

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

David's Bridal, Inc. v. mckin leyde1, 李策平 (Li Ce Ping), theapplied biosystems
Case No. D2026-3154

1. The Parties

The Complainant is David's Bridal, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Johnson Winter Slattery, Australia.

The Respondents are mckin leyde1, China; 李策平 (Li Ce Ping), China; theapplied biosystems, China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <olegcassinibrand.com> is registered with Spaceship, Inc.; The disputed domain name <oleg-cassini.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc; The disputed domain name <theolegcassini.com> is registered with DNSPod, Inc. (collectively, the "Registrars").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 17, 2026. On July 17, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the concerned Registrars requests for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names then identified in the Complaint. On July 20, 2026, the concerned 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY)) and contact information in the Complaint.

On August 4, 2026, the Center informed the parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain name <theolegcassini.com> is Chinese. On August 9, 2026, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding. The Respondents did not submit any comment on the Complainant's submission.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 4, 2026, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaints 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 disputed domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended

Complaint on August 9, 2026, requesting the addition of a third disputed domain name, <olegcassinibrand.com>. On August 10, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the concerned Registrar request for registrar verification. The Center sent a new email communication to the Complainant on August 14, 2026, with the registrant and contact information of the newly added disputed domain name.

The Complainant filed a further amended Complaint on August 14, 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 Respondents of the Complaint in English and in Chinese, and the proceedings commenced on August 17, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 6, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents’ default on September 17, 2026.

The Center appointed Andrew Sim as the sole panelist in this matter on September 22, 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 United States corporation and a wedding and formal-wear retailer founded in 1951. It sells wedding, prom, and party dresses and offers related products and services, including in-house alterations, shoes, and accessories.

In or around June 2022, the Complainant acquired from Oleg Cassini, Inc. the exclusive worldwide rights to design, manufacture, and sell bridal and occasion collections under the OLEG CASSINI brand. The evidence states that the OLEG CASSINI name and marks have been used in commerce since 1951 in connection with, among other things, couture, wedding dresses, bridal gowns, accessories, and related goods.

The Complainant owns registrations for OLEG CASSINI and related marks in multiple jurisdictions. By way of example:

Jurisdiction	Mark	Registration Number	Registration Date	Class(es)
Australia	OLEG CASSINI	2310252	October 26, 2022	25
United Kingdom	OLEG CASSINI	UK00911779139	September 10, 2013	3, 25
European Union	OLEG CASSINI	011779139	September 10, 2013	3, 25

The Complainant operates its principal website at “www.davidsbridal.com”. It also owns “www.olegcassini.com”, which redirects to “www.davidsbridal.com”, and promotes Oleg Cassini products through social media accounts using the OLEG CASSINI name.

The disputed domain name <theolegcassini.com> was registered on October 16, 2024; <oleg-cassini.com> was registered on January 9, 2026; and <olegcassinibrand.com> was registered on July 30, 2026.

When the original Complaint was filed on July 17, 2026, <theolegcassini.com> redirected to <oleg-cassini.com>. The website then displayed at <oleg-cassini.com> prominently used the OLEG CASSINI mark, described itself as the “Oleg Cassini Official Website”, promoted Oleg Cassini products, and included “Buy on Amazon” links containing the affiliate tag “theolegcassini-20”. It did not appear to contain its own

product catalogue, checkout, or order-processing function. The website also displayed the Complainant's former Melbourne, Australia showroom address and at least one image reproduced from a previous collection of the Complainant.

After the original Complaint was filed, <olegcassinibrand.com> was registered. As of the further amended Complaint, both <theolegcassini.com> and <oleg-cassini.com> redirected to <olegcassinibrand.com>. Based on the Complainant's evidence, the website at <olegcassinibrand.com> used OLEG CASSINI branding, promoted purported Oleg Cassini products, and contained buttons linking to Amazon searches as well as broken external pages at <davidsbridal.com> and <macys.com>. It did not appear to contain its own product catalogue, checkout, or order-processing function. The website also stated that content was aggregated from David's Bridal, Amazon, and independent bridal forums.

