Names as they might deem appropriate.

On July 17, 2026, the Complainants filed an Amended Complaint naming the Respondents. No submission regarding consolidation was received from any Respondent, and no Response was filed in respect of the Additional Domain Names within the period fixed by the Panel.

Due to an administrative oversight, it appears the Center’s email was not copied to the Respondents at certain email addresses. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents huapusjmn huapusjmn and 云云张, bwhd, at the specified email addresses of an additional five-day period, through August 17, 2026, to indicate whether they wish to participate in this proceeding. No response was received.

4. Factual Background

Curio manufactures and sells candles, soaps, bath and body products, and home fragrance goods. The trademark THYMES (the “Mark”) is owned by The Thymes, LLC, a wholly-owned subsidiary of Curio, and has been used by the Complainants and their predecessors since at least 2005 in connection with these goods. The Complainants operate their official website at the domain name <thymes.com>.

The Mark is the subject of numerous trademark registrations. These include:

- United States Registration No. 3,288,716 for THYMES, registered on September 4, 2007, in International Classes 3 and 4;
- United States Registration No. 3,308,432 for THYMES and design, registered on October 9, 2007, in International Classes 3 and 4; and

- United States Registration No. 4,053,963 for a stylized T design, registered on November 8, 2011, in International Classes 3, 4, and 5.

The Mark is also registered in other jurisdictions, including the European Union, the United Kingdom, Canada, the Dominican Republic, and China.

The First Respondent registered the disputed domain name <thymesshop.sbs> on December 25, 2025. When the Complaint was filed, <thymesshop.sbs> resolved to an active online store that displayed the Mark and the stylized T design, offered for sale candles, bath and body products, and home fragrance goods of the kind sold under the Mark, and reproduced the layout, imagery, and design elements of the Complainants' official website. The listed products were offered at substantial discounts.

The Second Respondent registered the disputed domain name <thymeshome.shop> on March 18, 2026. The Third Respondent registered the disputed domain name <thymesshop.it.com> on May 21, 2026³. The disputed domain names <thymeshome.shop> and <thymesshop.it.com> do not currently resolve to active websites. According to the evidence on file, the disputed domain name <thymesshop.it.com> previously resolved to a website substantially similar to the website at the disputed domain name <thymesshop.sbs>.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainants

The Complainants contend that they have rights in the Mark and that each of the disputed domain names is confusingly similar to it. They argue that the disputed domain names <thymesshop.sbs> and <thymesshop.it.com> incorporate the Mark in its entirety with the addition of only the generic term "shop", and that the disputed domain name <thymeshome.shop> incorporates the Mark in its entirety with the addition of only the generic term "home", and that neither addition prevents a finding of confusing similarity. The Complainants contend that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. They state that they have never authorized any Respondent to register or use a disputed domain name or to offer any goods or services on their behalf, that there is no relationship of any kind between the Parties, and that the unauthorized incorporation of the Mark in each disputed domain name cannot support a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Complainants contend that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. As to the disputed domain name <thymesshop.sbs>, the Complainants contend that the First Respondent uses the Mark as the principal identifier of a website that copies the Complainants' branding and design in order to impersonate the Complainants and to offer counterfeit goods, and that, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Mark, the First Respondent has intentionally sought to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain or to disrupt the Complainants' business. As to the disputed domain names <thymeshome.shop> and <thymesshop.it.com>, the Complainants contend that the Second and Third Respondents registered their disputed domain names in bad faith for the purpose of trading on the reputation and goodwill of the Mark and diverting consumers by falsely suggesting an affiliation with the Complainants. The Complainants add that the addition of the terms "shop" and "home" reinforces the commercial character of each registration by suggesting an online retail storefront for products bearing the Mark that the Respondents are not authorized to sell.

The Complainants further contend that the disputes concerning the three disputed domain names should be consolidated in this single proceeding, on the grounds that the disputed domain names are subject to common control and that consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties.

³ The Panel visited the disputed domain names <thymeshome.shop> and <thymesshop.it.com> on August 1, 2026, and found that neither resolves to an active website. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.8, regarding a panel's discretion to undertake limited independent research into matters of public record.

B. Respondents

No Respondent replied to the Complainants' contentions. No Respondent made any submission regarding the Complainants' request for consolidation, notwithstanding the opportunity to do so afforded by Procedural Order No. 1.

6. Discussion and Findings

Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules provides that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder. Paragraph 10(e) of the Rules grants the Panel discretion to consolidate multiple domain name disputes. Where the domain names are not held by a nominally identical registrant, the Panel considers (i) whether the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control, and (ii) whether consolidation would be fair and equitable to all parties. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.11.2.

Several factors support a finding of common control. Each of the three disputed domain names incorporates the Mark in its entirety with the addition of only a generic e-commerce term, "shop" or "home", a construction pattern that is unlikely to have arisen independently across three unrelated registrants. The three disputed domain names were registered within a five-month period, between December 25, 2025, and May 21, 2026. And the registrant information disclosed for each of the three disputed domain names has, on its face, the appearance of unreliability: the First Respondent's registration lists an incoherent name and address; the Second Respondent's registration lists a repeated nonsense character string as both first and last name; and the Third Respondent's registration lists an address, and a state/province field that do not correspond to any identifiable place. The submission of facially incoherent registrant information across three ostensibly unrelated registrants is circumstantial evidence of concealment by a common actor.

