

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Urban Outfitters Inc. v. 吕景华 (Jing Hua Lv), 刘胜利 (Sheng Li Liu)
Case No. D2026-2618

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Urban Outfitters Inc., United States of America, represented by Safenames Ltd., United Kingdom.

The Respondents are 吕景华 (Jing Hua Lv), China; and 刘胜利 (Sheng Li Liu), China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <freepeopleusa.com>, and <urbanoutusa.net> are registered with Cloud Yuqu LLC.

The disputed domain names <urbanoutfittersusa.com>, and <anthrousa.com> are registered with Chengdu West Dimension Digital Technology Co., Ltd.

(collectively referred as the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English 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 names. On June 18 and 22, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrants and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication in Chinese and English to the Complainant on June 22, 2026 with the registrants 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 in English on June 22, 2026.

On June 22, 2026, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain names is Chinese. On June 22, 2026, the Complainant confirmed its request that English be the language of the proceeding. The Respondents did not submit any comment on the Complainant's submission.

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 in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 25, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 15, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents' default on July 17, 2026.

The Center appointed Rachel Tan as the sole panelist in this matter on July 27, 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, founded in 1970 in Philadelphia, United States of America, is a fashion and lifestyle retailer and has become famous for offering on-trend apparel, accessories and wellness products which are primarily targeted towards young adults. The Complainant was listed on the NASDAQ stock exchange in 1993.

The Complainant states that it maintains substantial operations, both through physical retail stores and online channels, for the sale of its URBAN OUTFITTERS, FREE PEOPLE, and ANTHROPOLOGIE products. The URBAN OUTFITTERS brand operates more than 250 stores worldwide, the ANTHROPOLOGIE brand operates more than 250 stores worldwide, and the FREE PEOPLE brand operates more than 260 stores worldwide. In 2025, net sales generated by the Complainant's URBAN OUTFITTERS, FREE PEOPLE, and ANTHROPOLOGIE brands were USD 1.3 billion, USD 1.6 billion, and USD 2.5 billion, respectively.

The Complainant operates official websites at "www.anthropologie.com", "www.urbanoutfitters.com", and "www.freepeople.com" to offer its products. In May 2026, these official websites received 30.8 million, 23.1 million, and 20.3 million visits, respectively. The Complainant also offers mobile applications for its URBAN OUTFITTERS, FREE PEOPLE and ANTHROPOLOGIE brands through the Apple App Store and Google Play. In addition, the Complainant has established a strong social media presence, with tens of millions of followers across major platforms including Instagram, LinkedIn, YouTube, TikTok, and Facebook.

The Complainant submitted numerous trademark registrations for URBAN OUTFITTERS, FREE PEOPLE, ANTHROPOLOGIE, and ANTHRO, and states that these trademark registrations are owned by the Complainant and its subsidiaries, which include:

- United States of America trademark URBAN OUTFITTERS Registration No.1323901, registered on March 5, 1985, in class 42;
- United States of America trademark FREE PEOPLE Registration No. 1827547, registered on March 22, 1994, in class 25;

- United States of America trademark ANTHROPOLOGIE Registration No. 1814261, registered on December 28, 1993, in class 42;

- United Kingdom trademark ANTHRO Registration No. UK00003940085, registered on November 10, 2023, in classes 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 16, 18, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 32, and 35.

The trademark records for the above registrations state that the first three listed trademark were previously owned by the Complainant, and the fourth-listed trademark is owned by Urban Outfitters Ireland Limited. The Panel conducted its own search of publicly available records, including the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) database. These searches indicate that the first three listed trademarks have been assigned to Urban Outfitters Wholesale, Inc. The Panel's further searches also indicate that the Complainant, Urban Outfitters Wholesale, Inc., and Urban Outfitters Ireland Limited are affiliated companies.

The first Respondent, 吕景华 (Jing Hua Lv), is reportedly based in China and registered the disputed domain name <anthrousa.com> on February 20, 2024, and the disputed domain names <freepeopleusa.com> and <urbanoutusa.net> on January 8, 2025. The second Respondent, 刘胜利 (Sheng Li Liu), is reportedly based in China and registered the disputed domain name <urbanoutfittersusa.com> on March 4, 2024.

Presently, all four disputed domain names resolve to inactive websites. According to the Complainant's evidence, the disputed domain names <urbanoutfittersusa.com> and <urbanoutusa.net> previously resolved to websites displaying the Complainant's URBAN OUTFITTERS trademark and purportedly offering clothing at discounted prices. The disputed domain name <anthrousa.com> previously resolved to a website displaying the Complainant's ANTHROPOLOGIE trademark and purportedly offering clothing at discounted prices. As for the disputed domain name <freepeopleusa.com>, Google search results indicate that it was previously used for hosting a website containing the Complainant's FREE PEOPLE trademark, as well as the logo "FP" identical to the label and icon used on the Complainant's official website at "www.freepeople.com" and in its official application and purportedly offering clothing.

