ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Peet’s Coffee & Tea Inc. v. WILLIAMS THURMAN ONEIL, Fynneganx Bishop, Masbate MJFG
Case No. D2026-3105

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Peet’s Coffee & Tea Inc., United States of America, represented by Ploum, Netherlands (Kingdom of the).

The Respondents are WILLIAMS THURMAN ONEIL, United States of America, Fynneganx Bishop, United States of America, and Masbate MJFG, United States of America.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <peetfcoffee.com> is registered with Gname.com Pte. Ltd. The disputed domain names <peetscoffee.shop> and <shoppeets.shop> are registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrars”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 15, 2026. On July 15, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars requests for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On July 16, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses 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 20, 2026, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, 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 an amended Complaint on July 21, 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 28, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 17, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents' default on August 21, 2026.

The Center appointed Clark W. Lackert as the sole panelist in this matter on August 28, 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 corporation organized and existing under the law of the State of California, United States of America. In 1966, the Complainant was founded by Alfred Peet, a Dutch-born coffee importer who opened his first store in Berkeley, California, with the aim of introducing American consumers to high-quality, dark-roasted specialty coffee. Alfred Peet is widely regarded as one of the founding figures of the specialty coffee movement in North America. Under the brand PEET'S, in word mark form, with the word COFFEE, and in logo form with the letter P, the Complainant sells a wide variety of coffee and tea products, including whole bean, ground coffee, espresso, cold brew, and loose-leaf teas, through its own retail stores, grocery channels, foodservice partners, and an online store. The brand is known for its emphasis on quality sourcing, dark roasting, and single-origin coffees.

The Complainant forms part of the Jacobs Douwe Egberts ("JDE") group, which in turn forms part of JDE Peet's, one of the world's largest pure play coffee and tea companies, headquartered in Netherlands (Kingdom of the). Earlier this year, JDE Peet's merged with Keurig Dr Pepper. With roots dating back to 1753, JDE Peet's has grown into one of the world's leading coffee and tea companies. Its portfolio of coffee and tea brands is marketed and sold in more than 100 countries worldwide, including throughout Europe, Asia and North America.

The Complainant, through its affiliate, has registered the PEET'S and PEET'S COFFEE marks (collectively, the "Mark") internationally, including, but not limited to, the following trademark registrations:

Jurisdiction	Trademark	Registration Number	Registration Date
United States of America	PEET'S	955284	March 13, 1973
European Union	PEET'S	001075589	July 26, 2000
European Union	PEET'S COFFEE	016779639	January 31, 2018
China	P Peet's Coffee	26858430	October 28, 2018

The Complainant operates its official website at its principal domain name <peets.com>, which was registered on February 3, 1995.

The disputed domain names were registered as follows: <peetfcoffee.com> on October 16, 2025, <peetscoffee.shop> on June 5, 2026, and <shoppeets.shop> on June 18, 2026. The disputed domain names resolve to websites displaying the Mark and images of Peet's-branded products, which are purportedly offered for sale at discounted prices.

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.

The disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights

First of all, the disputed domain name <peetscoffee.shop> is identical to the Complainant's PEET'S COFFEE mark, as it incorporates the said trademark in its entirety without any alteration. The second disputed domain name <peetfcoffee.com> is confusingly similar to the Complainant's PEET'S COFFEE mark, as it incorporates the mark in its entirety, only substituting the letter "s" for the letter "f". The third disputed domain name <shoppeets.shop> is confusingly similar to the Complainant's PEET'S mark, as it incorporates the mark in its entirety to which Respondents have merely added the generic term "shop". Those additions and/or alterations are, however, insufficient to distinguish the disputed domain names from the Mark, and go unnoticed by the casual observer. Consequently, the dominant element of the disputed domain names is the Mark, and those trademarks are also recognizable as such. This is, given the generally accepted test for establishing confusing similarity in the domain name cases, sufficient. In addition to the above, and through the combination of the Mark and the generic term "shop" and/or the very obvious typosquatted term including the letter "f", the Respondents are deceiving the public into believing that these disputed domain names resolve to an official website or web shop. In doing so, the Respondents are intentionally creating the impression that the disputed domain names resolve to an official website from the Complainant.

