ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Goop Inc. v. alain esposito carbone, Converto Boost SASU
Case No. D2026-3239

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Goop Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by FBT Gibbons LLP, United States.

The Respondent is alain esposito carbone, Converto Boost SASU, France.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <sharegoop.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 22, 2026. On July 23, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 24, 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 (None Provided, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 24, 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 29, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 3, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 23, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 25, 2026.

The Center appointed Aaron Newell 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 was founded in 2008 by Oscar-winning actress and entrepreneur Gwyneth Paltrow. Since this time the Complainant has become an internationally-recognised lifestyle brand operating by reference to the trademark GOOP and offering a range of products and services in the fields of fashion, beauty, wellness, home decor and nutrition. The Complainant offers and provides its goods and services through numerous brick-and-mortar retail locations and online at its “www.goop.com” website. The Complainant’s business was subject of a television series entitled “The Goop Lab with Gwyneth Paltrow” on the Netflix streaming service.

The Complainant owns a number of registered trademark rights that protect its GOOP trademark, including:

i) United States Trademark Registration No. 4946429 GOOP (word mark) filed May 22, 2012 and registered April 26, 2016 in class 35;

ii) United States Trademark Registration No. 5232763 GOOP (word mark) filed June 8, 2012 and registered June 27, 2017 in classes 3, 5, 8, 14, 18, 20, 21, 24.

The disputed domain name was registered on February 16, 2026. The case file shows that the disputed domain name has historically not resolved to an active website, instead loading a browser error message. The Panel encountered a similar error message when accessing the disputed domain name while drafting this decision.

The Respondent appears to be an individual based in France. It did not file a Response. There is no evidence in the case file that it has engaged with the Complainant or with these proceedings generally.

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 confusingly similar to its registered trademark rights in the name GOOP because the disputed domain name incorporates the trademark GOOP in its entirety;

ii) the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because the Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, has no affiliation or contractual relationship with the Complainant, and is not making any bona fide offering of goods or services in connection with the disputed domain name;

iii) the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith because the disputed domain name is an obvious and opportunistic reference to the Complainant and its business, falsely implies a connection with the Complainant and its business, is targeting customers of the Complainant who seek information about the Complainant and options for purchasing its products, is intended to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating confusion with the Complainant, has been set up with MX (“mail exchange”) records which indicates that the disputed domain name could be used for fraudulent communications; and,

iv) the Respondent is passively holding the disputed domain name and preventing the Complainant from obtaining its rightful ownership and control of the disputed domain name.

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;

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 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.

Further, the entirety of the Complainant's GOOP trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is 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, the word "share") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of this term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name 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 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.

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. Those circumstances generally comprise conduct where a respondent takes unfair advantage of or otherwise abuses a complainant's mark, including for the purposes of commercial gain arising from confusing or misleading use of the disputed domain name.

In the present case, the Complainant has provided evidence supporting its assertions that its GOOP trademark is well known and particularly distinctive of the Complainant's business. The trademark has been used by the Complainant for over a decade in respect of a multifaceted enterprise supported by a famous celebrity founder. The Complainant has also provided evidence supporting its assertions that MX records have been configured in respect of the disputed domain name, enabling the Respondent to use the disputed domain name to send and receive e-mail.

Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a well-known trademark, particularly in the case of a coined or fanciful mark, can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.4.

Further, from the inception of the UDRP panelists have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "error" page) would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.3.

Notably each passive holding case is assessed based on the totality of the relevant circumstances. Those circumstances can include (i) the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant's mark, (ii) the failure of the respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, (iii) the respondent's taking active steps to conceal its identity or (iv) the use of false or inaccurate contact details (noted to be in breach of the respondent's registration agreement). It is often held that the more arbitrary or distinctive a mark the less plausible a claimed non-infringing good faith use is likely to be, and vice versa. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.3.

Further, Panels have in the past noted that the activation of MX records can in certain circumstances support a determination of bad faith (see for example *Goop Inc. v. Atilla Albayrak*, WIPO Case No. D2024-0908 where the Panel held that the configuration for e-mail of the disputed domain name constituted an "abusive threat hanging over the head of the Complainant" supporting a determination of bad faith use and registration).

In the present case the Complainant's trademark is an unusual term and has been in use for over a decade in respect of a well-known enterprise. The disputed domain name wholly incorporates that unusual term alongside the word "share". While there is no evidence of an active website, MX records have been activated in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not come forward with a good faith explanation for the registration of the disputed domain name or its potential use for e-mail, or otherwise rebutted any of the Complainant's contentions.

Lastly, the Panel notes that the name of the Respondent's organization corresponds to that of a company registered in France. That company's corporate records indicate that its primary business activities relate to advertising, and that the named Respondent is the sole director of the company. If the Respondent is truly involved in legitimate advertising activities the Panel would expect some degree of care or knowledge when adopting a well-known trademark or, at minimum, an explanation of any rights or legitimate interests upon receipt of the Complaint. Further, and on the other hand, if the Respondent falsely used the identity and contact details of a third party (in this case a potentially-legitimate advertising agency and/or its director) this would be a clear indication of bad faith. Again, given that the Respondent did not come forward with any explanation as to its activities or its reasons for registration of the disputed domain name, the Panel may draw appropriate inferences accordingly.

In the totality of the circumstances, and absent any rebuttal on the part of the Respondent, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was registered to target the Complainant's well-known and distinctive GOOP trademark.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that disputed domain name has been registered and used in bad faith, and that 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 <sharegoop.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Aaron Newell/
Aaron Newell
Sole Panelist
Date: September 11, 2026