

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Serax nv v. Gibbs8 Janelle, Castillosa Leon, Shuiping Xie, Aoshua Fogleman, FoglemanAoshua, Aellie Morton, MortonAellie, BodilyMaria
Case No. D2026-2514

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Serax nv, Belgium, represented by Co & Delarue, Belgium.

The Respondents are Gibbs8 Janelle, United States of America ("United States"); Castillosa Leon, United States; Shuiping Xie, China; Aoshua Fogleman, FoglemanAoshua, United States; Aellie Morton, Morton Aellie, United States; BodilyMaria, United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <minimalistischserax.com> is registered with Name SRS AB; the disputed domain names <nl-serax.com>, <seraxkeuken.com>, and <seraxwinkel.com> are registered with Gname.com Pte. Ltd.; and the disputed domain names <seraxkeukenwinkel.com>, and <serax-winkel.com> are registered with GMO Internet, Inc. d/b/a Discount-Domain.com and Onamae.com (collectively the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 10, 2026. On June 10, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On June 11, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Whois Privacy Protection Service by onamae.com/ redacted for privacy/ Protected Protected) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 12, 2026, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on June 17, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 6, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 26, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents’ default on August 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Willem J. H. Leppink as the sole panelist in this matter on August 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 following facts are undisputed.

The Complainant is a Belgian company founded in 1986 by the brothers Serge and Axel Van Den Bossche, active in the interior design sector. The Complainant collaborates with creative professionals who design exclusive collections under the SERAX brand. These collections range from dinnerware, cutlery, tableware, glassware, cookware, kitchen and table accessories, lighting, pottery, and furniture. The Complainant markets these collections to retailers and consumers.

The Complainant is the owner of the following trademarks for SERAX:

- The Benelux trademark registration, with registration number 976160, registered on May 11, 2016, for goods and services in classes 4, 8, 11, 14, 18, 20, 21, 24, 27, 35 and 42 for a wide array of goods and services, including candles, lightning, furniture, carpets and interior design;
- The European Union trademark registration with registration number 014800296, registered on March 25, 2016 for goods and services in classes 4, 8, 11, 14, 18, 20, 21, 24, 27, 35 and 42 for wide array of goods and services, including candles, lightning, furniture, carpets and interior design.
- The International trademark registration with registration number 1383679, registered on September 18, 2017 for goods and services in classes 11, 20 and 21 designating inter alia Australia, Japan, Republic of Korea, Norway, the United States, Switzerland, China, and Russian Federation.

The Complainant is the owner of the domain name <serax.com> registered on November 27, 1997 which resolves to its official website.

The disputed domain names were registered within the time period between December 2024 and May 2026. At the time of the filing of the Complaint and at the time of rendering this Decision, the disputed domain names resolved to parked pages of the Registrar and thus none of the disputed domain names resolved to an active website.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends the following.

Over the years the Complainant has established a worldwide well-known reputation in the interior design sector, in particular for minimalist and contemporary design styles. As of today, the Complainant has 256,000 followers on Instagram. Thus the Complainant is well known under the name SERAX. "Serax" is an invented name derived from the names of the Complainant's two founders, Serge Van Den Bossche and Axel Van Den Bossche. No similar trademarks have been registered by any other party. An Internet search further confirms that the name SERAX refers exclusively to the Complainant and its products.

The first five disputed domain names, <seraxwinkel.com>, <serax-winkel.com>, <seraxkeuken.com>, <seraxkeukenwinkel.com>, and <minimalistischserax.com>, incorporate the SERAX Trademark in its entirety, combined with an additional descriptive Dutch term such as "winkel", "keuken", "keukenwinkel", or "minimalistisch". Such additions of descriptive terms do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the Policy. Moreover, these additions only add to the confusion of Internet users looking for a SERAX store or for specific products such as a minimalistic kitchen.

