

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

SALT & STONE v. Name Redacted

Case No. D2026-3141

1. The Parties

Complainant is SALT & STONE, United States of America “United States”), represented by Thorpe North & Western, United States.

Respondent is Name Redacted¹.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <satandstones.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (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 20, 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 named Respondent (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on July 21, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. 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”).

¹ The Respondent appears to have used the name of a third party when registering the disputed domain name. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted the Respondent’s name from this decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this decision an instruction to the 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Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in this proceeding and has indicated Annex 1 to this decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case.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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 29, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 18, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on August 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Colin T. O'Brien as the sole panelist in this matter on August 31, 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

Complainant is in the business of manufacturing and marketing personal care products.

Complainant owns numerous registrations for SALT & STONE including the following United States registrations:

Reg. No. 5,188,252, registered on April 18, 2017 for "non-medicated lip balm; Sunscreen creams and preparations; Skin, face and body lotions; Oils for cosmetic purposes; Cosmetic sun oils; Cosmetic preparations; Body butters; Sun creams";

Reg. No. 5,826,235, registered on August 6, 2019 for "personal care products, namely, facial cleanser, facial moisturizer, non-medicated cleansers, namely, cleanser for shaving, lip moisturizer, facial oil, body oil, body scrub, body wash, non-medicated cleansers, namely, body cleansers, body moisturizer, skin soap, non-medicated hand soap, bar soap, liquid bath soap";

Reg. No. 7,651,475, registered on January 14, 2025 for "personal care products, namely, facial cleanser, facial moisturizer, nonmedicated facial cleansers, namely, cleanser for shaving, non-medicated lip moisturizer balms, facial oil, body oil, body scrub, body wash, non-medicated skin cleansers for the body and hands, body moisturizer, skin soap, non-medicated hand soap, bar soap, liquid bath soap, and deodorant for personal use"; and

Reg. No. 7,990,443, registered on October 21, 2025 for "non-medicated skin care preparation, namely, body mist."

The SALT & STONE Mark has been used continuously in commerce since at least as early as 2017 and registered its first mark in the United States in 2017. Respondent is not a licensee of any of the SALT & STONE Marks.

The disputed domain name <satandstones.com> was registered on November 13, 2025. The disputed domain name is currently inactive but previously resolved to a website which purported to sell Complainant's products, and mimicked Complainant's website.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

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

Notably, Complainant contends that the disputed domain name incorporates Complainant's SALT & STONE trademark nearly in its entirety. Respondent removed the "l" from "satandstones.com" and added an "s" at

the end, which creates a confusingly similar domain name because it incorporates Complainant's trademark almost in its entirety. It is well established that adding a minor typographical error, such as removing and adding a letter, can be sufficient to establish that a domain name is confusingly similar.

Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent cannot demonstrate any of the enumerated means whereby an entity may show a right or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name. Complainant has been using its SALT & STONE Marks in the United States since at least as early as 2017. In contrast, Respondent registered the disputed domain name on November 13, 2025.

As of the date of this Complaint, Respondent has made absolutely no use of the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Rather, items appearing on Respondent's web pages are products that are sold as Complainant's products. Respondent is clearly attempting to profit from the value created in the SALT & STONE Mark by Complainant.

Respondent is attempting to mimic Salt & Stone and make consumers believe that the website is in fact an official "Salt & Stone" website. Respondent's landing pages have directly copied "SALT & STONE" logo and copied photographs directly from Complainant's website. Also, Respondent's website includes listings for Complainant's products,

Based on the commercial nature of Respondent's sites, it is clear that Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Rather, upon information and belief, Respondent is purposefully attempting to profit from the significant value created in the SALT & STONE Marks by unlawfully and misleadingly diverting SALT & STONE customers to <satandstones.com> for its own commercial gain.

Respondent registered the <satandstones.com> disputed domain name on November 13, 2025. Due to the extensive sales of Complainant's products across the United States as well as internationally, it is apparent that Respondent knew of the SALT & STONE Marks and intentionally registered the disputed domain name in the hopes of monetizing its market value. No other conclusion may be reached other than that Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website for financial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's SALT & STONE Marks.

Due to the confusingly similar nature of the disputed domain name and SALT & STONE's Marks, Internet users looking for SALT & STONE products which bear the SALT & STONE brand would clearly be deceived as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of Respondent's website. Once consumers enter Respondent's website, their attention is directed to numerous listings of products bearing the SALT & STONE logo, which blatantly reproduces the look and feel of Complainant's official website, including identical product photographs, product organization, branding, navigation, and overall commercial presentation.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Complainant has demonstrated it owns registered trademark rights in the SALT & STONE Mark. The disputed domain name misspells Complainant's SALT & STONE Mark, by deleting an "l" to "salt", adding an "s" to "stone" and substituting "and" for "&", which in the Panel's view is confusingly similar. The generic Top-Level-Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is typically disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test.

Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a mark in which Complainant has rights. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), sections 1.7, 1.9 and 1.11.1, and *Hoffmann-La Roche AG v. Domain Admin, Privacy Protection Service INC d/b/a PrivacyProtect.org / Conan Corrigan*, WIPO Case No. [D2015-2316](#).

Accordingly, the Panel finds that Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Complainant has presented a prima facie case that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and has not been commonly known by the disputed domain name. There is no evidence that Respondent was ever authorized to sell Complainant's products nor was it ever affiliated with Complainant. Further, Respondent's use of the disputed domain name does not comply with the test laid down in *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#), as the website does not accurately and prominently disclose Respondent's relationship (or lack thereof) with Complainant.

While the disputed domain name does not currently resolve to an active website, Complainant has provided sufficient evidence that Respondent had set up a website in order to take unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion with Complainant, as regards the source or endorsement of the website.

After a complainant has made a prima facie case, the burden of production shifts to a respondent to present evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. See, e.g., *Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2003-0455](#); and [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Here, Respondent has provided no evidence of any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

In the absence of any evidence rebutting Complainant's prima facie case indicating Respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The disputed domain name was registered years after Complainant first registered and used the SALT & STONE marks. The evidence on the record provided by Complainant is sufficient to satisfy the Panel that, at the time the disputed domain name was registered, Respondent undoubtedly knew of Complainant's SALT & STONE marks.

Further, the Panel finds the use of the disputed domain name by Respondent is in bad faith. Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy states that evidence of bad faith may include a respondent's use of a domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the respondent's website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark. The evidence, including the website content and composition of the disputed domain name, shows that Respondent had created a website at the disputed domain name with the intention to confuse unsuspecting Internet users into believing that the disputed domain name is operated by Complainant.

In the absence of any evidence or explanation from Respondent, the Panel finds that the registration and use of the disputed domain name have been made for bad faith purposes.

Respondent's bad faith is reinforced by its use of an unrelated third party's name when registering the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(iii) 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 name <satandstones.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Colin T. O'Brien/

Colin T. O'Brien

Sole Panelist

Date: September 15, 2026