

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Goop Inc. v. Pedro Rosa, Goop Brasil  
Case No. D2026-3262

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is Pedro Rosa, Goop Brasil, Brazil.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <goopbr.com> is registered with Squarespace Domains II LLC (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 22, 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 (Redacted for Privacy, Goop Brasil) 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 amended Complaint in English on August 5, 2026, and a further amended Complaint, also in English, on August 6, 2026.

On July 28, 2026, the Center informed the parties in Portuguese and English that the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain name is Portuguese. On August 5, 2026, the Complainant requested that English be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant's submission.

The Center verified that the Complaint, the amended Complaint, and the further 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, in English and Portuguese, the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 7, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 27, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 31, 2026.

The Center appointed Gonçalo M. C. Da Cunha Ferreira as the sole panelist in this matter on September 4, 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 lifestyle company founded in 2008 by actress and entrepreneur Gwyneth Paltrow and based in Santa Monica, California. It offers goods and services in the fields of beauty, wellness, fashion, home, food, travel, media, and retail, including cosmetics and skincare products, vitamins and dietary supplements, jewellery, clothing and accessories, home products, editorial content, podcasts, and television content. The Complainant opened its first physical retail location in Los Angeles, California, in 2017 and has since opened at least five additional physical retail locations.

The Complainant operates its official website at the domain name <goop.com>, through which it promotes and sells its products and services under the GOOP Trade mark. The evidence shows the GOOP Trade mark prominently displayed throughout the website in connection with the Complainant's online shop, GOOP BEAUTY product line, fashion and wellness offerings, editorial articles, newsletter, and podcast.

The Complainant is the owner of registrations and applications for the GOOP Trade mark, including the following:

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

United States Trade mark Registration No. 5232763 for GOOP (word mark), filed on June 8, 2012, and registered on June 27, 2017, in classes 3, 5, 14, 21 and 24; and

Brazilian Trade mark Applications Nos. 943198860 and 943199093 for GOOP (words plus design), filed on March 27, 2026, in classes 3 and 5, respectively, still pending examination by the Brazilian Trademark Office ("INPI").

The disputed domain name was registered on March 28, 2026, one day after the filing of the Brazilian Trade mark applications.

The publicly available registration data did not disclose the identity of the underlying registrant. In response to the Center's verification request, the Registrar disclosed the registrant as Pedro Rosa, organization "Goop Brasil", and an address in Osasco, São Paulo, Brazil.

According to the evidence submitted with the Complaint, dated May 29, 2026, the disputed domain name resolved to a landing page displaying "goopbr.com" and the statement "We're under construction. Check back soon for updates". The page contained no information about the Respondent, no description of any business, and no disclaimer of any lack of affiliation with the Complainant.

The disputed domain name was also configured with an Mail Exchange ("MX record") directed to Google's mail servers. The record contains no evidence that it has actually been used to send email.

## 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:

1. the Complainant is a global lifestyle company founded in 2008 by actress and entrepreneur Gwyneth Paltrow, offering a broad range of fashion, beauty, wellness, home, food, media, and retail goods and services;
2. the Complainant has used the GOOP Trade mark continuously for more than ten years, has extensively advertised and sold goods under that mark, and has acquired substantial recognition and goodwill in the United States and internationally;
3. the Complainant owns United States registrations for the GOOP Trade mark, including Registration Nos. 4946429 and 5232763, as well as applications filed in Brazil on March 27, 2026, and uses the mark prominently at its official domain name <goop.com>;
4. the GOOP Trade mark is the subject of incontestable United States registrations, which had become incontestable long before the registration of the disputed domain name and give rise to a legal presumption that the mark is conceptually strong;
5. the disputed domain name incorporates the GOOP Trade mark in its entirety. The addition of the letters "br", a commonly recognised geographical abbreviation for Brazil, reinforces the impression that the disputed domain name is intended for the Complainant's Brazilian consumers and does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is irrelevant to this assessment;
6. prior UDRP panels have found that the addition of other terms to the GOOP Trade mark did not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, including in *Goop Inc. v. Atilla Albayrak, WIPIT AB*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-0908](#), concerning <goopit.net>, and *Goop Inc. v. mmd ndrae*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-0687](#), concerning <goopcareers.com>;
7. the Complainant has not licensed, authorised, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to register or use the GOOP Trade mark, and the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has never had any business relationship with it;
8. the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name ;
9. the Complainant's searches identified no bona fide entity operating under the name "Goop Brasil". The use of that designation in the registration data instead creates a false impression that the Respondent is affiliated with or authorised by the Complainant;
10. publicly available information indicates that the Respondent is an advertising creative director, while the registrant email address appears to be associated with a Brazilian company engaged in the retail sale of cosmetics, perfumery, and personal hygiene products, which are similar to products offered under the GOOP Trade Mark;
11. the disputed domain name resolves only to an "under construction" landing page and is not being used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services;
12. the disputed domain name was registered long after the Complainant acquired rights in the GOOP Trade Mark and only one day after the Complainant filed applications for GOOP marks in Brazil, which demonstrates that the Respondent was aware of and targeted the Complainant and its Trade Mark;

13. the composition of the disputed domain name, combining the GOOP Trade Mark with “br”, together with the registrant organisation “Goop Brasil”, falsely suggests that the disputed domain name is owned, operated, sponsored, or authorised by the Complainant;

14. the Respondent registered the disputed domain name to capture customers of the Complainant seeking information on, and options to purchase, its products, thereby intentionally attempting to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the GOOP Trade Mark, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy;