The sixth disputed domain name <nl-serax.com> incorporates the Complainant's trademark in its entirety, preceded by a geographic element, namely "nl", referring to the language code for Dutch (and the country code for the Netherlands (Kingdom of the)). Given that the Complainant is headquartered in the Dutch-speaking part of Belgium, such an addition will only add to the confusion of Internet users.

In the present case, the Respondents have no legitimate interests, nor any rights in any of the disputed domain names, within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, for the following reasons.

A first indication that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain names can be found in the fact that the Respondents are not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Secondly, the deliberate use of a privacy service by the Respondents is aimed at hiding their real identity and contact information. This clearly shows that the Respondents are not commonly known by the disputed domain names. Indeed, should the Respondents be known by the disputed domain names, there would be no need for the Respondents to shield their identity.

Third, the Respondents have not acquired any trademark or service mark rights, and the registration and use of the disputed domain names was not authorized by the Complainant. In the absence of any license or permission from the Complainant to use its widely known trademark, no actual or contemplated bona fide or legitimate use of the disputed domain names could reasonably be claimed.

It is moreover clear that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain names.

The disputed domain names were registered in bad faith. At the time the Respondents registered the disputed domain names, they must have known the Complainant and its trademarks and could not have been unaware of the reputation of the Complainant. This is demonstrated by the following elements. The Complainant's trademark is well known and the Complainant's products are sold throughout the European Union, the United Kingdom, and the Middle East. The Complainant's social media presence further evidences this reputation, with 254,000 followers on its Instagram page. Moreover, the Complainant's trademark is an invented name derived from the names of the Complainant's founders and carries no generic meaning.

All six disputed domain names do not resolve to an active website and are therefore passively held. The passive holding of the disputed domain names amounts to bad faith where it is difficult to imagine any plausible future active use of the disputed domain names by the Respondents that would be legitimate and would not infringe the Complainant's well-known mark or violate unfair competition and consumer protection legislation. The registration of the disputed domain names further disrupts the Complainant's business by diverting Internet users who are searching for information about the Complainant or its marks, thereby creating confusion. It is therefore clear that the Respondents are using the disputed domain names in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that the disputed domain names follow the same naming pattern and are all in the same language, namely Dutch or refer to the Dutch language, and therefore correspond with the Dutch-speaking market in Belgium and the Netherlands (Kingdom of the). Moreover, the disputed domain names make use of the same hostname and identical IP addresses, which suggests that they are subject to common control. A further pattern can be observed in the Respondents' email addresses, with all five email domains pointing to the same MX destination IP address, meaning that all of these disputed domain names are configured so that inbound mail is routed to the same MX host. The registration timeline further supports the conclusion of common control, as the disputed domain names were all registered within a concentrated period of time.

The Panel finds that there is sufficient evidence that the disputed domain names are subject to common control, and that it would be procedurally efficient, fair, and equitable to all Parties to accept the Complainant's consolidation request. The Panel further notes that the Respondents did not object to the consolidation request.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

6.2. Substantive Issues

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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, "winkel", "keuken", "keukenwinkel", "nl" or "minimalistisch" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel refers to its considerations under section 6.2.B.

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, the Panel notes that the disputed domain names were registered after the Complainant had obtained rights in its SERAX trademark. The distinctiveness of the Complainant's mark, and the composition of the disputed domain names, each of which incorporates the Complainant's mark together with the terms related to the Complainant's business or market, support a finding that the Respondent had the Complainant and its mark in mind when registering the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names were registered in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain names, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

In addition, as for five disputed domains MX servers have been configured, the Panel finds that it more likely than not, that the disputed domain names will be used for fraudulent purposes.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element 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 names <minimalistischserax.com>, <nl-serax.com>, <seraxkeuken.com>, <seraxkeukenwinkel.com>, <serax-winkel.com>, and <seraxwinkel.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Willem J. H. Leppink/

Willem J. H. Leppink

Sole Panelist

Date: August 14, 2026