Little information is known about the Respondents. Available information provided by the Registrars covers only the registrants' name, postal address, telephone number, and email address.

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.

First, the Complainant contends that each disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the OLEG CASSINI marks in which the Complainant has rights: <oleg-cassini.com> differs only by a hyphen, <theolegcassini.com> adds "the", and <olegcassinibrand.com> adds "brand".

Second, the Complainant submits that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. The Complainant has not authorized use of its marks and there is no evidence that any of the Respondents is commonly known by the disputed domain names. The Complainant further submits that the disputed domain names have been used to impersonate the Complainant and divert Internet users to third-party shopping pages, including through affiliate links.

Third, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith for the reasons below:

- (a) the incorporation of its OLEG CASSINI marks;
- (b) repeated use of the OLEG CASSINI name and indicia of official status;
- (c) use of addresses associated with the Complainant or OLEG CASSINI;
- (d) redirection to the Amazon website to generate commission revenue;
- (e) the incorporation of links to the websites of the Complainant and a well-known third-party brand Macy's;
- (f) migration of the website to the disputed domain name <olegcassinibrand.com> after the Complaint was filed; and
- (g) concealing the identity of the Respondents' behind domain privacy proxy services.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy states that, in an administrative proceeding, the Complainant must prove each of the following three elements:

- (a) the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (b) the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and
- (c) the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The further amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different disputed domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the disputed 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 when the original Complaint was filed, <theolegcassini.com> redirected to <oleg-cassini.com>. After <olegcassinibrand.com> was registered, both original disputed domain names redirected to it. The websites displayed substantially similar OLEG CASSINI-focused content and a common commercial structure involving third-party retail links. The timing of the third registration and coordinated redirection chain are particularly persuasive. All three registrants are located in China, and none offered an explanation to the contrary.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party. Each Respondent received notice and had an opportunity to object. The claims raise the same factual and legal issues, and separate proceedings would cause unnecessary duplication.

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.

Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain names <oleg-cassini.com> and <olegcassinibrand.com> is English while the language of the Registration Agreement for <theolegcassini.com> is Chinese. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceedings shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including the fact that the content of the website related to the disputed domain name <theolegcassini.com> was in English, and that the website to which this disputed domain name and <olegcassinibrand.com> now redirects, is in English too.

The Respondents did not make any specific submissions with respect to the language of the proceeding.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.5.1).

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

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. 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, a hyphen, the term "the", and the term "brand" 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. 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.

From the available record, there is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain names, which could demonstrate its rights or legitimate interests (see, e.g., *World Natural Bodybuilding Federation, Inc. v. Daniel Jones TheDotCafe*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-0642](#)).

The Respondent has not used the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services. The websites associated with the disputed domain names falsely suggest an official or authorized connection with the Complainant. The websites used the mark, claimed or implied official status, and redirected users to third-party retail pages. The first website used an Amazon affiliate tag, while neither website appeared to provide its own checkout or ordering function.

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 knew of and targeted the Complainant and its marks. The marks substantially predate the disputed domain names. Each disputed domain name reproduces it, and each corresponding website was devoted to OLEG CASSINI-branded content. The websites used the marks prominently, suggested official status, and used contact addresses associated with the Complainant or OLEG CASSINI. Coincidental registration is implausible.

The disputed domain names attracted Internet users through confusion and diverted them to Amazon and other retail pages. The affiliate tag "theolegcassini-20" supports a finding of intended commercial gain. This falls within paragraph 4(b)(iv). The registration of the disputed domain name <olegcassinibrand.com> less than two weeks after the original filing, followed by redirection of both original disputed domain names to a substantially similar website, further demonstrates continuation of the same misleading operation.

The Respondent did not participate or provide a good-faith explanation. The Panel may draw appropriate inferences under paragraph 14(b) of the Rules. On the totality of the record, the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

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 <olegcassinibrand.com>, <oleg-cassini.com>, and <theolegcassini.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrew Sim/

Andrew Sim

Sole Panelist

Date: October 6, 2026