

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

ITV Studios Limited v. newbie man
Case No. D2026-2801

1. The Parties

The Complainant is ITV Studios Limited, United Kingdom, internally represented.

The Respondent is newbie man, United States of America ("United States") or ("U.S.").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <getloveisland.shop> (the "Disputed Domain Name") is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 26, 2026. On June 29, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On June 30, 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 (The RDAP server redacted the value, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 30, 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 July 3, 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 July 10, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 30, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 6, 2026.

The Center appointed Flip Jan Claude Petillion as the sole panelist in this matter on August 17, 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, ITV Studios Limited, is a company registered in England and Wales and is active in television (TV) production and distribution. The Complainant creates and distributes TV shows, including the reality television programme “Love Island”, which has been broadcast in its current format in the United Kingdom since 2015 and has also been adapted in a number of other countries, including the U.S.

The Complainant has offered merchandise under the LOVE ISLAND brand since 2017, including clothing, drinkware, and accessories. According to the evidence submitted with the Complaint, such merchandise is offered through e-commerce platforms operated by or on behalf of the Complainant and its licensees.

The Complainant is the owner of various registered trademarks for LOVE ISLAND, including the following:

- LOVE ISLAND, United Kingdom trademark registration No. UK00002412536, registered on July 14, 2006, in classes 9, 16, 38, and 41;
-  figurative United Kingdom trademark registration No. UK00004309850, registered on March 13, 2026, in classes 3, 9, 14, 16, 18, 21, 24, 25, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 35, 38, and 41; and
- LOVE ISLAND, U.S. trademark registration No. 6166959, registered on October 6, 2020, in classes 3, 9, 16, 18, 21, 24, 25, 28, 38, and 41.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on March 14, 2026. According to the Complainant's evidence, the Disputed Domain Name resolved to an e-commerce website which displayed the Complainant's LOVE ISLAND word and figurative marks and used product images and descriptions taken from the Complainant's e-commerce website. The website offered LOVE ISLAND-branded merchandise, including at discounted prices, and included the phrases “OFFICIAL LOVE ISLAND STORE” and “© 2026 Official Love Island Store. All Rights Reserved”. The website also contained a checkout facility through which users could enter payment details. The website displayed the email address “[...]@officialloveislandstore.com”, incorporating the domain name used for the Complainant's official U.S. e-commerce website.

On May 8, 2026, the Complainant, through a third-party enforcement provider, sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Registrar concerning the website associated with the Disputed Domain Name, requesting that it take all steps necessary to disable the website. The Disputed Domain Name currently does not resolve 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 Name.

The Complainant contends that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to its LOVE ISLAND trademark, as it reproduces the mark in its entirety, merely adding the term “get”.

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

- the Respondent is not related to the Complainant and has not been authorized to use or register the Complainant's LOVE ISLAND trademarks;
- the registration of the Disputed Domain Names postdates the registration of the Complainant's trademarks and by this time the Complainant had been using its official e-commerce websites for a number of years;
- the Respondent was attempting to fraudulently misrepresent itself as the Complainant through the Disputed Domain Name by impersonating and mirroring the Complainant's official e-commerce site, with clear use of the LOVE ISLAND trademarks and consistent use of images from the Complainant's website; and
- accordingly, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name and did not use the Disputed Domain Name for any legitimate purpose.

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

- the Respondent ran an active website at the Disputed Domain Name that impersonated the Complainant's official e-commerce site, using the Complainant's LOVE ISLAND trademarks and stylized logo, product images taken directly from the Complainant's official site, duplicated product descriptions, and repeatedly using the word "official". According to the Complainant, this constitutes a deliberate attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's products and marks as to the source, sponsorship, or affiliation of the site;
- the Respondent attempted to deceive customers by using an uncontactable support email address corresponding to the domain name of the Complainant's official US e-commerce site, thereby creating an illusion of legitimacy;
- given the global fame of the LOVE ISLAND brand, it is inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's rights at the time of registration. The Respondent's consistent use of images from the Complainant's websites to advertise unauthorized products confirms that the Disputed Domain Name was registered with the Complainant's specific brand assets in mind;
- the Respondent used the Disputed Domain Name to host a commercial enterprise that directly competes with the Complainant's official retail channels and authorized merchandising partners, thereby diverting traffic from legitimate platforms and capturing revenue through the sale of unlicensed goods under the guise of authenticity; and
- by holding the website out as the "Official Love Island Store", the Respondent places the reputation of the Complainant's brands at risk. Any issues regarding the quality of the unauthorized merchandise or the security of the Respondent's checkout process would be unfairly attributed to the Complainant, causing irreparable harm to the goodwill of the trademarks and the Complainant as a company.

