

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Dairy Boy LLC v. BOSONGO TOMMY, VERRIN ANTOINE, KJOULI DESIREE

Case No. D2026-3187

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Dairy Boy LLC, United States of America (“United States” or “US”), represented by 101domain.com, United States.

The Respondents are BOSONGO TOMMY, VERRIN ANTOINE, KJOULI DESIREE, France.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <dairyboy-official.com>, <dairyboy-outlet.com>, and <dairyboy-shop.com> are registered with Ligne Web Services SARL (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 21, 2026. On July 21, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On July 23, 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 Respondents (Information not available in the Domain Registration Database) and contact information in the Complaint.

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 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 an amended Complaint on August 14, 2026. On August 17, 2026, the Center sent a request for amendment to the Complainant. The Complainant filed a further amended Complaint on August 24, 2026.

On August 4, 2026, the Center informed the parties in French and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain names is French. On August 14 and 24, 2026, the Complainant confirmed its request that English be the language of the proceeding. The Respondents did not submit any comment on the Complainant's submission.

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, in English and French, of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 28, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 17, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents' default on September 18, 2026. On the same date, the Center received an automatic reply communication from an email address associated with two of the disputed domain names.

The Center appointed William A. Van Caenegem 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, Dairy Boy LLC, was founded in 2021 and provides clothing, accessories, candles, and houseware goods amongst other things. The Complainant is the owner of a number of registered trademarks comprising the terms DAIRY BOY, being United States trademark No 7505165 registered on September 17, 2024 for services in class 35, with first use date of August 1, 2020; and European Union ("EU") trademark No 019250595 registered on February 1, 2026 (filing date September 23, 2025), for goods in class 25.

The Complainant's primary website is found at the domain name <dairyboy.com>, where customers can browse a range of DAIRY BOY branded clothing and homewares products.

The disputed domain name <dairyboy-shop.com> was registered on March 14, 2026; <dairyboy-official.com> on April 18, 2026; and <dairyboy-outlet.com> on May 1, 2026. The disputed domain names were consecutively registered and previously hosted websites with the same design and including replications of the DAIRY BOY trademark of the Complainant, offering for sale DAIRY BOY products. At present, the disputed domain names resolve to inactive sites that cannot be reached.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant requests that the language of these proceedings be English, despite the Registration Agreement being in French. The Complainant says that it does not understand French and that it would be an undue burden to submit French translations. The Complainant also points out that the Registry Agreement for the ".com" generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") is in English, as is the UDRP Policy published on the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers ("ICANN")'s website and cited in the Registration Agreement's Dispute Policy. The Complainant adds that the disputed domain names previously hosted live sites that were in English by default, with incorporated words that are English dictionary terms: "outlet", "official", and "shop" and English synonyms for the corporate retail activity that the Complainant's trademarks are known for.

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

The Complainant says that the disputed domain names are registered and controlled by the same entity despite the differing Whols information for each. The Complainant thus requests consolidation of these proceedings. In support of this request, the Complainant points out that the disputed domain names previously hosted the same infringing live websites and designs, including a contact page on <dairyboy-official.com>, and <dairyboy-outlet.com> that listed the same exact email address. Additionally, the Complainant says that all three disputed domain names listed their managing company as TMB Webworks L.L. C-FZ on the "Contact Information" page. The Complainant also asserts that the disputed domain names themselves are linguistically similar in their composition, clearly using the Complainant's trademark combined with a hyphenated, interchangeable English dictionary term for commercial retail. The Complainant adds that <dairyboy-shop.com> was first registered with Ligne Web Services SAS dba LWS on March 14, 2026, with the providers subsequently removing the infringing content on April 15, 2026, after receiving the Complainant's DMCA Takedown notice. Three days later, the Complainant says, the Respondents registered <dairyboy-official.com> with Ligne Web Services SAS dba LWS, on April 18, 2026, to regenerate the same fraudulent website. The Complainant says that it then submitted another DMCA Takedown for that domain on April 28, 2026, and the providers removed the reported content once again. The Complainant says that the Respondents then repeated this pattern of bad faith, registered <dairyboy-outlet.com> with Ligne Web Services SAS dba LWS, put up another live, infringing website, whereafter the Complainant submitted another DMCA Takedown to the providers. In conclusion, the Complainant contends that in consideration of the Respondents' clear pattern of bad faith and the timeline of events, the disputed domain names are managed by the same controlling entity.