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 that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its URBAN OUTFITTERS, FREE PEOPLE, ANTHROPOLOGIE, and ANTHRO trademarks. The disputed domain names <urbanoutfittersusa.com> and <freepeopleusa.com> incorporate the entirety of the Complainant's URBAN OUTFITTERS or FREE PEOPLE trademarks, with the addition of the geographic abbreviation "usa" (referring to the United States of America). The disputed domain names <urbanoutusa.net> and <anthrousa.com> omit the term "fitters" and "pologie", respectively, and add the geographic abbreviation "usa", but retain the dominant and distinctive element of the Complainant's URBAN OUTFITTERS and ANTHROPOLOGIE trademarks. In addition, the Complainant also owns a trademark registration for ANTHRO. The addition of the geographic abbreviation and the omission of the terms do not dispel the confusing similarity between the Complainant's trademarks and the disputed domain names. The generic Top-Level domains (gTLDs) such as ".com" or ".net", are standard registration requirements and are disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test.

The Complainant further contends that to the best of the Complainant's knowledge, the Respondents do not have any trademark rights corresponding to the dispute domain names and have not been commonly known by the disputed domain names. Nor have the Respondents received any license from the Complainant to use the Complainant's trademarks. The Respondents previously resolved the disputed domain names to websites displaying the Complainant's trademarks and purportedly offering clothing at discounted prices, without any disclaimer clarifying the lack of affiliation with the Complainant. It is clear that the Respondents

intended to create confusion between the websites associated with the disputed domain names and the Complainant and its trademarks, and to take advantage of the goodwill and reputation attached to the Complainant's trademarks in order to attract Internet users to the websites associated with the disputed domain names for commercial gain. Such use cannot be considered a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names. The current non-use of the disputed domain names does not give rise to any rights or legitimate interests to the Respondents. Therefore, the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names.

The Complainant finally contends that the Complainant's URBAN OUTFITTERS, FREE PEOPLE, ANTHROPOLOGIE, and ANTHRO trademarks were registered long before the registration of the disputed domain names and have acquired substantial reputation and recognition within the clothing industry. It is inconceivable that Respondents were not aware of the Complainant's URBAN OUTFITTERS, FREE PEOPLE, ANTHROPOLOGIE, and ANTHRO trademarks at the time of registering the disputed domain names. Moreover, the fact that the websites previously associated with the disputed domain names displayed the Complainant's trademarks and purportedly offered clothing at discounted prices further indicates that Respondents were fully aware of the Complainant and the Complainant's URBAN OUTFITTERS, FREE PEOPLE, ANTHROPOLOGIE, and ANTHRO trademarks when registering the disputed domain names. The Respondents' use of the disputed domain names clearly demonstrates that the Respondents' purpose in registering and using the disputed domain names has been to intentionally attempt to attract Internet users seeking the Complainant's URBAN OUTFITTERS, FREE PEOPLE, ANTHROPOLOGIE, and ANTHRO products to the websites associated with the disputed domain names for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the websites associated with the disputed domain names and the goods offered on the websites.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Procedural Issues – Language of the Proceedings

The language of the Registration Agreements for the disputed domain names is Chinese. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including the fact that 1) all four disputed domain names contain Latin characters and the websites associated with the disputed domain names previously contained English content; 2) the Respondents target the Complainant and are familiar with the Complainant's operation within the Complainant's market, of which is primarily English speaking; 3) using Chinese as language of the proceeding would unfairly disadvantage and burden the Complainant and delay the proceedings and adjudication of this matter.

The Respondents did not make any submissions with respect to the language of the proceeding.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#)), section 4.5.1.

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English. See *Williams-Sonoma, Inc. v. Junhao Luo*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-1049](#).

6.2. Procedural Issues – 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. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that (i) the two Respondents share the same email address and phone number and (ii) all four disputed domain names were previously used for hosting similar websites that displayed the Complainant's trademarks and purported to offer clothing for sale. These facts satisfy the criteria of a finding of common control under [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.11.2.

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. See *Instagram, LLC v. vu dinh dat, Tran Dinh Luong*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-0119](#).

6.3. Substantive Issues

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademarks and the disputed domain names. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Panel is prepared to accept on the basis of the publicly available information identified through its independent searches, that the Complainant's affiliated companies currently own the submitted trademark registrations. Therefore, the Complainant has shown rights in respect of the URBAN OUTFITTERS, FREE PEOPLE, ANTHROPOLOGIE, and ANTHRO trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.4.1.

