

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Bliss Trademark Holdings, LLC v. Kaylee Wells
Case No. D2026-2397

1. The Parties

Complainant is Bliss Trademark Holdings, LLC, United States of America (“United States” or “U.S.”), represented by Dorsey & Whitney LLP, United States.

Respondent is Kaylee Wells, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <theblissco.shop> (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 June 2, 2026. On June 3, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On June 5, 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, Dynadot Privacy Service) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on June 5, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on June 8, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 11, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for the Response was July 1, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on July 3, 2026.

The Center appointed John C. McElwaine as the sole panelist in this matter on July 13, 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

Complainant is a United States-based company engaged in the sale of beauty, cosmetics, homeware, and self-care products. Complainant is a Delaware limited liability company with its principal place of business in New York, United States, and it acquired the BLISS trademark and stylized variations thereof (collectively, the “BLISS Marks”) in 2023. Complainant continues to sell various goods under the BLISS Marks, which are sold in numerous retailers in the United States and abroad.

Relevant to this matter, Complainant owns the following trademark registrations:

- BLISS, U.S. Registration. No. 2,116,892, registered on November 25, 1997, in International Class 44;
- BLISS, U.S. Registration. No. 2,913,434, registered on December 21, 2004, in International Class 3; and
- BLISS, U.S. Registration. No. 4,543,707, registered on June 3, 2014, in International Class 35.

Complainant operates its primary website for the BLISS brand at “www.blissworld.com”, which prominently displays the BLISS Marks.

The Domain Name was registered on April 16, 2026. At the time of filing the Complaint, the Domain Name resolved to an online storefront that prominently displays the BLISS Marks, identifies itself as the “Bliss World Store,” offers for sale skincare and beauty products, including serums, cleansers, moisture creams, and body butters at discounted prices, and carries a footer notice reading “© 2026 Bliss World Store”.

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. Complainant asserts that it owns longstanding and well-known rights in the BLISS Marks through use since 1996 and multiple United States and international trademark registrations, and that it has invested substantial resources in developing strong consumer recognition of the BLISS Marks. Complainant states that it has never authorized Respondent to use the BLISS Marks and that Respondent is exploiting Complainant’s goodwill through a deceptive storefront that impersonates Complainant.

With respect to the first element of the Policy, Complainant contends that the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which Complainant has rights. Complainant asserts that the Domain Name incorporates the entirety of the well-known and distinctive BLISS trademark, differing only by the addition of the generic terms “the” and “co,” which merely draw attention to the prominence of the BLISS portion, and that the “.shop” generic Top-Level Domain is discounted in the confusing similarity analysis. Complainant argues that the Domain Name is likely to cause consumers to believe that Respondent is affiliated with, endorsed by, or sponsored by Complainant.

With respect to the second element of the Policy, Complainant contends that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name. Complainant states that Respondent is not a licensee or subsidiary of Complainant, has never been authorized to use the BLISS Marks, is not commonly known by the Domain Name, and has no claim to the BLISS Marks, which are not descriptive or geographically significant terms. Complainant argues that Respondent instead uses the Domain Name under the guise of being Complainant by prominently displaying the BLISS Marks and replicating Complainant’s product photos,

marketing text, and overall look and feel to pose as Complainant's retail storefront. Complainant asserts that such impersonation and fraud can never constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

With respect to the third element of the Policy, Complainant contends that the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Complainant asserts that the BLISS Marks are well known and that Respondent had at least constructive, and likely actual, knowledge of Complainant's rights when it registered the Domain Name, given Complainant's prior registrations and the multiple instances of the BLISS Marks on Respondent's website. Complainant further contends that Respondent's website falsely impersonates Complainant to deceive consumers into believing they are interacting with Complainant, and that Respondent registered the Domain Name to cause consumer confusion, free ride on Complainant's goodwill, and commit fraud, including through the sale of heavily discounted counterfeit goods

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Even though Respondent has defaulted and failed to file a Response, paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires Complainant to support its assertions with evidence and thus prove each of the following elements:

- (i) the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights;
- (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Because of Respondent's default, the Panel may accept as true Complainant's reasonable factual allegations and draw appropriate inferences in Complainant's favor, provided the Panel is satisfied that such allegations are supported by evidence. See *St. Tropez Acquisition Co. Limited v. AnonymousSpeech LLC and Global House Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1779](#); *Bjorn Kassoe Andersen v. Direction International*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-0605](#); see also Rules, paragraph 5(f) ("If a Respondent does not submit a response, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel shall decide the dispute based upon the complaint"). Having reviewed the Complaint, the amended Complaint, and the supporting evidence, and in light of the Policy, the Rules, the Supplemental Rules, and applicable principles of law, the Panel's findings on each of the required elements are set forth below.