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, 3.1 (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Complainant's LOVE ISLAND mark is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name, with the sole addition of the term "get". The Panel finds that the addition of such term 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.

It is well established that generic Top-Level Domain, here ".shop", 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 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 in the domain name, 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.

The Panel notes that the Respondent has not been shown to be commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name. According to the information provided by the Registrar, the Respondent is "newbee man". The Respondent's use and registration of the Disputed Domain Name was not authorized by the Complainant.

Fundamentally, 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. Even where a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term, UDRP panels have largely held that such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1. The Disputed Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's LOVE ISLAND trademark in its entirety, preceded by the term "get", and uses the ".shop" Top-Level Domain. The Panel finds that this composition, coupled with the use of the disputed domain name as further addressed below, signals the Respondent's intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant as to the origin or affiliation of the website.

Beyond looking at the Disputed Domain Name and the nature of any additional terms appended to the mark, UDRP panels also assess whether the overall facts and circumstances of the case, including the content of the website linked to a disputed domain name and the absence of a response, support a fair use or not. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 2.5.2 and 2.5.3.

According to the Complainant's undisputed evidence, the Disputed Domain Name resolved to an e-commerce website prominently displaying the Complainant's LOVE ISLAND marks and reproducing product images and descriptions from the Complainant's e-commerce website. The website presented itself as an "OFFICIAL LOVE ISLAND STORE", offered LOVE ISLAND-branded merchandise for sale (often at discounted prices), and provided a checkout facility. It also displayed an email address incorporating the domain name resolving to the Complainant's official U.S. e-commerce store.

In the Panel's view, this neither amounts to a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name. UDRP panels have categorically held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, such as passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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, 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. Among these factors demonstrating bad faith registration and use is the use of a domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to a website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website or location or of a product or service on the website or location.

In the present case, the Panel finds that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its trademark rights when it registered the Disputed Domain Name as:

- the Disputed Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's LOVE ISLAND trademark in its entirety, preceded by the term "get" and combined with the ".shop" Top-Level Domain ;
- the Complainant's LOVE ISLAND trademark registrations predate the registration of the Disputed Domain Name, including in the U.S. where the Respondent appears to be located; and
- the website linked to the Disputed Domain Name provides clear evidence of the Respondent's knowledge of the Complainant and its mark, given its repeated use of the Complainant's LOVE ISLAND word and figurative marks, product images, and product descriptions.

As noted above, the Disputed Domain Name resolved to an e-commerce website offering merchandise for sale at discounted prices and included a checkout facility through which Internet users could enter payment details. It also displayed an email address incorporating the domain name resolving to the Complainant's official U.S. e-commerce store.

In the Panel's view, the above circumstances clearly indicate that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and the products offered on it. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4. Given that the use of a domain name for per se illegitimate activity such as passing off here, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent, such behavior is manifestly considered evidence of bad faith.

The fact that the Disputed Domain Name no longer resolves to an active website does not alter the Panel's finding in light of the Respondent's prior use of the Disputed Domain Name and the circumstances described above.

By failing to respond to the Complaint, the Respondent did not contest the foregoing. Pursuant to paragraph 14 of the Rules, the Panel may draw the conclusions it considers appropriate.

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 <getloveisland.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Flip Jan Claude Petillion/

Flip Jan Claude Petillion

Sole Panelist

Date: August 31, 2026