

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

ITV Studios Limited v. leo Tome

Case No. D2026-3261

1. The Parties

The Complainant is ITV Studios Limited, United Kingdom, internally represented.

The Respondent is leo Tome, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <loveisland-network.shop> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 23, 2026. On July 24, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 28, 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 amendment to the Complaint on the same day.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 6, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 26, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 27, 2026.

The Center appointed Assen Alexiev 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

The Complainant states that it is the largest television production group in the United Kingdom and operates in 13 countries with local production offices in Australia, Belgium, France, Germany, Israel, Italy, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), Spain, the United Kingdom, and United States. The Complainant has created and distributes worldwide TV shows such as “Love Island”, “Hell’s Kitchen”, “The Chase”, “The Voice” and “Come Dine With Me”.

The Complainant owns the television brand Love Island, a non-scripted reality television programme co-produced by the Complainant and WPP Motion Entertainment Group. Love Island was first broadcast in its current format in the United Kingdom in 2015, and as of June 2025, the series had been streamed 2 billion times. Beyond the United Kingdom, the Love Island brand has expanded into a global brand with over 20 international versions, including ‘Love Island USA’, which was first aired in 2019 and the seventh season airing in 2026. The sixth season generated 18.4 billion minutes of watch time over its six-week run and achieved the number one spot for most streamed television show, per the Nielsen report.

The Complainant is the owner of a number of trademark registrations for LOVE ISLAND (the “LOVE ISLAND trademark”), including the following representative registrations:

- the United Kingdom trademark LOVE ISLAND with registration No. 00002412536, registered on July 14, 2006 for goods and services in International Classes 9, 16, 38 and 41;
- the United States trademark LOVE ISLAND with registration No. 6166959, registered on October 6, 2020 for goods and services in International Classes 3, 9, 16, 18, 21, 24, 25, 28, 38 and 41; and
- the European Union trademark LOVE ISLAND with registration No. 018094312, registered on January 30, 2020 for goods and services in International Classes 3, 9, 16, 18, 21, 24, 25, 28, 38 and 41.

The Complainant also sells and licenses a range of Love Island-branded merchandise, including apparel, cosmetics, drinkware, and accessories through its e-commerce store located at the domain name <officialloveislandstore.com>, registered on June 10, 2020. Since 2017, the Complainant states it has made over GBP 20 million in sales of LOVE ISLAND branded merchandise internationally. The Complainant also owns the domain names <loveislandshop.com>, registered on September 4, 2017, <loveislandshop.us>, registered on July 18, 2018, and <loveislandshop.co.uk>, registered on June 12, 2017, etc.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 11, 2026. It is currently inactive. At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a web shop purportedly offering adult merchandise such as sex dolls. The website indicates contact details in Denver, Colorado, United States.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its LOVE ISLAND trademark and to its domain names <loveislandshop.com>, <loveislandshop.us>, and <loveislandshop.co.uk>, because “love island” is the main and distinctive part of the disputed domain name, while “network” is a dictionary word that is commonly used in the media and entertainment industry. According to the Complainant, rather than distinguishing the disputed domain name from the LOVE ISLAND trademark, the addition of “network” reinforces the false impression of an official affiliation with the Complainant.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, because it is not related to the Complainant and has not been authorised to use the Complainant's trademark.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent leverages the global recognition and high search volume of the LOVE ISLAND trademark to divert unsuspecting consumers to a website at the disputed domain name selling adult merchandise that is entirely unrelated to the Love Island franchise, for the Respondent's own commercial gain. Such use of the LOVE ISLAND trademark to promote the sale of sex dolls, without any authorisation or affiliation, is not a bona fide offering of goods and tarnishes the reputation of the Complainant and the Love Island brand by associating the brand with adult-themed products. The Complainant notes that, while the Respondent does not utilise the LOVE ISLAND trademark or the Complainant's copyrighted imagery within the website at the disputed domain name, the disputed domain name itself incorporates the Complainant's trademark in its entirety to serve as "bait" for Internet traffic.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. According to it, given the global fame of the LOVE ISLAND trademark, it is inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's rights at the time of registration, and the disputed domain name has been registered to take advantage of the Complainant's reputation and the goodwill of the LOVE ISLAND trademark. By incorporating the LOVE ISLAND trademark in the disputed domain name, the Respondent impersonates the Complainant and makes a deliberate attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the website at the disputed domain name by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's LOVE ISLAND trademark as to the source, sponsorship, or affiliation of the website at the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 the LOVE ISLAND trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the LOVE ISLAND trademark is recognisable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the LOVE ISLAND trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, "network") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such 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 recognised 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 disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the LOVE ISLAND trademark, which was first registered 20 years earlier and has achieved significant popularity in the United Kingdom and the United States as a result of the Complainant’s activities. In addition to the LOVE ISLAND television programme, the Complainant also offers LOVE ISLAND-branded merchandise online. The disputed domain name has been used for a website offering adult entertainment goods without the consent of the Complainant.

In view of the above, and taking into account that the Respondent has not provided any plausible explanation about the registration and use of the disputed domain name, the Panel accepts as more likely than not that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant and its LOVE ISLAND trademark in an attempt to exploit its goodwill for commercial gain for activities that may negatively affect the image of the Complainant. Such conduct does not give rise to rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel therefore finds that 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.

As discussed above in the section on rights and legitimate interests, the evidence in the case supports a conclusion that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant and its LOVE ISLAND trademark and has used it for a website offering adult entertainment goods without the consent of the Complainant. In the absence of any evidence pointing to a different conclusion, the Panel accepts that it is more likely than not that by registering and using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the associated website and the goods offered there by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s LOVE ISLAND trademark. This supports a finding of bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel therefore 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 name <loveisland-network.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Assen Alexiev/

Assen Alexiev

Sole Panelist

Date: September 10, 2026