

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Broers Group Pty Ltd v. ambri elleshop

Case No. D2026-2629

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Broers Group Pty Ltd, Australia, represented by Zeal Legal Group, Australia.

The Respondent is ambri elleshop, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <oikitures.com> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with Realtime Register B.V. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 17, 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 disclosing registrant and contact information for the Disputed Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (“REDACTED FOR PRIVACY” C/O REALTIME REGISTER B.V.) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 22, 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 23, 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 26, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 16, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 17, 2026.

The Center appointed Flip Jan Claude Petillion as the sole panelist in this matter on July 22, 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 is Broers Group Pty Ltd, a company incorporated under Australian law. The Complainant is the owner of Australian registered trade mark number 2204443 for OIKITURE (the “Trade Mark”), in a stylised form, registered with a priority date of August 26, 2021, in class 20 in respect of furniture and related goods, including furniture for offices and the home, sofas, chairs, tables, desks, shelving units, beds, and related items.

The Disputed Domain Name <oikitures.com> was created on May 12, 2026. According to the Complainant, the Disputed Domain Name has been used to resolve to a website displaying content purportedly related to furniture products, including product descriptions and images that did not match one another, and links that did not function. The content and images on the website bear all the hallmarks of being generated by artificial intelligence.

The Panel also notes that, on April 28, 2026, the Complainant had already filed a domain name dispute in respect of the domain name <oikiture.com> (*Broers Group Pty Ltd v. themytexas house*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-1808](#)), and that the Disputed Domain Name was registered shortly thereafter. When the Panel verified whether the Disputed Domain Name resolved to a webpage, the Disputed Domain Name was returning an error and a security warning.

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.

First, the Complainant submits that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to its Trade Mark. The Disputed Domain Name consists of the textual element “oikitures”, which is the plural of OIKITURE.

Second, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name. In summary, according to the Complainant:

- the Complainant has not authorised the Respondent to use the Trade Mark or to register the Disputed Domain Name;
- the Disputed Domain Name forms no part of the Respondent’s business or corporate name;
- there is no genuine commercial activity on the website, as the product links do not work, the product descriptions and images do not match, and no purchases can be made; and
- the content and images on the website bear all the hallmarks of being created with generative AI.

Third, the Complainant claims that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. In summary, according to the Complainant:

- the Disputed Domain Name was registered days after the Complainant filed a dispute regarding <oikiture.com>, and once that proceeding was commenced, traffic was redirected to the Disputed Domain Name;
- the website lists an Australian physical address and uses the registered trade mark symbol to suggest the domain name owner is the registered owner of the OIKITURE trade mark in Australia when it is not;

- the address listed is for a related company of the Complainant, and the phone number is associated with an unrelated third party;
- the term “oikiture” is a coined, fanciful term with no dictionary meaning and bears no resemblance to the Respondent’s name; and
- the Respondent used a privacy service to mask its identity, which in the context of impersonation and deceptive redirection supports a bad faith inference.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds that the Complainant has demonstrated rights in a trademark for the purposes of the Policy. The Complainant holds Australian registered trade mark number 2204443 for OIKITURE, registered in class 20 with a priority date of August 26, 2021. Where the complainant holds a nationally registered trademark, this prima facie satisfies the threshold requirement of having trademark rights for the purposes of standing to file a UDRP case. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel observes that the Disputed Domain Name <oikitures.com> consists of the textual element “oikitures”, which is simply the plural form of the Complainant’s registered Trade Mark OIKITURE. In cases where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark, or where at least a dominant feature of the relevant mark is recognizable in the domain name, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7. The addition of the plural “s” does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity with the Trade Mark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.9.

It is well established that generic Top-Level Domains, here “.com”, may be disregarded when considering whether the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.

The Panel finds that 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 the Disputed Domain Name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognised that proving 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 that 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 Respondent has not apparently been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name. The registrant name disclosed by the Registrar is "ambri elleshop", a name that bears no resemblance to the Disputed Domain Name or the Trade Mark. The term "oikiture" is a coined, fanciful term with no dictionary meaning and does not correspond to the Respondent's identity. The Respondent's use and registration of the Disputed Domain Name was not authorised by the Complainant. There is no evidence in the record that the Respondent holds any trademark rights in the trade mark OIKITURE.

A respondent's use of a domain name will not be considered "fair" if it falsely suggests affiliation with the trademark owner. The correlation between a domain name and the complainant's mark is often central to this inquiry. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1. In the present case, the Disputed Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's Trade Mark in its entirety (with the mere addition of the plural "s"), which is insufficient to avoid the risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant.

The Panel further observes that the website that appears to have been previously associated with the Disputed Domain Name does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services. While the website was technically active in the sense that it displays content, there is no genuine commercial activity: according to the unrebutted evidence and allegations of the Complainant, the product links did not work, the product descriptions and images do not match, and no purchases can be made anywhere on the website. Furthermore, the content and images on the website, as shown by the Complainant, bear hallmarks of being created with generative AI. UDRP panels have categorically held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (e.g., impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.

The Respondent had the opportunity to demonstrate its rights or legitimate interests but did not do so. In the absence of a Response from the Respondent, the prima facie case established by the Complainant has not been rebutted.

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 that, in particular but without limitation, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

The Panel finds that the following circumstances, considered together, clearly demonstrate registration and use in bad faith.

First, the Disputed Domain Name was registered days after the Complainant filed a domain name dispute in respect of the domain name <oikiture.com>. Once that proceeding was commenced, traffic from the domain name <oikiture.com> was purportedly redirected to the Disputed Domain Name. The Panel infers that this is not a coincidence. The registration of a confusingly similar domain name shortly after the commencement of UDRP proceedings concerning a related domain name is a strong indicator of bad faith.

Second, the term "oikiture" is a coined, fanciful term with no dictionary meaning and shares no similarity with the Respondent's name as revealed by the Registrar's verification. The Respondent accordingly had no legitimate reason to register the Disputed Domain Name other than to take advantage of the Complainant's Trade Mark.

Third, the website that appears to have been associated with the Disputed Domain Name lists an Australian physical address and uses the registered trade mark symbol to falsely suggest the domain owner is the registered owner of the OIKITURE trade mark in Australia. The address listed is for a related company of the Complainant. The Panel considers this deliberate impersonation to be a further indicator of bad faith.

Fourth, the Respondent did not formally take part in the administrative proceedings, thereby failing to rebut the Complainant's evidence and contentions. According to the Panel, this constitutes an additional indication of bad faith in the circumstances of this case.

In the circumstances, the overwhelming inference available is that the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name primarily for the purpose of taking advantage of the Complainant's Trade Mark, or otherwise to disrupt the Complainant's business.

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 <oikitures.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Flip Jan Claude Petillion/

Flip Jan Claude Petillion

Sole Panelist

Date: July 30, 2026