

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Tea Forté, Inc. v. Imani Brooks and Faye Tagg
Case No. D2026-2981

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Tea Forté, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Ploum, Netherlands (Kingdom of the).

The Respondents are Imani Brooks and Faye Tagg, both of the United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <myteaforte.shop> and the <theteaforte.shop> are registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 7, 2026. On July 7, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On July 8, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 16, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file a separate complaint for the disputed domain name associated with a different underlying registrant or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on July 17, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 20, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 9, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Parties of the Respondents' default on August 11, 2026.

The Center appointed Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa as the sole panelist in this matter on August 25, 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 United States subsidiary of Jacobs Douwe Egberts. It markets tea internationally under the “Tea Forté” brand. It is the proprietor of several trademarks, including the following:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 3039916 for TEA FORTÉ (device mark) registered on January 10, 2006 for goods in class 30;
- United States Trademark Registration No. 3677058 for TEA FORTÉ (word mark), registered on September 1, 2009 for goods in class 30; and
- United States Trademark Registration No. 4952013 for  Tea Forté (device mark), registered on May 3, 2016 for goods in classes 21 and 30.

The Complainant operates its primary business website at the domain name <teaforte.com>.

The disputed domain name <theteaforte.shop> was registered on June 14, 2026. At the time of filing of the Complaint and this Decision, it resolved to an e-commerce website displaying the TEA FORTÉ mark and purportedly offering “Tea Forté” products for sale. The website stated: “Elevate Your Daily Tea Ritual Savor gourmet whole leaf teas served in our signature handcrafted silken pyramid infusers” and displayed a copyright notice stating “©2026 Tea Forté”. It also suggested it is operated by the Complainant through the language such as “At Tea Forté we believe tea is more than a beverage” under “Our Story”.

The disputed domain name <myteaforte.shop> was registered on June 21, 2026 and, at the time of filing of the Complaint and this Decision, resolved to a similar “Tea Forté” branded e-commerce website, albeit with a slightly different tagline, namely, “Elevate Your Daily Tea Ritual Experience gourmet whole leaf teas served in our signature leaf-topped pyramid silken infusers”. It also displayed a copyright notice stating “©2026 Tea Forté” and a similar language.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

1. Request to Consolidate

The Complainant requests consolidation of the disputes for the following reasons: both websites identify the operator as “Tea Forté” and display the contact e-mail address that is used by the Complainant, namely, “[...]@teaforte.com”. The registrants’ addresses that appear not to exist and appear to contain false contact information. Both domain names target the same trademark owned by the Complainant and use a similar naming pattern. They were registered within a very short period of time with the same Registrar. Both websites purport to offer the Complainant’s products for sale at heavily discounted prices. The websites are very similar overall and have many identical pages, including the “About Us”, “Privacy Policy”, “Shipping Info” and other pages. These facts indicate that the disputed domain names are under common control.

2. Substantive Matters

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that it was founded in the United States in 2003. The company's signature pyramid tea bag became popular and these products were exported to over 35 countries, and after various acquisitions the Complainant became a subsidiary of a unit of Jacobs Douwe Egberts. The disputed domain names incorporate the Complainant's well-known and highly distinctive TEA FORTÉ mark in its entirety, together with the generic terms "the" or "my". The Respondents are not related to the Complainant and have no rights in the TEA FORTÉ mark. They are not making a bona fide offering as a reseller because it is unclear that the goods sold are actually the Complainant's products, the websites display the Complainant's marks and e-mail address and copy images from the Complainant's website, the websites purport to be operated by the Complainant and the relationship between the Parties is not in any way disclosed. Rather, the Respondents are attempting to impersonate the Complainant. The use of fake contact information by the Respondents is another indication of bad faith.

The Complainant requests transfer of the disputed domain names.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the disputes against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that the disputed domain names reflect similar naming patterns, consisting of the Complainant's mark preceded by the terms "the" and "my". The disputed domain names resolved to websites featuring the Complainant's mark, containing similar language and purporting to offer the Complainant's products for sale. The registrations were effected within a few days of each other, using the same Registrar.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

6.2 Substantive Matters

Paragraph 4(a) of the UDRP requires the Complainant to make out all three of the following:

- (i) the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and
- (iii) the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain names in bad faith.

Under paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, “[a] Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable”.

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 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 Complainant’s TEA FORTÉ mark is reproduced within the disputed domain names (without an accent). Therefore, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names are 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, “my” and “the”) 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 names and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The composition of the disputed domain names, which reflect the Complainant's TEA FORTÉ trademark, coupled with their use to resolve to websites in which the Respondent tries to impersonate the Complainant, signals the Respondent's intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain names and the Complainant as to the origin or affiliation of the websites.

The Respondent does not rebut the Complainant's assertion that the Parties are unrelated. The evidence indicates that the Respondent's websites purported to be operated by "Tea Forté", displaying the Complainant's marks and images of its products without any disclaimer of the lack of relationship between the Parties. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, claimed passing off) 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 intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark. The disputed domain names were registered at least 20 years after the Complainant registered its TEA FORTÉ trademark and reflect the Complainant's mark in its entirety, preceded by the terms "my" and "the", which may suggest a connection to the Complainant. Under these circumstances, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names were registered in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.

The record contains un rebutted evidence that the disputed domain names both resolved to websites featuring the Complainant's mark, posing as the Complainant and purporting to offer the Complainant's products at discounted prices. Such conduct is clearly indicative of bad faith use of the disputed domain names. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, claimed 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 names constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 names <myteaforte.shop> and <theteaforte.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa/
Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa
Sole Panelist
Date: September 1, 2026