ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Corner Rock B.V. v. Ren Wei
Case No. D2026-2988

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Corner Rock B.V., Netherlands (Kingdom of the), represented by NLO Shieldmark B. V., Netherlands (Kingdom of the Netherlands).

The Respondent is Ren Wei, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <norahoutlet.shop> is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 7, 2026. On July 8, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 10, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that 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 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 3, 2026.

The Center appointed Ganna Prokhorova as the sole panelist in this matter on August 6, 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 Dutch fashion retail company established in 2014, specializing in women's clothing. It operates more than 90 physical stores across the Netherlands, as well as an online shop serving customers in the Netherlands and abroad.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations incorporating the mark NORAH, including, inter alia:

- European Union trademark registration NORAH (word), No. 013052055, registered on November 26, 2014, in classes 14, 25 and 35; and

- United Kingdom trademark registration NORAH (word), No. UK00913052055, registered on November 26, 2014, in classes 14, 25 and 35.

The Complainant has also operated the domain name <norah.eu> registered in 2006.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 23, 2026. At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website presenting itself as an online store offering NORAH clothing products. The website prominently displayed the NORAH name and logo, reproduced the Complainant's business profile and information concerning its operations, and featured product names, images, and other content corresponding to products offered on the Complainant's official website, while offering such products at significantly lower prices than those displayed on the Complainant's website. At checkout, users were requested to provide sensitive personal information. As of the date of this Decision, the disputed domain name resolves to a webpage displaying "N***H" together with the message: "This store is under construction".

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:

1. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark, since it incorporates the NORAH mark in its entirety, and the addition of the descriptive term "outlet" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".shop" is typically disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test.

2. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name resolves to an active website that prompts Internet users to initiate a purchase process during which they are required to provide extensive personal and financial information, including their full name, residential address, telephone number, and email address. Such collection of personal information, in the absence of legitimate business credentials, indicates fraudulent intent and is consistent with a phishing operation designed to obtain sensitive information from unsuspecting Internet users.

3. The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent used the disputed domain name to resolve to a webpage prompting consumers to initiate a purchase process during which they are required to submit extensive personal and financial information. Furthermore, the Respondent's conduct in presenting itself as the Complainant on the website reinforces this conclusion. Therefore, by using the disputed domain name, the

Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial purposes, internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark. Such conduct is clearly designed to create a misleading association with the Complainant further reinforces finding bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules provides that the Panel is to decide the Complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, the Rules, and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

The onus is on the Complainant to make out its case and it is apparent, both from the terms of the Policy and the decisions of past UDRP panels, that the Complainant must show that all three elements set out in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been established before any order can be made to transfer the disputed domain name. In UDRP cases, the standard of proof is the balance of probabilities.

To succeed in a UDRP complaint, the Complainant has to demonstrate that all the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied, namely:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a 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.

The Respondent was given proper notice of the Complaint and had the opportunity to respond. Under paragraph 5(a) of the Rules, the Respondent was required to submit its response within 20 days of commencement of the proceeding. The Respondent failed to do so.

Pursuant to paragraph 5(f) of the Rules, in the event of such a default, the Panel shall proceed to a decision based on the Complaint. However, the Respondent's default does not mean that the Complainant automatically prevails; the Complainant continues to bear the burden of proof on each element. The Panel may draw appropriate inferences from the Respondent's silence, and, where appropriate, accept as true the reasonable allegations in the Complaint that are not contradicted by evidence.

The Panel has reviewed the records on file and the evidence provided. The Panel is also guided, where pertinent, by the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), which reflects consensus positions of UDRP panels on many common issues. The Panel will make reference to these consensus views in the analysis below as 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 mark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Based on the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the Panel finds that the Complainant has shown rights in respect of its NORAH mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the Complainant's mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's NORAH mark in its entirety, with the only differences being the addition of the descriptive term "outlet". In accordance with WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8, addition of other terms, whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise, do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element, as the Complainant's mark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name.

The Panel further notes that the gTLD ".shop" is required only for technical reasons and is generally disregarded for the purposes of comparison of the Complainant's mark to the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark and that the first element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is satisfied.

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 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 record, the Panel finds that the Complainant has made a prima facie showing that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not filed a Response and therefore has not rebutted the Complainant's case or provided any evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests under the Policy or otherwise.

The evidence shows that as of the time of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to an active website which prompted Internet users to begin a purchase process during which they are required to provide extensive personal and financial information. Such use of the disputed domain name does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services under paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy in the circumstances of this case. Nor does the Respondent's conduct qualify as a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name under paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy. Accordingly, the Respondent has failed to demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel further notes that the Complainant has established trademark rights in NORAH trademark and has confirmed that it has no relationship with the Respondent. The Respondent has not been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted to use the Complainant's trademarks. There is also no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

Because the Respondent has chosen not to participate in these proceedings, it has failed to rebut the Complainant's prima facie showing.

In view of the above, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the Complainant has satisfied the requirement of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

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 that the Respondent both registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith under paragraph 4(b) of the Policy.

The Complainant, established in 2014, is a Dutch fashion retail company operating more than 90 physical stores and an online shop. The Complainant operates under and is widely known by the NORAH name, which it uses in connection with its women's clothing.

Given the Complainant's reputation internationally and the distinctive nature of its NORAH mark, the Panel finds it implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's rights. The registration itself, mirroring the Complainant's trademark in full, demonstrates clear targeting.

The disputed domain name incorporates the NORAH in its entirety, merely adding the term "outlet" and the gTLD ".shop". Under WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.1, this composition strongly suggests deliberate targeting.

The disputed domain name previously resolved to a fraudulent website impersonating the Complainant, reproducing the Complainant's NORAH mark, clothing-related content, offering purported NORAH products for sale, and prompting Internet users to provide personal and payment information in the course of the purchase process. This conduct falls squarely within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, as the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark for deceptive purposes. Although the website has since been deactivated, this does not negate a finding of bad faith. On the contrary, the deliberate imitation of the Complainant's website confirms that the Respondent had no bona fide use in mind, but instead sought to exploit the Complainant's reputation, disrupt its business, and undermine user trust.

The Respondent has not provided any explanation for selecting the disputed domain name, is not commonly known by it, and has not been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted by the Complainant to use its mark. The absence of any Response further strengthens the inference of bad faith. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 4.3.

Considering the totality of the circumstances, including the Complainant's established trademark rights, the Respondent's reproduction of the Complainant's NORAH mark and website content, the use of the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant and solicit personal and financial information from Internet users, and the clear absence of any rights or legitimate interests, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

Accordingly, the third element of paragraph 4(a) 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 <norahoutlet.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ganna Prokhorova/
Ganna Prokhorova
Sole Panelist
Date: August 20, 2026