WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

PRL USA Holdings, Inc., The Polo/Lauren Company L.P. v. The Anh
Case No. D2026-2273

1. The Parties

The Complainants are PRL USA Holdings, Inc., and The Polo/Lauren Company L.P., United States of America, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is The Anh, Viet Nam.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ralphscoffee.shop> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 27, 2026. On May 27, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 28, 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 (The RDAP server redacted the value / Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on May 28, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainants to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainants filed an amended Complaint on June 1, 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 June 8, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 28, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 30, 2026.

The Center appointed Torsten Bettinger as the sole panelist in this matter on July 7, 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 Complainants are wholly-owned subsidiaries of Ralph Lauren Corporation. PRL USA Holdings, Inc. and The Polo/Lauren Company L.P. own and manage trademark rights associated with the RALPH LAUREN and RALPH'S COFFEE brands.

Ralph Lauren Corporation traces its origins to 1967 and is active internationally in the design, marketing, and distribution of premium lifestyle products, including apparel, accessories, home products, fragrances, and hospitality services.

The Complainants opened the first Ralph's Coffee location in New York in 2014 and have since offered coffee, coffee-related products, and merchandise through cafes, coffee trucks, kiosks, and other retail formats in North America, Europe, and Asia.

The Complainants own numerous trademark registrations for RALPH'S COFFEE, including, inter alia:

- International Trademark Registration No. 1412961 for RALPH'S COFFEE, registered on May 14, 2018, in Classes 21, 25, 30, and 43; and

- International Trademark Registration No. 1416572 for RALPH'S COFFEE (figurative), registered on May 14, 2018, in Classes 21, 25, 30, and 43;

The International Registrations designate, inter alia, Viet Nam under the Madrid Protocol.

The Complainants maintain an extensive Internet presence through, among other domain names, <ralphlauren.com> and <ralphs-coffee.com>, the latter having been registered in 2014.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 12, 2025.

The evidence submitted by the Complainants shows that the disputed domain name previously resolved to a website displaying the Complainants' RALPH'S COFFEE mark. The website reproduced references to the RALPH LAUREN brand and used the official address of the Complainants' flagship store in New York.

Following takedown efforts by the Complainants, the disputed domain name no longer resolves to an active website.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainants

The Complainants request consolidation of their claims on the basis that they are wholly-owned subsidiaries of the same parent company, have rights in the same trademark portfolio, and share a common grievance against the same Respondent.

The Complainants contend that they have satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

With regard to paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Complainants contend:

- that the disputed domain name is identical to the RALPH'S COFFEE trademark;
- the disputed domain name consists solely of the words "ralphscoffee", with the apostrophe omitted because it cannot be represented in the domain name system, together with the Top-Level Domain ("TLD") ".shop".

With regard to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, the Complainants submit:

- that the Respondent has no relationship with them and has never been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted to use the RALPH'S COFFEE trademark or to register the disputed domain name;
- the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name;
- the prior website impersonated the Complainants and their RALPH'S COFFEE business and did not accurately disclose the Respondent's lack of relationship with the Complainants;
- the Complainants submit that such use is neither a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

With regard to paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, the Complainants contend that:

- the Respondent knew of and targeted the RALPH'S COFFEE trademark when registering the disputed domain name;
- the prior website used references to the RALPH LAUREN brand and the official address of the Complainants' flagship store, demonstrating deliberate impersonation;
- the Complainants argue that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy;
- the subsequent inactivity of the disputed domain name does not cure the prior bad-faith use.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainants' contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy states that the Complainants must prove each of the following three elements:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainants have 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 Complainants' trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 1.7.

The Complainants have shown rights in the RALPH'S COFFEE trademark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The second-level portion of the disputed domain name is "ralphscoffee". It reproduces the Complainants' RALPH'S COFFEE trademark in its entirety, save for the omission of the apostrophe and space. Those characters cannot be represented in the relevant portion of a domain name and their omission does not affect the recognizability of the trademark.

The TLD ".shop" is viewed as a standard registration requirement and is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity analysis.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is identical or, at a minimum, confusingly similar to the Complainants' RALPH'S COFFEE trademark. 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 may result in the difficult task of proving a negative, requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent.

Where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name, although the burden of proof remains on the complainant. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1.

The Complainants have not authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the RALPH'S COFFEE trademark. There is no evidence that the Respondent is affiliated with the Complainants or has been commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Registrar-disclosed registrant name, The Anh, does not resemble the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name is identical to the Complainants' trademark and therefore carries a high risk of implied affiliation. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.1.

The evidence shows that the disputed domain name previously resolved to a website impersonating the Complainants' RALPH'S COFFEE business. The website referred to the RALPH LAUREN brand and used the official address of the Complainants' flagship store, thereby presenting itself as if it were operated by or affiliated with the Complainants. Such impersonation does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services under paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy or legitimate noncommercial or fair use under paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy.

The fact that the disputed domain name is now inactive does not confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent.

The Respondent has not submitted any response and has not come forward with any evidence of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out circumstances, in particular but without limitation, that shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

The Complainants' RALPH'S COFFEE trademark rights predate the registration of the disputed domain name by several years. The Complainants have also used the RALPH'S COFFEE brand since 2014, and the disputed domain name was registered on November 12, 2025.

The disputed domain name reproduces the RALPH’S COFFEE trademark in its entirety. The Respondent’s prior website expressly referred to the RALPH LAUREN brand and used the official address of the Complainants’ flagship store. In these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with actual knowledge of the Complainants and their trademarks.

The evidence further shows that the Respondent used the disputed domain name for a website designed to impersonate the Complainants’ RALPH’S COFFEE business. The composition of the disputed domain name and the content of the website were calculated to give Internet users the false impression that the website was operated by, affiliated with, or authorized by the Complainants.

The Panel therefore finds that, by using the disputed domain name, the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainants’ RALPH’S COFFEE trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent’s website. Such conduct falls within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The disputed domain name no longer resolves to an active website. That subsequent inactivity does not cure the Respondent’s prior bad-faith use. In the circumstances of this case, including the distinctiveness of the Complainants’ mark, the exact reproduction of the mark in the disputed domain name, the prior impersonating website, and the absence of any response or plausible good-faith explanation, the current passive holding of the disputed domain name also supports a finding of bad faith.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) 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 <ralphscoffee.shop> be transferred to the Complainants.

/Torsten Bettinger/
Torsten Bettinger
Sole Panelist
Date: July 21, 2026