

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Adanola Limited v. Name Redacted
Case No. D2026-3138

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Adanola Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Com Laude Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Name Redacted¹.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <adanola.app> is registered with Sav.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 16, 2026. On July 17, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 17, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 22, 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 24, 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”).

¹ The underlying registrant of the disputed domain name appears to have used the name and contact details of a third party when registering the disputed domain name. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted the name of this registrant from this Decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this Decision an instruction to the concerned Registrar regarding transfer of the disputed domain name, which includes the name of the Respondent. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the concerned Registrar as part of the order in these proceedings, and has indicated that Annex 1 to this Decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST-12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1788](#).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 30, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 19, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 2, 2026. The Center received a letter from a third party on August 14, 2026 claiming identity theft.

The Center appointed Aaron Newell as the sole panelist in this matter on September 9, 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 established in 2015 and is a well-known UK-based fashion brand with a particular focus on sportswear and activewear. It has enjoyed media coverage in various well-known publications such as Vogue Business and Women's Health, and has launched high-profile celebrity collaborations including a 2025 collaboration with supermodel Kendall Jenner. It has used the trademark ADANOLA as its house brand throughout this time, including to market, promote and sell its products at its website at the domain name "www.adanola.com".

The Complainant's ADANOLA trademark is protected by way of a number of trademark registrations in various countries around the world, including:

- i) United Kingdom trademark registration no UK00003152822 ADANOLA registered May 27, 2016 in class 25;
- ii) European Union trademark registration no 018310759 ADANOLA registered February 24, 2021 in classes 18, 25, 35;
- iii) United States trademark registration no 7732312 ADANOLA registered March 18, 2025 classes 18, 25, 35.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 30, 2026.

The Complainant has provided evidence that the disputed domain name resolves to a Shopify-hosted website that imitates the Complainant's website and purported to offer the Complainant's products at discounted prices.

There are no indications that the Respondent has engaged with these proceedings or with the Complainant or the Center. While it is evident from the case file that a party replied to the notification of the Complaint, this reply was intended to indicate to the Center that the party's name and contact information had been misused as the registrant details for the disputed domain name. The indications are that this communication came from an otherwise-unrelated, independent third party who is not the Respondent, and whose identity had been misappropriated by the Respondent, as noted above.

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:

- i) the disputed domain name is identical to its registered trademark rights as it contains the Complainant's ADANOLA trademark in its entirety;
- ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name because there is no evidence that the Respondent is known as ADANOLA, there is no evidence of any historical use of the name ADANOLA by the Respondent, the Respondent is not making non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name implies an affiliation with the Complainant (including as a distributor of the Complainant's products) when no such affiliation actually exists, and there is no use of the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services because the disputed domain name has been used to resolve to a website that impersonates the Complainant's website;
- iii) the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith because the disputed domain name is being used to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's ADANOLA trademark, the disputed domain name has been used to redirect Internet users to a website that imitates the Complainant's website and is otherwise unrelated to the Complainant, the Respondent has not used a disclaimer or any other indications as to the nature of its relationship with the Complainant, the disputed domain name is being used to disrupt the Complainant's business, and the Respondent is targeting the Complainant's well-known trademark and business.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant carries the burden of proving:

- i) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which it has rights; and
- ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- iii) that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Respondent's default does not automatically result in a decision in favor of the Complainant.

Paragraph 5(f) of the Rules does however provide that if the Respondent does not submit a response, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel shall decide the dispute solely based upon the Complaint.

Further, according to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, the Panel may draw such inferences from the Respondent's failure to submit a Response as it considers appropriate.

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 identical 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 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, claimed by the Complainant to be the imitation of Complainant’s website and business and therefore a passing off, but also potential identity theft as indicated in unrebutted third party correspondence to the Center) 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.

These include circumstances set out at paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy whereby:

(iv) by using the domain name, [the Respondent has] intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [its] web site or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of [its] web site or location or of a product or service on [its] web site or location.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name wholly contains the Complainant’s registered trademark and was registered by the Respondent without the Complainant’s authorization.

The Respondent has used the disputed domain name to redirect Internet users to a website that is similar in numerous respects to the Complainant’s website, including through its copying of the Complainant’s logo as well as its product and other promotional images. With the benefit of these images, the Respondent’s website purports to offer for sale the Complainant’s products at prices that are significantly lower than those for the identical products as featured on the Complainant’s website.

Noting the lack of any disclaimer, the overall impression given by the Respondent's conduct at the disputed domain name is that the website at the disputed domain name is or is related to the Complainant, when this is not the case. As alleged by the Complainant and not rebutted by the Respondent, the Respondent has most likely undertaken this conduct for the purposes of commercial gain by misleading consumers, in competition with the Complainant, and obviously to the detriment of the Complainant. This conduct is clearly described by paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Further, the Panel notes the unsolicited third party allegations that when registering the disputed domain name the Respondent provided to the registrar the name and address of an unrelated third party. This conduct could constitute identity theft and is itself misleading and indicative of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. The nature of the third party allegations was made known to the Respondent who did nothing to explain its conduct or rebut the allegations. There is also no indication in the case file that the allegations were not made to the Center in good faith by the affected party.

On this basis, 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 the third element 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 <adanola.app> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Aaron Newell/

Aaron Newell

Sole Panelist

Date: September 23, 2026