

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Boll & Branch LLC v. 雷清云 (Qing Yun Lei)
Case No. D2026-3372

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Boll & Branch LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Keating Muething & Klekamp PLL, United States.

The Respondent is 雷清云 (Qing Yun Lei), China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <bollandbranchs.shop> is registered with West263 International Limited (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 29, 2026. On July 30, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 31, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 3, 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 3, 2026.

On August 3, 2026, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. On August 3, 2026, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant's submission.

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 in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceeding commenced on August 4, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 24, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 25, 2026.

The Center appointed Sebastian M.W. Hughes as the sole panelist in this matter on August 27, 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

A. Complainant

The Complainant is a company founded in 2014 and headquartered in the United States, carrying on business as a purveyor of high quality luxury bedding products and apparel under the trade mark BOLL & BRANCH (the "Trade Mark"), including via its website at "www.bollandbranch.com".

The Complainant is the owner of several registrations for the Trade Mark, including United States registration No. 4769218, with a registration date of July 7, 2015, and Canadian registration No. 1825287, with a registration date of June 11, 2018.

B. Respondent

According to the Registrar's verification, the Respondent is an individual located in China.

C. The Disputed Domain Name

The disputed domain name was registered on July 22, 2026.

D. Use of the Disputed Domain Name

The disputed domain name has previously been used in respect of an English language website styled as "Silver Birch Storage Solutions", prominently featuring the Trade Mark and the Complainant's marketing images, and purportedly offering similar products at discounted prices (the "Respondent's Website").

After the Complainant's takedown request and as of the date of this Decision, the disputed domain name no longer resolves to an active website.

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 the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith, under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's Trade Mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's Website or of a product or service on the Respondent's Website.

The Complainant contends further that, in all the circumstances, the Respondent's current non-use of the disputed domain name also supports a finding of bad faith.

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 for the disputed domain name 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 proceeding 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 Respondent's Website was in the English language.

The Respondent 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 of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[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 trade mark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Trade Mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name, save for the ampersand. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trade Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, the letter "s") 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 Trade Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8. The Panel also finds that the replacement of the ampersand with the term "and" in the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity as the Trade Mark remains recognizable in the disputed domain name.

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.

The Complainant has rights in the Trade Mark, established long before the registration of the disputed domain name. The Panel finds that the Respondent knew or should have known of the Complainant’s Trade Mark when registering the disputed domain name.

The Respondent’s registration and prior use of the disputed domain name in respect of the Respondent’s Website constitutes bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The fact that the disputed domain name no longer resolves to an active website does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the circumstances of this case.

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 name <bollandbranches.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Sebastian M.W. Hughes/

Sebastian M.W. Hughes

Sole Panelist

Date: September 3, 2026