Finally, the addition of the different generic Top Level Domains ("gTLD") ".shop" and ".com" is not to be taken into consideration when examining the identity or similarity between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain names, as it is viewed as a standard registration requirement (See section 1.11.1 of WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1")).

The Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names

First of all, to the best of the Complainant's knowledge and belief, the Respondents are not commonly known under the name "Peets", "Peets Coffee", "Shop Peet's", or any other variation thereof, nor have the Respondents acquired any relevant trademark or service mark rights. Secondly, the Respondents are not affiliated with the Complainant, and the Complainant has not licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondents to use the Mark or to register domain names incorporating the Mark. In addition to this, the Respondents cannot claim prior rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names, since the Complainant's use and registration of the Mark predates the registration of the disputed domain names for many years. Thirdly, the use of the disputed domain names and/or the Mark by Respondents can in no event lead to a legitimate interest for the Respondents, whereas the Respondents do not make demonstrable use of the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services.

As the Respondents have no rights nor legitimate interests in relation to the disputed domain names, the second element as referred to in paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy is satisfied.

The disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith

The disputed domain names have been registered and have been used in bad faith. Based on the presented facts, this is beyond doubt and self-explanatory. The Complainant refers to what has been brought forward in relation to the clear lack of rights and legitimate interests of the Respondents.

Due to the fact that the Mark is a well-known brand, the fact that the Mark is highly distinctive and given the great similarities between the Mark and the disputed domain names, the Respondents must have been aware of the Complainant, the Mark, as well as the goodwill associated with it, when the Respondents registered the disputed domain names, which indicates a registration in bad faith. See for instance, *Hodge Jones & Allen LLP v. Koichiro Taneda*, WIPO Case No. D2018-1426.

This is further enhanced by the fact that on their websites, the Respondents are calling its business "Peets Coffee" and are using the Complainant's figurative trademark on every single page, making it all the more clear that the Respondents have specifically targeted the Complainant and its Mark. Because of this, the Internet users that are led to the websites are made to believe that the websites are either run by the Complainant or an official authorized agent of the Complainant, which is clearly not the case.

Given the strong confusing similarity, the fact that the Mark is well known and has a very distinctive character, there is also a great risk that the disputed domain names will be used for fraudulent activities by the Respondents (if not already). Therefore, the third element has been satisfied.

B. Respondents

The Respondents are in default and 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 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 3.1, section 4.11.2.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain names are subject to common control because they display a closely coordinated naming pattern targeting the Complainant's distinctive Mark; in particular, <peetscoffee.shop> and <shoppeets.shop> were registered through the same Registrar only 13 days apart, on June 5 and June 18, 2026, respectively, using the same ".shop" TLD, while <peetfcoffee.com> similarly incorporates an apparent typographical variation of the PEET'S COFFEE mark, i.e., "f" substituted for "s", supporting a finding of common control. The websites also share similar layouts, product presentations, trademark displays, and copyright notices. In addition, the websites at <peetscoffee.shop> and <shoppeets.shop> contain identical "About Us" page and display the same contact email address. 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 Issues

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 Panel finds the Mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. The replacement of the letter "s" with "f" in <peetfcoffee.com> and the addition of the term "shop" in <shoppeets.shop> do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

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(s) may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondents lack 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 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 has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark in violation of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

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 illegal activity, here, claimed copycat sites, passing off, or other types of fraud 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 <peetfcoffee.com>, <peetscoffee.shop>, and <shoppeets.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Clark W. Lackert/
Clark W. Lackert
Sole Panelist
Date: September 9, 2026