ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Maurices Incorporated v. 派 派
Case No. D2026-2301

1. The Parties

Complainant is Maurices Incorporated, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Faegre Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP, United States.

Respondent is 派 派, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <maurices.lol> (the "Domain Name") 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 28, 2026. On May 29, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On May 30, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent ("REDACTED FOR PRIVACY Super Privacy Service Ltd c/o Dynadot") and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on June 1, 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 June 5, 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 June 8, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 28, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on July 6, 2026.

The Center appointed Kimberley Chen Nobles as the sole panelist in this matter on July 8, 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

Founded in 1931, Complainant has used the MAURICES trademark in connection with women's fashion clothing and retail footwear services. To date, Complainant has retail stores with over 800 locations across the United States and Canada, employing approximately 9,500 associates. Complainant also conducts business online, which generated approximately USD 400 million in e-commerce revenue in 2025.

Complainant owns several registered trademarks for the MAURICES mark in various jurisdictions, including:
- United States registered trademark number 1095513 for the MAURICES word mark, registered on July 4, 1978;
- United States registered trademark number 3386467 for the MAURICES word mark, registered on February 19, 2008; and
- Canadian registered trademark number TMA776138 for the MAURICES word mark, registered on September 1, 2010.

Complainant also owns and operates its website at <maurices.com>, registered in 1995, to advertise and sell Complainant's MAURICES branded women's fashion clothing, footwear, cosmetics, jewelry, clutch bags, wallets, shoulder bags, tote bags and related products.

The Domain Name was registered on December 12, 2025, and resolved to a website that features Complainant's trademarks and content, including official marketing images, offers Complainant's MAURICES-branded merchandise for sale and also claimed to being "Maurices" on its website's "About Us" page.

On April 12, 2026, Complainant's representative sent a cease-and-desist letter by email to Respondent, but received no response.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Name.

Notably, Complainant contends that (i) the Domain Name is confusingly similar to Complainant's trademarks; (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name; and (iii) Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith.

In particular, Complainant contends that it has trademark registrations and rights for MAURICES and that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name with the intention to confuse Internet users looking for bona fide and well-known MAURICES products and services.

Complainant notes that it has no affiliation with Respondent, nor authorized Respondent to register or use a domain name, which includes Complainant's trademarks, and that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the registration and use of the Domain Name. Rather, Complainant contends that Respondent has acted in bad faith in acquiring and setting up the Domain Name, when Respondent clearly knew of Complainant's rights. Specifically, Complainant argues that Respondent used the Domain Name to set up a

website to impersonate or pose as Complainant, featuring Complainant's trademarks and content, including official marketing images, and offering Complainant's MAURICES-branded merchandise for sale.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1") states that failure to respond to the complainant's contentions would not by itself mean that the complainant is deemed to have prevailed; a respondent's default is not necessarily an admission that the complainant's claims are true.

Thus, although in this case Respondent has failed to respond to the Complaint, the burden remains with Complainant to establish the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy by a preponderance of the evidence.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Complainant has provided evidence of its rights in the MAURICES trademarks, as noted above. Complainant has therefore proven that it has the requisite rights in the MAURICES trademarks.

With Complainant's rights in the MAURICES trademarks established, the remaining question under the first element of the Policy is whether the Domain Name, typically disregarding the Top-Level Domain ("TLD") in which it was registered (in this case, is ".lol") is identical or confusingly similar to Complainant's trademarks. See, e.g., *B & H Foto & Electronics Corp. v. Domains by Proxy, Inc. / Joseph Gross*, WIPO Case No. D2010-0842.

Here, the Domain Name is identical to Complainant's MAURICES trademarks.

Thus, the Panel finds that Complainant has satisfied the first element of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, a complainant must make a prima facie showing that a respondent possesses no rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name. See, e.g., *Malayan Banking Berhad v. Beauty, Success & Truth International*, WIPO Case No. D2008-1393. Once a complainant makes such a prima facie showing, the burden of production shifts to the respondent, though the burden of proof always remains on the complainant. If the respondent fails to come forward with relevant evidence showing rights or legitimate interests, the complainant will have sustained its burden under the second element of the UDRP.

From the record in this case, it is evident that Respondent was, and is, aware of Complainant and its MAURICES trademarks and does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Complainant has confirmed that Respondent is not affiliated with Complainant, or otherwise authorized or licensed to use the MAURICES trademarks or to seek registration of any domain name incorporating these trademarks. Respondent is also not known to be associated with the MAURICES trademarks and there is no evidence showing that Respondent has been commonly known by the Domain Name.

