ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
FragranceX.com Inc. v. MEI WANG
Case No. D2026-2615

1. The Parties

The Complainant is FragranceX.com Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by SafeNames Ltd., United Kingdom.

The Respondent is MEI WANG, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <fragrancex.shop> 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 16, 2026. On June 17, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 18, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that 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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 13, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 17, 2026.

The Center appointed Wilson Pinheiro Jabur as the sole panelist in this matter on July 23, 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 was founded in 2001 as an online outlet for fragrances, being its official website available at “www.fragrancex.com”, which was registered on April 13, 2001.

The Complainant is the owner of the following, amongst others, trademark registrations:

- United States registration No. 3,365,121 for the word mark FRAGRANCEX.COM, registered on January8, 2008, successively renewed, claiming first use in commerce in March 2000, in class 35; and
- United States registration No. 5,375,103 for the word mark FRAGRANCEX, registered on January 9, 2018, claiming first use in commerce in March 2000, in class 35.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 22, 2026, and resolves to a parked webpage offering it for sale for USD 1,450.

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.

Notably, the Complainant asserts that its store is offered exclusively online, making its services within reach globally, and international shipping is made available, having received over 2.4 million visits in May 2026, around 46% of which accessed the store via direct or organic searches, thus submitting that its FRAGRANCEX trademark has become well known and is recognized as one of the leading brands for offering perfume and cologne products online.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant’s FRAGRANCEX trademark as it is clearly contained within the disputed domain name in its entirety, without alteration or adornment, and is therefore identical for the purposes of the Policy.

The Complainant further submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect to the disputed domain name given that:

a) the Respondent does not have any trademark rights to the term “fragrancex” or any other term used in the disputed domain name;
b) the Respondent has not received any license from the Complainant to use domain names featuring the FRAGRANCEX trademark;
c) the Respondent has not used, nor prepared to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, rather having the disputed domain name been redirecting Internet users to a website where the disputed domain name is listed for sale for a “Buy now” price of USD 1,450, a price exceeding its out-of-pocket costs; and
d) the Respondent is not known, nor has ever been genuinely known by the term “fragrancex” or anything similar.

The Complainant also asserts that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith given that it consists solely of the Complainant’s FRAGRANCEX trademark which has become well known for the online provision of cosmetics and perfumes. Furthermore, given the Respondent’s offer to sell the disputed domain name for USD 1450, a price which is beyond what would reasonably be expected within the Respondent’s out-of-pocket costs, the Respondent can only plausibly be targeting the Complainant and intending to profit from the Complainant by offering the disputed domain name for sale, evidencing the Respondent’s bad faith conduct. In addition to that, the Complainant’s representatives sent a cease and desist letter to the Respondent on May 12 and 19, 2026, not having received any response thereto. Lastly,

the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of abusive conduct by registering other domain names that encompass other well-known third-party trademarks, such as <jagermeister.shop>, <zoopla.shop>, <coors.xyz>, and <globant.xyz>; in addition to having been found in bad faith in multiple previous UDRP cases, such as *Zambon S.p.A. v. Mei Wang*, WIPO Case No. D2024-2066; *Société Cooperative Agricole Limagrain v. MEI WANG and 于青青 (yu qing qing),* WIPO Case No. D2024-1794; *Landis+Gyr AG v. MEI WANG,* WIPO Case No. D2023-1770; and *Mölnlycke Health Care AB v. 于青青 (yu qing qing) and MEI WANG*, WIPO Case No. D2024-3545.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy sets forth three requirements, which have to be met for this Panel to order the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
(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.

The Complainant must prove in this administrative proceeding that each of the aforesaid three elements is present in order to obtain the transfer of the disputed domain name.

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 a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical 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.

In that sense, and according to the evidence submitted, the Complainant has made a prima facie case against the Respondent, known as "MEI WANG", who has not been commonly known by the disputed domain name and the Respondent is neither authorized, licensed, nor been allowed to use the Complainant's trademark, whether in the disputed domain name, or in any other way. Further, the disputed domain name has not been actively used apart from resolving to a parked page, offering it for sale. In addition, the case record does not show that the Respondent has any registered trademarks corresponding to the disputed domain name what further corroborates the indication of an absence of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Under these circumstances and absent evidence to the contrary, the Panel finds that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name.

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.

This case presents the following circumstances which indicate on the balance of probabilities bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name:

a) the Respondent has provided no evidence of any actual or contemplated good faith use by it of the disputed domain name;

b) the Complainant and its FRAGRANCEX trademark are well known;

c) the disputed domain name consists of the entirety of the Complainant's FRAGRANCEX trademark, thus carrying a high risk of implied affiliation. The Top-Level Domain ".shop" is closely related to the Complainant's business activity;

d) the offer of the disputed domain name for sale at the price of USD 1,450 on the associated website indicates an amount most likely in excess of the Respondent's out-of-pocket costs directly related to registration of the disputed domain name; and

e) as seen above, the Respondent has already been found in bad faith in several UDRP cases, indicating a pattern of bad faith conduct.

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 name <fragrancex.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Wilson Pinheiro Jabur/
Wilson Pinheiro Jabur
Sole Panelist
Date: August 6, 2026