

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Wickes Building Supplies Limited v. stokesk stokesk, Jones Jones
Case No. D2026-3029

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Wickes Building Supplies Limited, United Kingdom ("UK"), represented by Stobbs IP Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondents are stokesk stokesk and Jones Jones, United States of America ("USA").

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <wickeshome.com> and <wickesshop.com> are registered with Cosmotown Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 9, 2026. On July 9, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On July 11, 2026, and July 16, 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 17, 2026, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants 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 amended Complaints on July 22, 2026, and August 4, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaints 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 August 5, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 25, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 27, 2026.

The Center appointed Christopher J. Pibus as the sole panelist in this matter on September 4, 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 was incorporated in the United Kingdom in 1984. The Complainant carries on business as a home improvement retailer with over 230 stores in the UK as of 2023. The Complainant has been listed on the London Stock Exchange since April 28, 2021. In 2022, the Complainant's business earned profits of around GBP 75.4 million.

The "Wickes" name dates back to 1854 when Henry Dunn Wickes started a modest lumber business in Michigan, USA. Over the years, the business' commercial focus moved to the UK, which became its core market. The Complainant's company has grown substantially over the years, beginning with Complainant's first UK based store which was opened in Whitefield, Manchester in 1972. By 2011, the Complainant opened its 200th store, selling a wide range of over 100,000 home improvement products.

The Complainant registered the domain name <wickes.co.uk> in 2003, which it has used to host the main transactional website for the Complainant for at least 20 years, currently generating traffic of over 12 million visitors every month. The Complainant also owns a portfolio of various other domain registrations encompassing the "WICKES" term in the domain name string.

Aside from website presence, the Complainant is also active on social media, where it uses its channels to advertise the brand's services and to engage with customer queries. This social media presence incorporates the term "WICKES" in the corresponding account handles, dating back to 2009. Core accounts include: Instagram – "@wickes" with around 95,000 followers; Facebook – "@wickes.co.uk" with around 212,000 followers; X – "@wickes" with around 94,000 followers; and YouTube – "@wickesvideo" with around 85,000 subscribers.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for WICKES. Registrations for the mark, across various jurisdictions and classes, include the following:

- European Union Trademark: WICKES; Registration date September 19, 2023, Registration no. 18808593; Classes 6, 7, 11, 19, 20, 21, 35, 37, 42 and 43;
- United Kingdom Trademark WICKES; Registration date June 21, 1984; Registration No. 00001221188; Classes 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 16, 17, 19, 20, and 27.

The disputed domain names were registered as follows:

<wickeshome.com> registered January 27, 2026;
<wickeshop.com> registered February 28, 2026.

Originally the disputed domain names resolved to websites which closely resembled the official website of the Complainant. The Complainant claims that the websites have since been disabled by the Registrar pursuant to takedown notices filed by the Complainant.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has deliberately targeted the well-known WICKES trademark by creating copycat websites which prominently use the WICKES mark and logo to impersonate the look and feel of the Complainant's principal commercial website, in a deliberate attempt to deceive potential customers and to interfere with the Complainant's business.

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, the 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.

Preliminary Matters - 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 Complaint 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 Complainant has identified a number of factors which, when considered together, support a finding of common control. In particular the Complainant relies on the following facts: (1) the disputed domain names were registered with the same registrar Cosmotown, Inc.; (2) the disputed domain names were registered in quick succession in January and February of 2026; (3) the Respondent used the same naming convention in creating both disputed domain names, combining the word mark WICKES as the first element followed by descriptive words relating to the targeted field of business; and (4) the disputed domain names resolved to virtually identical copycat websites, featuring widespread use of the WICKES brand and logo.

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 herein as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

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 long-established rights in respect of the trademark WICKES, for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, 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, "shop" and "home" respectively, 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. In particular, the Panel notes that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names, and the Respondent is not sponsored by or affiliated with the Complainant in any way, nor has the Complainant given the Respondent a license, authorization or permission to use the Complainant's trademark in any manner, including in domain names. The Complainant has also provided evidence that the Respondent has used or is using the disputed domain names to redirect users to unauthorized websites claiming to offer home improvement products and services, which directly targets the Complainant's business. Evidence in the form of copycat web pages created and used by the Respondent demonstrates a deliberate intention to deceive web users into the belief that they have accessed the Complainant's website.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed impersonation, copycat sites, passing off, or other types of fraud can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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 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 that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's well-known and long-established WICKES mark.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed impersonation, copycat sites, passing off, or other types of fraud constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. The Complainant has provided evidence to establish intentional targeting of the WICKES trademark by the Respondent. In particular, the evidence includes pages from the websites operated by the Respondent in association with the disputed domain names that show copying of the look and feel of the Complainant's principal website, by virtue of the widespread use of the WICKES logo, along with copied photographs, promotional text, similar colours and layout. The Respondent's conduct points clearly to a conclusion that the websites have been designed to deceive consumers into believing that they are accessing the Complainant's business.

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 <wickeshome.com> and <wickeshop.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Christopher J. Pibus/

Christopher J. Pibus

Sole Panelist

Date: September 18, 2026