15. the composition of the disputed domain name, combining the English-language term “goop” with an abbreviation for Brazil commonly used in English, together with the Respondent’s apparent proficiency in English, shows that the Respondent targets English-speaking consumers familiar with the Complainant and its GOOP Trade Mark;

16. the Respondent’s passive holding of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith in the circumstances, having regard to the recognition and distinctiveness of the GOOP Trade Mark,;

17. the Respondent used a privacy service when registering the disputed domain name, which, when considered together with the other circumstances of the case, supports an inference that the Respondent sought to conceal its identity and frustrate enforcement of the Complainant’s rights;

18. the disputed domain name has been configured with MX records, enabling it to be used for email communications which would carry a high risk of falsely implying an affiliation with the Complainant, even though the Complainant is not required to establish that deceptive emails have actually been sent; and

19. the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name intentionally to take unfair advantage of the Complainant’s GOOP Trade Mark and to create a likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement, which constitutes registration and use in bad faith under the Policy.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **Language of the Proceeding**

The language of the Registration Agreement is Portuguese. The Complaint and amended Complaint were filed in English. The Complainant requests that English be the language of the proceeding.

Pursuant to paragraph 11(a) of the Rules, unless otherwise agreed by the Parties, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the Registration Agreement, subject to the authority of the Panel to determine otherwise. Paragraphs 10(b) and 10(c) of the Rules require the Panel to ensure that the Parties are treated with equality, that each Party is given a fair opportunity to present its case, and that the proceeding takes place with due expedition. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions ([“WIPO Overview 3.1”](#)), section 4.5.1.

The Complainant has submitted evidence that an apparent professional profile and website of the Respondent are presented in English and refer to the individual concerned as Brazilian and British, with professional experience in the United Kingdom.

The Center sent email communications to the Respondent in both English and Portuguese, expressly allowed the Respondent to file a Response in either language, and invited the Respondent to comment on the Complainant's language request. The Respondent did not object to the Complainant's language request and did not submit a Response. Requiring a Portuguese translation of the Complaint at this stage would create additional expense and delay.

Having regard to these circumstances and the requirement of procedural fairness, 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 Trade mark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the GOOP Trade mark for the purposes of the Policy through its Trade Mark registrations. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name incorporates the GOOP Trade mark in its entirety, followed by the geographical abbreviation "br". The GOOP Trade mark remains clearly recognisable within the disputed domain name. The addition of a geographical term or abbreviation does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity where the mark remains recognisable. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

The gTLD ".com" is a standard registration requirement and, as such, is typically disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the first element of the Policy has been established.

#### **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a non-exhaustive list of circumstances in which a 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. 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 that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant has stated that it has not authorized the Respondent to use the GOOP Trade mark and that there is no relationship between the Parties. The disputed domain name resolved only to an "under construction" landing page. There is no evidence of use, or demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name, in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor of legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

Although the Registrar's disclosed registration data lists the organization "Goop Brasil", the record contains no evidence that the Respondent operated a bona fide business under that name or was otherwise commonly known by the disputed domain name before notice of the dispute. In the circumstances, the mere inclusion of "Goop Brasil" in the registration data does not establish rights or legitimate interests, particularly as that designation reproduces the Complainant's Trade mark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.3. The Panel further notes that the composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation and thus, prevents a finding of rights or legitimate interests for the Respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

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.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the second element of the Policy has been established.

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out non-exhaustive circumstances that evidence registration and use of a domain name in bad faith. A complainant may also establish bad faith through other evidence showing that a respondent seeks to take unfair advantage of, abuse, or otherwise engage in conduct detrimental to the complainant's Trade mark.

The Complainant's registered GOOP Trade mark predates the registration of the disputed domain name by approximately a decade. The disputed domain name combines the Trade mark in its entirety with "br", an abbreviation for Brazil, and the Respondent provided "Goop Brasil" as its organization in the registration data. These circumstances make it implausible to the Panel that the Respondent selected the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant and its Trade mark.

The timing of the registration provides further corroboration. The disputed domain name was registered on March 28, 2026, one day after the Complainant filed applications for GOOP marks in Brazil. Considered together with the composition of the disputed domain name and the registrant organization supplied by the Respondent, the timing supports the inference that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name to target the Complainant's Trade mark.

The disputed domain name has been passively held through an "under construction" page. Passive holding does not prevent a finding of bad faith. Relevant considerations include the distinctiveness and reputation of the mark, the respondent's failure to provide evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, concealment or inaccurate contact details, and the overall plausibility of a good-faith use of the disputed domain name. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3; *Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0003](#).

Here, the GOOP Trade mark is distinctive; the disputed domain name reproduces it in full with a geographical abbreviation that suggests a Brazilian presence of the Complainant; the Respondent identified its organization as "Goop Brasil"; and the Respondent has not participated in these proceedings and so has provided no explanation or evidence of any contemplated good-faith use. The Panel cannot identify any plausible good-faith use of the disputed domain name in these circumstances.

The disputed domain name is also configured with an MX record. The existence of an MX record does not by itself establish that the Respondent has sent deceptive emails. However, in the circumstances of this case, the email capability creates a material risk that communications sent from the disputed domain name could be perceived as having an affiliation with the Complainant and therefore provides additional corroboration of bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Panel finds 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 <goopbr.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Gonçalo M. C. Da Cunha Ferreira/*

**Gonçalo M. C. Da Cunha Ferreira**

Sole Panelist

Date: September 22, 2026