

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

RockLove Jewelry LLC v. Lanham Kimberly
Case No. D2026-2944

1. The Parties

Complainant is RockLove Jewelry LLC, United States of America (“United States” or “U.S.”), represented by Kushnirsky Law PLLC, United States.

Respondent is Lanham Kimberly, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <rockloverjewelry.com> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with Gname.com Pte. Ltd. (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 Domain Name. On July 7, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on July 10, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on July 11, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 17, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 6, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on August 11, 2026.

The Center appointed Kimberley Chen Nobles as the sole panelist in this matter on August 12, 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

Complainant, a company located in New York, United States, sells jewelry designed by its founder, and partners with many global companies to design and sell officially licensed jewelry products. Complainant created and launched its business website at “www.rocklovejewelry.com” on July 23, 2007 and has been using the ROCKLOVE mark in connection with jewelry since at least June 1, 2007. Complainant is also a well-known name in the officially licensed jewelry industry, as a licensee (often exclusive) for many global consumer culture brands. In addition, Complainant owns U.S. registered trademark number 4150094 for the ROCKLOVE word mark, registered on May 29, 2012, with a first use date of June 1, 2007.

The Domain Name was registered on April 1, 2026 and resolved to a website prominently displaying Complainant’s word mark, logo, unauthorized copies of Complainant’s original product images, and purportedly promoting and offering Complainant’s goods for sale.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Name.

Notably, Complainant contends that (i) the Domain Name is confusingly similar to Complainant’s trademark; (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name; and (iii) Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith.

In particular, Complainant contends that it has trademark registrations and rights for ROCKLOVE and that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name, with the intention to confuse Internet users looking for Complainant’s bona fide and well-known services.

Complainant notes that it has no affiliation with Respondent, nor authorized Respondent to register or use a domain name which includes Complainant’s trademark, and that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the registration and use of the Domain Name. Rather, Complainant contends that Respondent has acted in bad faith in acquiring and setting up the Domain Name, when Respondent clearly knew of Complainant’s rights. Specifically, Complainant argues that Respondent used the Domain Name to impersonate or pose as Complainant, so as to deceive Internet users into believing that its website is operated by or associated with Complainant.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant’s contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed Complainant must satisfy the Panel that:

- (i) the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights;

- (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Section 4.3 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), states that failure to respond to complainant's contentions would not by itself mean that the complainant is deemed to have prevailed; a respondent's default is not necessarily an admission that the complainant's claims are true.

Thus, although in this case Respondent has failed to respond to the Complaint, the burden remains with Complainant to establish the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy by a preponderance of the evidence.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Complainant has provided evidence of its rights in the ROCKLOVE trademark, as noted above. Complainant has therefore proven that it has the requisite rights in the ROCKLOVE trademarks.

With Complainant's rights in the ROCKLOVE trademark established, the remaining question under the first element of the Policy is whether the Domain Name, typically disregarding the Top-Level Domain in which it was registered (in this case, ".com"), is identical or confusingly similar to Complainant's trademark. See, e.g., *B & H Foto & Electronics Corp. v. Domains by Proxy, Inc. / Joseph Gross*, WIPO Case No. [D2010-0842](#).

Here, the Domain Name is confusingly similar to Complainant's ROCKLOVE trademark. The ROCKLOVE trademark is recognizable in the Domain Name. The addition of the letter "r" and the term "jewelry" after Complainant's ROCKLOVE trademark in the Domain Name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the ROCKLOVE trademark. See section 1.8 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

Thus, the Panel finds that Complainant has satisfied the first element of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, a complainant must make a prima facie showing that a respondent possesses no rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name. See, e.g., *Malayan Banking Berhad v. Beauty, Success & Truth International*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-1393](#). Once a complainant makes such a prima facie showing, the burden of production shifts to the respondent, though the burden of proof always remains on the complainant. If the respondent fails to come forward with relevant evidence showing rights or legitimate interests, the complainant will have sustained its burden under the second element of the UDRP.

From the record in this case, it is evident that Respondent was, and is, aware of Complainant and its ROCKLOVE trademark and does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Complainant has confirmed that Respondent is not affiliated with Complainant, or otherwise authorized or licensed to use the ROCKLOVE trademark or to seek registration of any domain name incorporating this trademark. Respondent is also not known to be associated with the ROCKLOVE trademark and there is no evidence showing that Respondent has been commonly known by the Domain Name.

