

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Drip Drop Hydration, Inc. v. shanbing ren
Case No. D2026-2922

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Drip Drop Hydration, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Venable, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is shanbing ren, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <drpidrop.shop> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 2, 2026. On July 3, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 3, 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 (REGISTRANT UNKNOWN) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 6, 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 amendments to the Complaint on July 6, 2026 and July 7, 2026, respectively.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendments 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 8, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 28, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 29, 2026.

The Center appointed Karen Fong as the sole panelist in this matter on August 3, 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

Founded in 2008 in the United States, the Complainant produces and markets hydration supplements under the brand DRIP DROP. The Complainant owns DRIP DROP trade mark registrations in many jurisdictions including the following:

- United States Trade Mark Registration No. 5904195 for DRIP DROP registered on November 5, 2019;
- United States Trade Mark Registration No. 3932601 for DRIP DROP registered on March 15, 2011; and
- United States Trade Mark Registration No. 4110969 for DRIP DROP registered on March 13, 2012;

(individually and collectively, the “Trade Mark”).

The Complainant’s products under the Trade Mark are sold in retailers such as Target, Walmart, and CVS in the United States. It also operates an online store on its primary website at the domain name <dripdrop.com>. The Complainant has a strong presence on social media platforms. Besides its primary domain name, it also owns many domain names incorporating the Trade Mark including <dripdrop.me> and <dripdrop.net>. The Complainant uses a logo comprising a motif of four blue water droplets arranged in a square formation (the “Logo Mark”).

The Respondent, who appears to be based in China, registered the disputed domain name on June 20, 2026. The disputed domain name resolves to a website which displays the Trade Mark and the Logo Mark prominently, mimics the Complainant’s own website including using its images and content and purportedly offers for sale products that bear the Trade Mark at discounted prices and purports to be the Complainant’s products (the “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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trade Mark, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name, and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 trade mark and the disputed domain name. (See 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 the Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the Trade Mark recognizable within the disputed domain name, being an intentional misspelling of the Trade Mark. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trade Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.9.

Based on the available record, 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.

While the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the often impossible 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. 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 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.

Moreover, the nature of the disputed domain name is inherently misleading. Except the different generic Top-Level Domain, the sole difference between it and the Complainant's domain name is the switching of the sequence of the letters "i" and "p" in the word "drip". Internet users may not notice such a subtle misspelling and are likely to be confused.

Based on the available record, 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 considers it evident that the Respondent was aware of the Trade Mark when registering the disputed domain name given the Trade Mark was registered prior to registration of the disputed domain name, the reputation of the Trade Mark and the use of the Trade Mark, the Logo Mark and the Complainant's content on the Website. It is therefore implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant when registering the disputed domain name.

In the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2 states as follows:

"Noting the near instantaneous and global reach of the Internet and search engines, and particularly in circumstances where the complainant's mark is widely known (including in its sector) or highly specific and a respondent cannot credibly claim to have been unaware of the mark (particularly in the case of domainers), panels have been prepared to infer that the respondent knew, or have found that the respondent should have known, that its registration would be identical or confusingly similar to a complainant's mark. Further factors including the nature of the domain name, the chosen top-level domain, any use of the domain name, or any respondent pattern, may obviate a respondent's claim not to have been aware of the complainant's mark."

The fact that there is a clear absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with the Respondent's choice of the disputed domain name without any explanation is also a significant factor to consider (as stated in [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1). The disputed domain name falls into the category stated above and the Panel finds that the registration is in bad faith. The fact that the disputed domain name is a misspelling of the Complainant's Trade Mark and domain name further indicates that the Respondent had or should have had actual knowledge of and was targeting the Complainant when registering the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name is also being used in bad faith. The Respondent has made unauthorised use of the Complainant's Trade Mark, the Logo Mark, and the Complainant's branded content, and the Website purports to offer for sale the Complainant's DRIP DROP products without authorisation. Taken together, these factors strongly indicate that the Respondent is deliberately passing off as the Complainant, with a view to misleading Internet users and potentially facilitating fraudulent activity.

The Website prominently displays the Trade Mark, the Logo Mark, and reproduces the Complainant's branded content, without any disclaimer clarifying the absence of any relationship between the Parties. The overall presentation of the Website is calculated to give the false impression that it is operated by, authorised by, or otherwise affiliated with the Complainant.

It is highly likely that Internet users who type the disputed domain name into their browser or encounter it via a search engine would expect to reach a website operated by the Complainant. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trade Mark and has been used in a manner that reinforces that false association, thereby increasing the risk of confusion.

In light of the above, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its Website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's Trade Mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Website and the products offered on it, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 <drpidrop.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Karen Fong/

Karen Fong

Sole Panelist

Date: August 19, 2026