In addition, Respondent has not used the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Rather, at the time of filing of the Complaint, Respondent used the Domain Name to set up a website that features Complainant's trademarks and content, including official marketing images, and offers Complainant's MAURICES-branded merchandise for sale. The website also claimed to being "Maurices" on its "About Us" page, essentially impersonating Complainant. UDRP panels have consistently held that use of a domain name for illegal activity — such as impersonation or

passing off — can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1. Complainant further alleges that Respondent's use of "Add to Cart" and "Buy Now" buttons facilitate the solicitation and Respondent's collection of personal and credit card information from Internet users looking for Complainant's products.

Such use of the Domain Name is misleading and such potential attempts to reach individuals seeking for Complainant's products may result in giving the false impression to Internet users that the Domain Name is owned by Complainant. The resulting confusion would cause damage to Complainant's reputation and goodwill, and interfere with Complainant's business activities. The use of a domain name for impersonation/passing off can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent.

Accordingly, Complainant has provided evidence supporting its prima facie showing that Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Respondent has failed to produce countervailing evidence of any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Thus, the Panel concludes that Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name and Complainant has met its burden under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel finds that Respondent's actions indicate that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides a non-exhaustive list of circumstances indicating bad faith registration and use on the part of a respondent, namely:

"(i) circumstances indicating that you have registered or you have acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of your documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or

(ii) you have registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that you have engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) you have registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the domain name, you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your website or location or of a product or service on your website or location."

The Panel finds that Complainant has provided ample evidence to show that registration and use of the MAURICES trademarks predate the registration of the Domain Name. Complainant is also well established and known. Indeed, the record shows that Complainant's MAURICES trademarks and related products and services are widely known and recognized. Therefore, and also noting the below use analysis, Respondent was clearly aware of the MAURICES trademarks when it registered the Domain Name.

The Panel therefore finds that Respondent's awareness of Complainant's trademark rights at the time of registration suggests bad faith. See *Red Bull GmbH v. Credit du Léman SA, Jean-Denis Deletraz*, WIPO Case No. D2011-2209; *Nintendo of America Inc v. Marco Beijen, Beijen Consulting, Pokemon Fan Clubs Org., and Pokemon Fans Unite*, WIPO Case No. D2001-1070; and *BellSouth Intellectual Property Corporation v. Serena, Axel*, WIPO Case No. D2006-0007.

Moreover, the Domain Name's inclusion of Complainant's trademark in its entirety in the Domain Name, further reflects the awareness that Respondent had of Complainant and its trademarks at the time of registration. Such adoption of Complainant's trademarks at the time of registration of the Domain Name illustrates Respondent's effort to mislead Internet users as to the Domain Name's association with Complainant.

Moreover, Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name to confuse and mislead consumers looking for the bona fide and well-known MAURICES products and services of Complainant, to its website likely for its own commercial benefit. In particular, at the time of filing of the Complaint, Respondent used the Domain Name to set up a website that features Complainant's trademarks and content, including official marketing images, and offers Complainant's MAURICES-branded merchandise for sale. The website also claimed to being "Maurices" on its "About Us" page, and the use of "Add to Cart" and "Buy Now" buttons which facilitate the solicitation and Respondent's collection of personal and credit card information from Internet users looking for Complainant's products.

Such use of the Domain Name is misleading and such potential attempts to reach individuals seeking for Complainant's products may result in giving the false impression to Internet users that the Domain Name is owned by Complainant.

The resulting confusion from such impersonation and/or phishing communications would cause damage to Complainant's reputation and goodwill, and interfere with Complainant's business activities. The use of a domain name for impersonation/passing off shows Respondent's acts of bad faith, and is not rebutted by Respondent.

UDRP panels have consistently held that Respondent's use of the Domain Name to trade off goodwill in Complainant's well-known trademark and impersonate Complainant constitutes bad faith. See *Philip Morris Products S.A. v. homn mohmoodi*, WIPO Case No. D2022-4158. Moreover, such use of the Domain Name may potentially result in tarnishing Complainant's reputation and goodwill.

Further, the Panel also notes the failure of Respondent to submit a response.

In the present circumstances, considering the reputation of the MAURICES trademarks and the fraudulent use of the Domain Name, the Panel finds that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith.

Therefore, the Panel finds that Complainant succeeds under the third element of paragraph 4(a) 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 Domain Name <maurices.lol> be transferred to Complainant.

/Kimberley Chen Nobles/
Kimberley Chen Nobles
Sole Panelist
Date: July 14, 2026