

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Kings Loot LCC v. youssef hajjami, youssef
Case No. D2026-2347

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Kings Loot LCC, United States of America, represented by Nieves IP Law Group, LLC, United States of America.

The Respondent is youssef hajjami, youssef, Morocco.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <kingslootofficial.com> 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 30, 2026. On June 1, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 2, 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 (Berthaus) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 3, 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 amended Complaint on June 4, 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 10, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 30, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 2, 2026.

The Center appointed Masato Dogauchi 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

The Complainant a Colorado, United States of America, limited liability company, dealing with wallets; business card holders, card cases; cell phone cases and so on.

The Complainant owns and exercises its rights in the KINGS LOOT trademark, through registrations such as:

- United States of America Trademark Registration No. 5961183 for KINGS LOOT, registered on January 14, 2020;
- United States of America Trademark Registration No. 7868354 for KINGS LOOT, registered on July 15, 2025; and
- United States of America Trademark Registration No. 7110455 for KINGS LOOT, registered on July 18, 2023.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 4, 2026. It resolved to a page reproducing the Complainant's brand, presentation and content, and offering the same type of goods as the Complainant's and bearing the Complainant's logo. The Complainant also submitted evidence of customer correspondence which shows that some of its customers have indicated that they placed orders at the disputed domain name website without ever receiving their orders.

5. 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.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 15(a), a panel shall decide a case on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable. Since the Respondent has not filed a Response in this case, the following decision is rendered on the basis of the Complainant's contentions and other evidence submitted by the Complainant.

In accordance with the Policy, paragraph 4(a), in order to qualify for a remedy, the Complainant must prove each of the following:

- (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 of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the KINGS LOOT trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Complainant's KINGS LOOT mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. The additional term "official" and the generic Top-Level Domain ".com" do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element test. 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 the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the 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 notes that the disputed domain name resolved to a page that mimicked the Complainant's brand, presentation and content, and offered the same type of goods as the Complainant's, also bearing the Complainant's logo. The Panel further notes that the Complainant's customers seem to have made purchases via the website at the disputed domain name without receiving said purchases. The Panel therefore concludes that, by passing off as the Complainant, the Respondent has not used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor is it making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. These facts prevent a finding of right or legitimate interests for the Respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.

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, noting the composition of the disputed domain name, the fact that the Complainant has been doing business under the “Kings Loot” brand and had such trademark registered for over five years, the Panel finds it is unlikely that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant’s KINGS LOOT trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name on May 4, 2026. Therefore, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith. This is further supported by the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name, impersonating the Complainant.

With regard to the requirement that the disputed domain name is being used in bad faith, the Panel finds in this case it resolved to a page that mimics the Complainant’s brand, presentation and content, and offered the same goods as the Complainant’s, also bearing the Complainant’s logo, which indicates that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark . The Panel further notes that the Complainant’s customers seem to have made purchases via the website at the disputed domain name without receiving said purchases. These facts are considered to be enough to show that the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name is in bad faith.

The Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 <kingslootofficial.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Masato Dogauchi/

Masato Dogauchi

Sole Panelist

Date: July 15, 2026