

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Cimpress plc, Cimpress Schweiz GmbH v. Joyner Joyner
Case No. D2026-2663

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Cimpress plc, United States of America ("United States"), and Cimpress Schweiz GmbH, United States, represented by The GigaLaw Firm, Douglas M. Isenberg, Attorney at Law, LLC, United States.

The Respondent is Joyner Joyner, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <vistaprintpro.com> is registered with TuringSign Inc. d/b/a Cosmotown (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 18, 2026. On June 19, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 20, 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 (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on June 20, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainants to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainants filed an amendment to the Complaint on June 21, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 22, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 12, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Michelle Brownlee 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

The Complainant Cimpres plc is the publicly traded parent company of the Complainant Cimpres Schweiz GmbH, which serves as the principal owner of intellectual property associated with Cimpres plc's printing services business conducted under the VISTA and VISTAPRINT names. The Complainants' business, founded in 1995, consists of printing services specializing in small-sized customized orders of marketing materials, signage, business cards, invitations, apparel, promotional products, among other categories. The Complainants employ more than 15,000 people and earned USD 3.4 billion in annual revenue in 2025.

Given the legal relationship between Cimpres plc and Cimpres Schweiz GmbH, it is appropriate for both of these entities to participate in this Complaint.

The Complainants own numerous registrations in jurisdictions throughout the world for the marks VISTA, VISTAPRINT and VISTAPRO, including the following:

United States Registration Number 2459636 for VISTA in connection with "building and hosting websites for others on the global computer network" in international class 42, registered on June 12, 2001;

United States Registration Number 2433418 for VISTAPRINT in connection with "printing services" in international class 42, registered on March 6, 2001; and

European Union Registration Number 018349898 for VISTAPRO in connection with "printed product design services" and other services in international classes 35, 41, 42 and 45, registered June 29, 2021.

The Complainants also own the domain names <vista.com>, registered on November 2, 1994, and <vistaprint.com>, registered on May 4, 1999, which are used in connection with the Complainants' custom printing business.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 4, 2025. The disputed domain name resolves to a website that displays the word "Vistaprint" and a stylized V logo that is indistinguishable from the Complainants' brand identity displayed on the Complainants' website and offers printing services similar to the Complainants' services.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainants

The Complainants contend that they have satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainants contend that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to their VISTA, VISTAPRINT and VISTAPRO trademarks, the Respondent has no rights to or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. In particular, the Complainants note that the Respondent is displaying the Complainants' VISTAPRINT trademark and stylized V logo on a website that offers printing services similar to those of the Complainants. The Complainants also presented evidence that two different cybersecurity service providers flagged the disputed domain name as being associated with phishing or other malicious activity.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainants' 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 Complainants' trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainants have 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 each of the VISTA and VISTAPRINT marks is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here, "pro", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the marks 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 Complainants have established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainants' 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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 Respondent is using the disputed domain name in connection with a website that uses the Complainants' brand identity and offers services that are indistinguishable from those of the Complainants. The copyright notice at the bottom of the Respondent's website reads "© 2025.vistaprint.com", which is a reference to the Complainants' website. There can be little question that the Respondent intended to create confusion with the Complainants. The addition of the term "pro" to the Complainants' VISTAPRINT mark in the disputed domain name is further evidence of the Respondent's intention to create confusion with the Complainants' trademarks, since the Complainants also own rights in the mark VISTAPRO. The Respondent's actions demonstrate bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy in that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users for presumable commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainants' VISTAPRINT mark.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed passing off, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. 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 Complainants have 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 <vistaprintpro.com> be transferred to the Complainant Cimpres Schweiz GmbH.

/Michelle Brownlee/

Michelle Brownlee

Sole Panelist

Date: July 14, 2026