Furthermore, the disputed domain names <thymesshop.sbs> and <thymesshop.it.com> resolved to fully built storefronts substantially similar in layout and design.

As regards the disputed domain name <thymeshome.shop>, the Panel recognizes the countervailing considerations: that disputed domain name is held by a different registrant, registered with a different registrar, and the disputed domain names were registered across several months rather than in immediate succession.

The decisive consideration is that the Panel expressly invited the Second and Third Respondents, in Procedural Order No. 1, to make submissions contesting consolidation, and afforded them a specific opportunity to do so by July 24, 2026. Neither the Second nor the Third Respondent, nor the First Respondent, made any submission on the question. Where the only parties positioned to disclaim common ownership, and with every incentive to do so if it were untrue, decline an express invitation to be heard, the Panel finds that consolidation would occasion no unfairness or prejudice to any Respondent, and that consolidation serves the efficient and consistent resolution of related disputes targeting the same Mark. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.11.2.

The Panel accordingly consolidates the disputes regarding the disputed domain names <thymesshop.sbs>, <thymeshome.shop>, and <thymesshop.it.com> in this single proceeding, and proceeds to address the merits below. The Respondents are collectively referred to below as "the Respondent".

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Mark is owned of record by The Thymes, LLC, Curio's wholly owned subsidiary. A complainant that is related to the registered owner of a mark, such as a parent company, has standing to bring a complaint under the Policy, and the Panel is satisfied that the Complainants have rights in the Mark for the purposes of the first element. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.4.1.

The Mark is reproduced in its entirety and is clearly recognizable within each of the disputed domain names. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7. The addition of the term "shop" in the disputed domain names <thymesshop.sbs> and <thymesshop.it.com>, and the addition of the term "home" in the disputed domain name <thymeshome.shop>, does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established as to each of the disputed domain names.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Complainants have not authorized the Respondent to register or use a domain name or to offer any goods or services under the Mark, there is no relationship between the Parties, and nothing in the record indicates that the Respondent is commonly known by any disputed domain name. The Complainants have accordingly made out a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, which the Respondent has not rebutted. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Each disputed domain name consists of the Mark together with the term "shop" or "home". The disputed domain name <thymesshop.sbs> is (and the disputed domain name <thymesshop.it.com> was) moreover used for a website that reproduces the Mark, the Complainants' stylized T design, and the design of the Complainants' official website to present the Respondent as, or as connected with, the Complainants. Such use to impersonate the Complainants is not a bona fide offering of goods or services and cannot give rise to rights or legitimate interests. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1. The Panel finds that the composition of these disputed domain names – each built from the identical Mark-plus-generic-term construction – coupled with the use to resolve to a website in which the Respondent tried to impersonate the Complainant, signals the Respondent's intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain names and the Complainant as to the origin or affiliation of the respective websites. Similarly, the Panel holds that the remaining disputed domain name <thymeshome.shop> was most likely selected with the Complainant's Mark in mind.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established as to each of the disputed domain names.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Mark was registered many years before any of the disputed domain names. The websites to which the disputed domain names <thymesshop.sbs> and <thymesshop.it.com> resolve(d) prominently display(ed) the Mark, the stylized T device, and the design of the Complainants' official website. The Respondent therefore registered the disputed domain names <thymesshop.sbs> and <thymesshop.it.com> with knowledge of, and to target, the Complainants and the Mark. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2. By using the disputed domain names <thymesshop.sbs> and <thymesshop.it.com> to operate a website with the same look and feel as the Complainants' official website, prominently featuring the Mark and the stylized T device, the Respondent has intentionally sought to attract Internet users to its websites for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the websites, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The use of the disputed domain names <thymesshop.sbs> and <thymesshop.it.com> to impersonate the Complainants in this manner is itself evidence of bad faith.

The disputed domain name <thymeshome.shop> was registered as part of the same scheme as <thymesshop.sbs> and <thymesshop.it.com> and the Panel finds, on balance, it was registered with the Complainant's Mark in mind in a deliberate scheme to construct domain names replicating the Mark.

The Mark is reputed in its sector and has been used in commerce for two decades. On this basis, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name <thymeshome.shop> was registered in bad faith.

See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2.

Neither the disputed domain name <thymeshome.shop> nor the disputed domain name <thymesshop.it.com> currently resolves to an active website. See footnote 2, *supra*. Non-use does not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the circumstances of this case. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Applying the factors relevant to the passive holding doctrine, the Panel notes: the Mark is reputed in its sector and has been used in commerce for two decades; the Respondent has not submitted a response or offered any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use; the registrant information provided for each of the disputed domain names has, as discussed above, the appearance of concealment; and the disputed domain name <thymesshop.it.com> was previously used for an impersonating online store. The passive holding of these two disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of bad faith.

The Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established as to each of the disputed domain names.

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 <thymesshop.sbs>, <thymeshome.shop>, and <thymesshop.it.com> be transferred to the Complainants.

/William F. Hamilton/

William F. Hamilton

Sole Panelist

Date: August 19, 2026