The Domain Name is intended to confuse Internet users into believing the Domain Name belongs to Complainant. See e.g., *Debevoise & Plimpton LLP v. Keyword Marketing, Inc. / Web Advertising, Corp.*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-1679](#) (explaining "typosquatting" is "a form of cybersquatting in which a respondent registers and uses a domain name in order to take advantage of typographical errors made by Internet users seeking the complainant's commercial website").

Here, the Domain Name not only constitutes typosquatting, it also includes the term "jewelry" which is Complainant's business product. In addition, Complainant owns and operates its business website at the domain name <rocklovejewelry.com>.

Furthermore, Respondent has not used the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Rather, the record shows that the Domain Name resolved to a website that imitated Complainant's genuine ROCKLOVE website located at the domain name <rocklovejewelry.com>, displaying Complainant's ROCKLOVE trademarks, logo, featuring Complainant's ROCKLOVE products, promoting and offering Complainant's goods for sale.

UDRP panels have consistently held that use of a domain name for illegal activity — such as impersonating or passing off — can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

Accordingly, Complainant has provided evidence supporting its prima facie showing that Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Respondent has failed to produce countervailing evidence of any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name.

Thus, the Panel Complainant has satisfied the second element of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel finds that Respondent's actions indicate that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides a non-exhaustive list of circumstances indicating bad faith registration and use on the part of a respondent, namely:

“(i) circumstances indicating that you have registered or you have acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of your documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or

(ii) you have registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that you have engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) you have registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the domain name, you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your website or location or of a product or service on your website or location.”

The Panel finds that Complainant has provided ample evidence to show that registration and use of the ROCKLOVE trademark predate the registration of the Domain Name. Complainant is also well established and known; indeed, the record shows that Complainant's ROCKLOVE trademark and related products and services are known and recognized for purposes of the Policy. In addition, the Domain Name not only includes Complainant's ROCKLOVE trademark in its entirety, but also includes the term “jewelry” – referring to Complainant's jewelry products. Complainant also owns and operates its main website at the domain name <rocklovejewelry.com>. Accordingly, and also noting the use analysis below, the Panel finds that Respondent was clearly aware of the Complainant's ROCKLOVE trademark when registering the Domain Name.

The Panel therefore finds that Respondent's awareness of Complainant's trademark rights at the time of registration suggests bad faith. See *Red Bull GmbH v. Credit du Léman SA, Jean-Denis Deletraz*, WIPO Case No. [D2011-2209](#); *Nintendo of America Inc v. Marco Beijen, Beijen Consulting, Pokemon Fan Clubs Org., and Pokemon Fans Unite*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-1070](#); and *BellSouth Intellectual Property Corporation v. Serena, Axel*, WIPO Case No. [D2006-0007](#).

Moreover, Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name to confuse and mislead consumers looking for bona fide and well-known ROCKLOVE products and services of Complainant. In particular, at the time of filing of the Complaint, the record shows that the Domain Name resolved to a website that imitates Complainant's genuine ROCKLOVE website located at the domain name <rocklovejewelry.com>, displaying Complainant's ROCKLOVE trademarks and logos, featuring Complainant's ROCKLOVE products, promoting and offering Complainant's goods for sale.

Therefore, by using the Domain Name featuring Complainant's trademarks, and then further to promote the purported Complainant's products using images apparently copied from Complainant's website, as shown by evidence in the record - to induce members of the public to pay for such products, Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's ROCKLOVE trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of Respondent's website.

UDRP panels have consistently held that a respondent's use of a domain name to trade off goodwill in a complainant's well-known trademark and impersonate complainant, as here, constitutes bad faith. See *Philip Morris Products S.A. v. homn mohmoodi*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-4158](#).

Finally, the Panel also notes the failure of Respondent to submit a response, which may be further evidence of Respondent's bad faith. In the present circumstances, considering the reputation of the ROCKLOVE trademark, and the use of the Domain Name, the Panel finds that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith.

Therefore, the Panel finds that Complainant succeeds under the third element of paragraph 4(a) 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 Domain Name <rockloverjewelry.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Kimberley Chen Nobles/

Kimberley Chen Nobles

Sole Panelist

Date: August 19, 2026