

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Nanu - Nana Joachim Hoepp GmbH & Co.KG v. Wolfe Jakob
Case No. D2026-2941

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Nanu - Nana Joachim Hoepp GmbH & Co.KG, Germany, represented by Nordemann Czychowski & Partner mbB, Germany.

The Respondent is Wolfe Jakob, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <nanuonlineshop.com> is registered with West263 International Limited (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 3, 2026. On July 6, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 7, 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 (Registration Private) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 9, 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 9, 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 15, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 4, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 6, 2026.

The Center appointed Andrea Mondini as the sole panelist in this matter on August 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 is part of a group of companies which was founded in 1972, is headquartered in Germany and operates a chain of retail stores under the trademark NANU-NANA offering a broad range of products in the fields home and living, kitchen utensils, home accessories, decoration, gifts, seasonal products and toys. The Complainant's group has more than 300 points of sale in Germany, Austria, the Czech Republic and Poland.

The Complainant owns trademark registrations in several jurisdictions, including:

TRADEMARK	JURISDICTION	REGISTRATION NUMBER	REGISTRATION DATE
NANU-NANA	European Union	006217814	April 11, 2011
NANU	European Union	006218879	May 26, 2016

The Complainant's group holds the domain name <nanu-nana.de> which hosts its web-shop.

The Respondent did not file a Response. Therefore, not much is known about the Respondent.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 11, 2025.

According to the evidence submitted with the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved until recently to a website prominently displaying the Complainant's NANU-NANA trademark and logo, imitating the look and feel of the Complainant's website, displaying the contact details of an affiliate of the Complainant and copying products images from the Complainant's website. Upon the Complainant's request, that website has been deactivated by the Registrar on June 3, 2026.

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 as follows:

The Complainant's trademarks have been extensively used to identify the Complainant and its retail services. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the NANU trademark in which the Complainant has rights, because it incorporates this trademark in its entirety, and the addition of the descriptive term "onlineshop" is not sufficient to prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not been authorized by the Complainant to use this trademark, is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name was registered and used in bad faith because the Respondent has operated a fraudulent website imitating the Complainant's original website.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, in order to succeed, a complainant must establish each of the following elements:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights;
- (ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 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 Panel finds the entirety of the NANU mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name.

Although the addition of other terms, such as here "onlineshop", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that in the present case the addition of such a 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.

The addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" in the disputed domain name is a standard registration requirement and as such may be disregarded under the confusing similarity test under the Policy, paragraph 4(a)(i). [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 for a complainant to prove 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 record shows that the Respondent used the disputed domain name for a web-shop imitating the Complainant's web-shop, offering the same type of products and impersonating the Complainant. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity such as here impersonating the Complainant, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

In the view of the Panel, noting that the Complainant's trademark registration predates the registration of the disputed domain name and considering that the disputed domain name resolves to a website featuring the Complainant's trademark and even listing the address of an affiliate of the Complainant, it is inconceivable that the Respondent could have registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant's trademark. In the circumstances of this case, this is evidence of registration in bad faith.

The impression given by the website posted under the disputed domain name before its deactivation would more likely have caused Internet users to believe that the Respondent is somehow associated with the Complainant when, in fact, it is not. The Panel holds that by using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its web site, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its web site in the sense of Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv).

Moreover, Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity such as in the present case impersonating/passing off as the Complainant constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

Although the disputed domain name has recently been deactivated by the Registrar upon the Complainant's request, considering its prior use, the composition of the disputed domain name and the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the Panel finds that such deactivation does not impact the Panel's finding on the Respondent's bad faith.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy with regard to the disputed domain name.

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 <nanuonlineshop.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrea Mondini/

Andrea Mondini

Sole Panelist

Date: August 18, 2026