

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Dom Dolla Music Proprietary Limited v. Prodip Mondal
Case No. D2026-2867

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Dom Dolla Music Proprietary Limited, Australia, represented by Hewitt Glass, Australia.

The Respondent is Prodip Mondal, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <domdollamerch.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 1, 2026. On July 1, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 1, 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 July 1, 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 amendment to the Complaint on July 2, 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 July 2, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 22, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 23, 2026.

The Center appointed Nathalie Dreyfus 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, Dom Dolla Music Proprietary Limited, is a proprietary limited company incorporated in Australia on November 3, 2020. It is the corporate vehicle of the Australian recording artist, producer, and songwriter Dominic Matheson, who records, performs, and trades under the name Dom Dolla.

Dom Dolla is an internationally recognized electronic music artist. According to the evidence submitted, his recorded music catalogue has generated more than 1.5 billion streams worldwide, he attracts more than six million monthly listeners on Spotify, and he has received four ARIA Awards for Best Dance or Electronic Release. In 2025, he became the inaugural recipient of the ARIA Global Impact Award.

The Complainant owns trademark registrations for the word trademark DOM DOLLA in several jurisdictions, including

- the Australian trademark DOM DOLLA registered on March 2, 2022, under number No. 2252740;
- the International DOM DOLLA registered on March 11, 2022, under number No. 1665541 designating, inter alia, the European Union and the United Kingdom;
- the United States trademark DOM DOLLA registered on September 19, 2023, under number No. 7166468; and
- the New Zealand trademark DOM DOLLA registered on October 3, 2023, under number No. 1212180 (collectively, the “DOM DOLLA trademark”).

The DOM DOLLA trademarks cover, inter alia, clothing, headwear, and related apparel in International Class 25, as well as entertainment services in International Class 41.

The Complainant operates its official website at the domain name <domdolla.com> and its official online merchandise store at the domain name <shop.domdolla.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 25, 2024. It has been used for a website presented as an official Dom Dolla merchandise store. The website prominently reproduces the DOM DOLLA trademark, uses images associated with Dom Dolla, describes itself as “Dom Dolla Official Merch”, and includes links to Dom Dolla’s genuine social media accounts. The website has also appeared in Google search results under a title representing it as an official Dom Dolla merchandise store.

Links displayed on the website have redirected Internet users to a third-party merchandise platform offering products bearing the DOM DOLLA trademark. The evidence shows that the redirection target was initially located at the domain name <teemerch.com> and was changed to the domain name <merchti.com> after correspondence sent by the Complainant’s representatives to the operator of the initial marketplace on June 12, 2026.

The Complainant arranged a test purchase of merchandise offered through the platform to which the disputed domain name redirected. The Complainant submitted photographs of the goods received and a signed statement from one of its legal representatives describing the purchase and inspection process and the features relied upon in support of the allegation that the goods were not genuine.

The Complainant has not licensed or otherwise authorized the Respondent to use the DOM DOLLA trademark, and there is no relationship between the Parties. There is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

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 contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the DOM DOLLA trademark because it incorporates the trademark in its entirety followed only by the descriptive term "merch", while the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is a standard registration requirement.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and has not been authorized to use the DOM DOLLA trademark. According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name has been used for a website falsely presented as an official Dom Dolla merchandise store, reproducing the trademark and images associated with Dom Dolla and directing Internet users to a third-party platform offering merchandise bearing the trademark. The Complainant also relies on evidence of a test purchase in support of its allegation that the merchandise was not genuine.

Finally, the Complainant submits that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant's rights, in order to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and the products offered through it. The Complainant also relies on prior UDRP decisions involving the Respondent as evidence of a pattern of similar conduct.

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.

The Complainant has established rights in the DOM DOLLA trademark through its trademark registrations in several jurisdictions. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms "merch", a common abbreviation for "merchandise", 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 trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

The gTLD ".com" is a standard registration requirement and is disregarded for the purposes of the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

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.

The Complainant has not licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the DOM DOLLA trademark, and there is no relationship between the Parties. Nothing in the record indicates that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name has been used for a website that prominently reproduces the DOM DOLLA trademark and images associated with Dom Dolla and falsely presents itself as an official merchandise store. The website also reproduces links to Dom Dolla’s genuine social media accounts and has been promoted in search results as an official store.

Such use is inherently misleading and does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

Furthermore, the Complainant has submitted evidence of a test purchase made through the merchandise platform to which the disputed domain name redirected. According to the signed statement and photographs submitted by the Complainant, the goods received were considered to be of materially inferior quality and not to have originated from the Complainant’s authorized supply chain. In addition, the website does not accurately and prominently disclose the absence of any relationship with the Complainant; rather, it falsely presents itself as an official DOM DOLLA merchandise store.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, including a copycat website, impersonation, passing off, and sale of potential counterfeit goods 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 registered the disputed domain name on September 25, 2024, more than two years after the priority date claimed by the Complainant's trademark registrations and at a time when Dom Dolla had already acquired a substantial international reputation.

The disputed domain name reproduces the DOM DOLLA trademark in its entirety together with the term "merch", which directly refers to merchandise offered under the trademark. In the Panel's view, the composition of the disputed domain name and the subsequent use made of it demonstrate that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and deliberately targeted the DOM DOLLA trademark when registering the disputed domain name.

The Respondent has used the disputed domain name for a website falsely presented as an official Dom Dolla merchandise store. The website prominently reproduces the DOM DOLLA trademark and images associated with Dom Dolla and directs Internet users to a third-party commercial platform offering products bearing the trademark. The use of the trademark, the representations suggesting an official commercial connection, the links to Dom Dolla's genuine social media accounts, and the prominence of the website in search results demonstrate a deliberate attempt to divert Internet users from the Complainant's authorized channels.

The Panel finds that, by using the disputed domain name in this manner, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website and to the platform to which it redirects by creating a likelihood of confusion with the DOM DOLLA trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the websites and the products offered through them. Such conduct falls within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel further notes that the Respondent has been involved in prior UDRP proceedings concerning domain names incorporating the names or trademarks of well-known personalities together with the terms "merch" or "merchandise". In *ILTB, LLC v. Prodip Mondal*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-0102](#), concerning <toebykeithmerch.com>, and *Mr. Jannik Sinner v. Prodip Mondal*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-0532](#), concerning <janniksinnermerch.com>, the disputed domain names were ordered to be transferred. In the latter case, the panel found that the respondent used the complainant's trademark and images to impersonate the complainant and falsely present the website as an official site in order to sell merchandise purportedly associated with the complainant. The materially similar circumstances of the present case reinforce the conclusion that the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of bad-faith conduct.

The Panel also notes that, following correspondence from the Complainant's representatives to the operator of the initial merchandise platform, the redirection target was changed from the domain name <teemerch.com> to the domain name <merchti.com>. In the circumstances of this case, that change is consistent with an attempt to evade enforcement and constitutes further evidence of bad faith.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, including copycat websites, impersonation, passing off and sale of potential counterfeit goods 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.

Irrespective of the status of the merchandise, the Respondent's conduct amounts to impersonation and passing off because the website falsely represents itself as being operated, authorized, or endorsed by the Complainant.

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 <domdollamerch.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nathalie Dreyfus/

Nathalie Dreyfus

Sole Panelist

Date: July 24, 2026