The Complainant says that it has been utilizing the DAIRY BOY trademarks consistently and consecutively since 2020 and claims to be exceptionally well-known in its community for retail clothing items offered on its website. It is also the registered owner in the US since 2024 and in the EU since 2026, of the DAIRY BOY trademark. The Complainant maintains that the disputed domain names are all identical or confusingly similar to its DAIRY BOY trademark, which is incorporated in each. By adding a hyphen and the terms "outlet", "shop" and "official", the Complainant says that the Respondents are purposefully attempting to validate the disputed domains for fraudulent means and cause confusion. The Complainant adds that it should be permitted to reflect its trademark online without the confusion of the Respondents' disputed domain names.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in any of the disputed domain names as it has not licensed nor allowed the Respondents to use the DAIRY BOY trademarks or trade name for any purpose. As described above, the Complainant sent takedown notices consecutively for each disputed domain name whereupon the infringing content was removed in every instance. The Complainant says that it believes that the Respondents have no registered trademarks using the term dairy boy and traded on the goodwill the Complainant has established under the DAIRY BOY brand for wrongful profit. The Complainant adds that the Respondents do not appear to have any legitimate connection to the dairy boy term, nor any connection to the Complainant's company, Dairy Boy LLC, and that the disputed domain names were solely being used to deceive the online community for wrongful profit. The Complainant asserts that the Respondents are not commonly known by the disputed domain names and registered the domains primarily for the purpose of disrupting the Complainant's business. The Complainant also submits that the Respondents are not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names because the disputed domain names resolved to websites which were impersonating the Complainant's own site. The Complainant contends that its trademarks have become well-known to characterize the Complainant's clothing and housewares company, as evidenced by their numerous registered dairy boy domain names. By the Respondents diverting potential customers away to domain names that are confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark the Complainant maintains that the Respondents are using the disputed domain names to actively disrupt its business and tarnish its established trademark DAIRY BOY.

The Complainant further alleges that the Respondents fraudulently used the disputed domain names to continue causing confusion among unsuspecting customers and thereby collecting personal data and payment from the Complainant's own customers. The Complainant asserts that the Respondents blatantly registered the disputed domains to facilitate an ongoing scam, using the Complainant's registered brand and product advertisements on the infringing websites of the disputed domain names containing the Complainant's entire trademark. The Complainant adds that given the inclusion of its logo and products on the relevant website, the Respondents intentionally registered the disputed domain names with complete awareness of the Complainant's established brand and corporate reputation. Therefore, the Complainant says that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith for wrongful purposes.

The Complainant adds that the registrant contact information for the disputed domain name <dairyboy-shop.com> is false as when it attempted to communicate with the provided email address, the Complainant received a rebound notification stating that the registrant's email address could not be found. The Complainant characterizes this as an evasive maneuver that shows the Respondents' bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 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. 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 each of the disputed domain names has a similar composition; each of the websites to which the disputed domain names resolved listed the same management company in their contact information; the websites to which <dairyboy-official.com>, and <dairyboy-outlet.com> resolved listed the same exact contact email address; the sequence of takedown notices for one site being quickly followed by another of the disputed domain names being registered; that the language and composition of each of the websites to which the disputed domain names resolved was seemingly identical, and that those websites each incorporated the DAIRY BOY trademark in an identical manner. The Panel therefore finds that consolidation should be granted as the disputed domain names are more likely than not under common control.

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.

Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement is French. 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 proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant says it does not speak French and requests that this proceeding be conducted in English for several reasons, including the fact that each of the disputed domain names incorporates a real English term, being “shop”, “outlet” and “official”, and the websites to which the disputed domain names previously resolved also displayed English terms. The Respondent has not made any comments about the language of the proceeding. The Complainant would be compelled to endure cost and delay if it had to conduct the proceeding in French.

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. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.5.1.

Therefore, the Panel resolves, under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules, that in the circumstances of this case, English will be the language of this 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 a 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. Although the addition of other terms, here “shop”, “outlet” and “official”, 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. The Complainant has established trademark rights in its DAIRY BOY brand name, but has not authorized the Respondent to make any use of that mark. Based on the available record, the Respondent is not known as “dairy boy” or by any of the disputed domain names.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here for identical and deceptive copycat sites each resolving from similarly composed domain names that include the Complainant’s distinctive trademark, can never confer rights or legitimate interests in the 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered three domain names that each included the Complainant’s distinctive DAIRY BOY trademark in its entirety, coupled with descriptive terms that are designed to reinforce the suggestion of a legitimate connection with the Complainant (“outlet”, “shop” and “official”). It is highly unlikely that this series of registrations came about coincidentally or without the Respondent knowing of the Complainant’s trademark rights in relation to the mark DAIRY BOY.

Furthermore, the fact that the disputed domain names then in quick succession resolved to sites that imitated the Complainant’s online presence, including its DAIRY BOY trademark, and gave the false impression of being the Complainant or associated with it further reinforces the inference that the disputed domain names were registered in bad faith. This also supports a finding of bad faith use, as the websites to which the disputed domain names resolved were designed to mislead consumers in a likely attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites, by taking unfair advantage of the Complainant’s mark and creating a likelihood of confusion. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here identical and deceptive copycat sites each resolving from similarly composed domain names that include the Complainant’s distinctive trademark to offer for sale the Complainant’s branded products, 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 <dairyboy-official.com>, <dairyboy-outlet.com>, and <dairyboy-shop.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/William A. Van Caenegem/

William A. Van Caenegem

Sole Panelist

Date: October 6, 2026