

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Kasper Group LLC v. David Sokolov
Case No. D2026-3393

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Kasper Group LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Jesse Levitt, United States.

The Respondent is David Sokolov, Ukraine.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <le-suit.com> and <thelesuit.com> are registered with Dynadot, Inc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 30, 2026. On August 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On August 10, 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 Respondent (Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 11, 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 August 11, 2026.

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 25, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 14, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 15, 2026.

The Center appointed Steven A. Maier as the sole panelist in this matter on September 21, 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.

The Panel is satisfied that both the disputed domain names are registered by the same domain name holder, and that no issue of consolidation of proceedings therefore arises: Rules, paragraph 3(c).

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a supplier of women's clothing and apparel under the brand name and trademark LE SUIT.

The Complainant is the owner of United States trademark registration number 2190755 for the word mark LE SUIT, registered on September 22, 1998, in International Class 25, covering "women's clothing, namely, suits, dresses, blouses, shells, jackets, skirts, slacks, pants, sweaters, vests, scarves, and shirts".

The disputed domain name <le-suit.com> was registered on February 9, 2024. The disputed domain name <thelesuit.com> was registered on November 10, 2025.

The Complainant provides evidence that both of the disputed domain names have resolved to websites headed "LE SUIT", stating "We're Le Suit, A Women's Suit Manufacturer", and containing information about the Complainant, its business profile and its products.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant states that it has used its LE SUIT trademark in commerce since 1990, for the purpose of its business in the United States and around the world.

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 submits that both of the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its LE SUIT trademark. It states that both disputed domain names fully encompass that trademark, with the first including only an additional hyphen, and the second only the additional word "the".

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. It states that it has never licensed or authorized the Respondent to use its LE SUIT trademark, and that the Respondent is making neither bona fide commercial use nor legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith. It asserts, in particular, that the Respondent is intentionally misleading Internet users into believing that its websites are owned or operated by, or otherwise legitimately affiliated with, the Complainant, and that the websites operated by the Respondent offer counterfeit goods.

The Complainant contends, in the alternative, that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names with the intention of selling them to the Complainant for an inflated price.

The Complainant provides evidence of three “cease and desist” letters sent to the Respondent on, respectively, October 9, 2024, September 17, 2025, and July 22, 2026. It states that, after each of the first of these two letters was sent, the Respondent’s websites were taken down for a period of time, only subsequently to have reappeared.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In order to succeed in the Complaint, the Complainant is required to show that all three of the elements set out under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are present. Those elements are that:

- (i) the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and
- (iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

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 demonstrated that it is the owner of registered trademark rights in the mark LE SUIT. The disputed domain name <le-suit.com> comprises that mark in its entirety, with the addition of a hyphen between its two constituent words. The disputed domain name <thelesuit.com> comprises that mark in its entirety, prefixed by the dictionary word “the”. Neither of these additions prevents the Complainant’s trademark from being recognizable within the disputed domain names, which the Panel finds therefore to be confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark.

The first element under the Policy is therefore 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 Panel finds, moreover, as discussed in further detail below, that the Respondent has used the disputed domain names in a deceptive manner, dishonestly to represent its websites as being those of the Complainant. Deceptive conduct of this kind cannot give rise to rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names.

The Panel therefore finds that the second element under the Policy is established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

While the Complainant contends that the Respondent's websites have offered counterfeit versions of the Complainant's goods, this matter does not appear to be entirely straightforward. As far as the Panel can ascertain, no goods are offered directly for sale from the Respondent's websites, although clicking on links at various locations, e.g. "Check Price", will redirect to pages at Amazon.com, offering what appear to be the Complainant's goods. The Complainant is not clear as to whether these are the goods that are said to be counterfeit, and produces no additional evidence in this regard.

It is, however, apparent that the Respondent will most likely receive affiliate commissions from Amazon in respect of visitors originating from the Respondent's websites, and the website associated with the disputed domain name <thelesuit.com> expressly states that it is a participant in the relevant Amazon affiliate program.

It is clear from the evidence available to the Panel that the Respondent's websites operated at the disputed domain names are misleading, as falsely representing themselves to be websites owned or operated by, or otherwise legitimately affiliated with, the Complainant. The Panel finds in the circumstances that the Respondent both registered and has used the disputed domain names to take unfair commercial advantage of the Complainant's rights in its LE SUIT trademark, and is likely to have profited from those actions by way of affiliate commissions.

The Panel finds, therefore, that by using the disputed domain names, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its websites or of a product or service on its websites (paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy).

The Respondent's conduct in temporarily withdrawing its websites in response to the Complainant's "cease and desist" letters, only then to reinstate them, adds further support to the overall picture of the Respondent's bad faith conduct.

The third element under the Policy is therefore 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 names <le-suit.com> and <thelesuit.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Steven A. Maier/

Steven A. Maier

Sole Panelist

Date: September 28, 2026