The gTLDs ".com" and ".net" as standard registration requirements should be disregarded in the assessment of confusing similarity under the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

The disputed domain names <urbanoutfittersusa.com>, <freepeopleusa.com>, and <anthrousa.com> each incorporate the Complainant's URBAN OUTFITTERS, FREE PEOPLE, and ANTHRO trademarks in their entirety. While the geographic abbreviation "usa" (referring to the United States of America) is included, the Complainant's URBAN OUTFITTERS, FREE PEOPLE, and ANTHRO trademarks remain clearly recognizable within the disputed domain names.

The disputed domain name <urbanoutusa.net> incorporates the dominant element of the Complainant's URBAN OUTFITTERS trademark. While the term "fitters" is omitted and the geographic abbreviation "usa" is added, the dominant element of the Complainant's URBAN OUTFITTERS trademark remains clearly recognizable in the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds that the addition of the geographic abbreviation "usa" and the omission of the term "fitters" do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the Complainant's URBAN OUTFITTERS, FREE PEOPLE, and ANTHRO trademarks. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 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.

The information in the case file shows that:

- the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has not been authorized to use the Complainant's URBAN OUTFITTERS, FREE PEOPLE, ANTHROPOLOGIE, and ANTHRO trademarks in any form;
- there is no evidence proving that the Respondent holds any trademark rights corresponding to the disputed domain names, or has been commonly known by the disputed domain names;
- all four disputed domain names currently resolve to inactive websites. However, the disputed domain names <urbanoutfittersusa.com> and <urbanoutusa.net> previously resolved to websites displaying the Complainant's URBAN OUTFITTERS trademark and purportedly offering clothing at discounted prices. The disputed domain name <anthrousa.com> previously resolved to a website displaying the Complainant's ANTHROPOLOGIE trademark and purportedly offering clothing at discounted prices. The disputed domain name <freepeopleusa.com> was previously used for hosting a website displaying the Complainant's FREE PEOPLE trademark, as well as the logo "FP" identical to the label and icon used on the Complainant's official website at "www.freepeople.com" and in its official application and purportedly offering clothing. These websites associated with the disputed domain names did not contain any prominent and accurate explanation of the relationship (or lack thereof) between the Parties. Such use of the disputed domain names indicates the Respondent's intention to divert Internet traffic to the websites associated with the disputed domain names by misleading Internet users into believing that the websites associated with the disputed domain names are operated or endorsed by the Complainant, which cannot be deemed as a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use;
- the nature of the disputed domain names, incorporating either the entirety or the dominant element of the Complainant's trademarks together with the geographic abbreviation "usa", referring to the United States of America where the Complainant is incorporated and conducts business. When considered alongside the Respondent's previous use of the disputed domain names, it supports to affirm the Respondent's intention of

taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain names and the Complainant as to the origin or affiliation of the websites associated with the dispute domain names; and

- no other factors demonstrate any rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in the disputed domain names.

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 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 Complainant (and its affiliated companies) obtained trademark registrations for URBAN OUTFITTERS as early as March 5, 1985; for FREE PEOPLE as early as March 22, 1994; for ANTHROPOLOGIE as early as December 28, 1993; and for ANTHRO as early as November 10, 2023. Each of these trademark registration dates predates the registration dates of the disputed domain names (February 20, 2024, March 4, 2024, and January 8, 2025). Based on the Complainant's evidence, the Panel accepts that the Complainant and its URBAN OUTFITTERS, FREE PEOPLE, ANTHROPOLOGIE, and ANTHRO trademarks have gained a certain degree of reputation and recognition worldwide through their extensive use and promotion. The Respondent registered the disputed domain names that incorporate either the entirety or the dominant element of the Complainant's trademarks and used them to host similar websites displaying the Complainant's trademarks, as well as the logo identical to the label and icon used on the Complainant's official website and official application and purportedly offering clothing for sale. Given these circumstances, the Panel determines that the Respondent had actual knowledge of the Complainant and its URBAN OUTFITTERS, FREE PEOPLE, ANTHROPOLOGIE, and ANTHRO trademarks at the time of registering the disputed domain names, and bad faith is found.

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.

The disputed domain names resolve to inactive websites at the time of the Decision but were once used for hosting similar websites that displayed the Complainant's trademarks, as well as the logo identical to the label and icon used on the Complainant's official website and official application and purportedly offered clothing for sale. The Panel holds that by selecting the domain names confusingly similar to the Complainant's URBAN OUTFITTERS, FREE PEOPLE, and ANTHRO trademarks, and using them in the manner as described, the Respondent obviously has intended to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the disputed domain names and the associated websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's URBAN OUTFITTERS, FREE PEOPLE, and ANTHRO trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the websites associated with the disputed domain names, which constitutes bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Given the circumstances above, the current non-use of the disputed domain names does not prevent the Panel's finding of the Respondent's bad faith.

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 <anthrousa.com>, <freepeopleusa.com>, <urbanoutfittersusa.com>, and <urbanoutusa.net> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Rachel Tan/

Rachel Tan

Sole Panelist

Date: August 10, 2026