ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Koninklijke Douwe Egberts B.V. v. tru bu
Case No. D2026-2962

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Koninklijke Douwe Egberts B.V., Netherlands (Kingdom of the), represented by Ploum, Netherlands (Kingdom of the).

The Respondent is tru bu, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <jeanitemstassimo.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 6, 2026. On July 7, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 8, 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 (Redacted for Privacy, 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 8, 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 9, 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 13, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 2, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 4, 2026.

The Center appointed Christelle Vaval as the sole panelist in this matter on August 7, 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 a private limited liability company organized under the laws of the Netherlands (Kingdom of the) and is part of Jacobs Douwe Egberts (JDE), one of the major international players in the coffee and tea industry. The Complainant was established in 2015 through the merger of D.E. Master Blenders (founded in 1753) and the coffee division of another leading company.

The Complainant owns the TASSIMO trademark in multiple jurisdictions, including:

- European Union trademark registration, No. 005416458, registered on August 20, 2007;
- International Registration No. 782380, registered on June 18, 2002; and
- International Registration No. 958516A, registered on March 12, 2008.

The Complainant owns a portfolio of domain names incorporating the TASSIMO trademark, such as <tassimo.com>.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on November 14, 2025. The associated website to the disputed domain name resolves to a French-language e-commerce platform displaying a modified version of the Complainant's TASSIMO logo as a favicon, and offers both third-party branded products and TASSIMO-branded products.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each element 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 its TASSIMO trademark because it incorporates its trademark in its entirety, with only the addition of the descriptive words "jean" and "items";

- The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not been authorized to use the TASSIMO trademark and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. The associated website to the disputed domain name is not making any bona fide offering of goods or services, as it sells products from various brands and fails to disclose the lack of affiliation with the Complainant; and

- The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent was likely aware of its TASSIMO trademark when it registered the disputed domain name to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion regarding its affiliation. The use of false contact information and the risk of fraudulent activities, such as phishing, further support the claim of 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 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 entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, "jeans" and "items" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms 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 ".shop" generic Top-Level Domain is a standard registration requirement and is typically disregarded under the first-element confusing similarity test. 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 did not authorize the Respondent to use the TASSIMO trademark, and nothing in the record indicates that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The records do not support a finding of bona fide offering of goods nor a fair use of the disputed domain name. The resolving website purported to offer TASSIMO-branded products alongside third-party branded products, without disclosing the Respondent's lack of relationship with the Complainant. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.8.1.

Moreover, the website operated under the disputed domain name used the Complainant's TASSIMO trademark and a modified version of the TASSIMO logo as a favicon and presented itself as "Tassimo".

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, such as the passing off claimed here, 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 finds it more likely than not that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its well-known TASSIMO trademark when registering the disputed domain name. The Complainant's trademark is distinctive, and its registration predates the disputed domain name by many years. Moreover, the disputed domain name incorporates the TASSIMO mark in its entirety, while the resolving website displays the TASSIMO trademark and a modified version of the logo as a favicon, presents itself as "Tassimo", and purports to offer TASSIMO-branded goods while also offering third party products. These circumstances lead the Panel to conclude that the Respondent targeted the Complainant's trademark when registering the disputed domain name.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, including passing off, 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.

The Panel finds that by using the Complainant's well-known TASSIMO trademark and presenting the website to which the disputed domain name resolves as if it were operated or affiliated with the Complainant, the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship or endorsement of the associated website.

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 <jeanitemstassimo.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Christelle Vaval/
Christelle Vaval
Sole Panelist
Date: August 19, 2026