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 Complainant's trademark and the Domain Name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

Complainant has shown rights in respect of the BLISS trademark through its registered trademark rights in the United States as detailed herein. In addition, the Panel finds that Complainant's BLISS trademark is recognizable within the Domain Name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7. The Domain Name incorporates the entirety of the BLISS trademark, adding only the article "the" and the abbreviation "co". Although the addition of such terms may bear on the assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that the addition of these terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which Complainant has rights. Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Under the Policy's second element, paragraph 4(a)(ii), Complainant has the burden of establishing that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Complainant needs to make a prima facie showing on this element, at which point the burden of production shifts to Respondent to present evidence that it has rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. If Respondent has failed to do so, Complainant is deemed to have satisfied its burden under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy. See *Vicar Operating, Inc. v. Domains by Proxy, Inc. / Eklin Bot Systems, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2010-1141](#).

In this case, Complainant has put forward a compelling prima facie case that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Complainant states that it has never authorized or permitted Respondent to use the BLISS Marks, and there is no evidence of any relationship between the Parties that would give rise to any license or permission for Respondent to use these trademarks. There is no evidence that Respondent has been commonly known by the Domain Name or that Respondent has acquired any trademark rights in the term "theblissco". The only name associated with Respondent in the record is "Kaylee Wells" which bears no connection to the Domain Name or to the BLISS Marks.

Respondent has not rebutted Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name, such as those enumerated in the Policy¹ or otherwise. Instead, the record demonstrates that Respondent has engaged in conduct that negates any claim to legitimate interests. Specifically, Respondent has operated a website that impersonates Complainant by adopting similar branding and using copied images of Complainant's products to sell such products without authorization and at a steep discount. Such impersonation is inconsistent with bona fide use and constitutes clear evidence of an intent to capitalize on Complainant's reputation. Panels have consistently held that impersonation of a complainant or its business through a domain name and associated website negates any claim to rights or legitimate interests. See *On AG, On Clouds GmbH v. Nguyen Luu, Withheld for Privacy Purposes, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf, Vuong Hoang, AN NGUYEN, NEO CORP., and Ngoc Tam Nguyen*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-1714](#) ("a [disputed domain name's] use cannot be deemed bona fide if the disputed domain names constitute trademark infringement"), citing *Sai Machine Tools Pvt. Ltd. v. Mr. Sudhir Jaiswal, Shree Sai Extrusion Technik Pvt. Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2018-2560](#) ("bona fide use is predicated on honest adoption of the name" and respondent failed to show such honest adoption; rather, respondent's use was infringing and therefore not bona fide).

Respondent, having defaulted, has not submitted any evidence to rebut Complainant's prima facie case. There is nothing in the record to suggest that any of the circumstances enumerated in Policy paragraph 4(c) (or any other basis for rights or legitimate interests) would apply. Respondent's use of the Domain Name is not in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, but rather in connection with a deceptive e-commerce site that infringes Complainant's rights, and Respondent is not making any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name, but instead is seeking to mislead Internet users for commercial gain.

The Panel concludes that Complainant's un rebutted evidence establishes that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Therefore, the second element of the Policy is satisfied.

¹ The Policy, paragraph 4(c), provides a non-exhaustive list of circumstances in which a respondent could demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name: "(i) before any notice to you of the dispute, your use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the domain name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or (ii) you (as an individual, business, or other organization) have been commonly known by the domain name, even if you have acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or (iii) you are making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue."

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides non-exhaustive circumstances evidencing bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) explains that bad faith may be found where Respondent seeks to take unfair advantage of, abuse, or otherwise engage in behavior detrimental to Complainant's trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1. The Panel finds that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith.

Bad faith registration can be found where a respondent "knew or should have known" of a complainant's trademark rights and nevertheless registered a domain name in which it had no rights or legitimate interests. See *Accor v. Kristen Hoerl*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-1722](#). The BLISS Marks are distinctive and were registered and used in commerce long before Respondent registered the Domain Name on April 16, 2026. The Domain Name reproduces the BLISS trademark together with the terms "the" and "co" and resolves to a storefront that adopts Complainant's BLISS Marks and logo, identifies itself as the "Bliss World Store" and offers the very categories of beauty goods that Complainant sells under the BLISS Marks. In these circumstances, there is no plausible explanation for Respondent's registration of the Domain Name other than to trade off the goodwill and reputation of Complainant's mark, and the Panel finds that Respondent registered the Domain Name with Complainant's mark firmly in mind and with the intention of exploiting it. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2.

Turning to the use of the Domain Name, by operating an online store that closely imitates Complainant's official website, Respondent has shown an intent to confuse and mislead consumers for commercial gain. The website under the Domain Name prominently displays the BLISS Marks throughout, reproduces product images and marketing text copied from Complainant, and offers purported BLISS-branded products at steep discounts, reinforcing a false impression of legitimacy and affiliation with Complainant. This conduct establishes that Respondent, by using the Domain Name, has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the BLISS Marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and the products offered on it, which constitutes bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

For these reasons, the Panel holds that Complainant has met its burden of showing that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith under 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 Domain Name, <theblissco.shop>, be transferred to Complainant

/John C McElwaine/

John C McElwaine

Sole Panelist

Date: July 27, 2026