

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Naked Whey, Inc. v. He Guiqiang
Case No. D2026-3440

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Naked Whey, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Stoel Rives, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is He Guiqiang, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <nakednutritions.fit> is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 3, 2026. On August 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 5, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that 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 19, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 8, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 18, 2026.

The Center appointed Edoardo Fano as the sole panelist in this matter on September 23, 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 has not received any requests from the Complainant or the Respondent regarding further submissions, waivers or extensions of deadlines, and the Panel has not found it necessary to request any further information from the Parties.

Having reviewed the communication records in the case file provided by the Center, the Panel finds that the Center has discharged its responsibility under the Rules, paragraph 2(a), “to employ reasonably available means calculated to achieve actual notice to [the] Respondent”. Therefore, the Panel shall issue its Decision based upon the Complaint, the Policy, the Rules and the Supplemental Rules and without the benefit of a response from the Respondent.

The language of the proceedings is English, being the language of the Registration Agreement, as per paragraph 11(a) of the Rules.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a United States company operating in the field of nutritional and dietary supplements, and owning several trademark registrations for NAKED and/or including NAKED, like NAKED NUTRITION, among which:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 5,900,057 for NAKED, registered on November 5, 2019;
- United States Trademark Registration No. 5,304,095 for NAKED NUTRITION, registered on October 10, 2017;
- Honk Kong, China Trademark Registration No. 305098690 for NAKED NUTRITION, registered on October 30, 2019;

The Complainant also operates on the Internet, its official website being “www.nakednutrition.com”.

The Complainant provided evidence in support of the above.

According to the Whois records, the disputed domain name was registered on May 19, 2026, and it is currently inactive. However, when the Complaint was filed, the disputed domain name resolved to a website in which the Complainant’s trademark NAKED was reproduced using the same typography as the Complainant’s, together with substantial elements of the Complainant’s official website, and purportedly offering for sale the Complainant’s products.

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 states that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark NAKED NUTRITION.

Moreover, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, since it has not been authorized by the Complainant to register the disputed domain name or to use its trademark within the disputed domain name, it is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and it is not making either a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name is used to impersonate the Complainant.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in bad faith, since the Complainant's trademarks NAKED and/or including NAKED, like NAKED NUTRITION, are known in the field of nutritional and dietary supplements. Therefore, the Respondent targeted the Complainant's trademark NAKED NUTRITION at the time of registration of the disputed domain name and the Complainant contends that the use of the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant and thereby fraudulently deceive consumers, attempting to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark, qualifies as bad faith registration and use.

B. Respondent

The Respondent has made no reply to the Complainant's contentions and is in default. In reference to paragraphs 5(f) and 14 of the Rules, no exceptional circumstances explaining the default have been put forward or are apparent from the record.

A respondent is not obliged to participate in a proceeding under the Policy, but if it fails to do so, reasonable facts asserted by a complainant may be taken as true, and appropriate inferences, in accordance with paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, may be drawn. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.3.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists three elements, which the Complainant must satisfy in order to succeed:

- (i) the disputed domain name is 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 name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is 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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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.

The Panel finds that the Complainant's trademark NAKED NUTRITION is recognizable 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. The addition of the letter "s" at the end of the disputed domain name could be seen as a typo. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9.

It is also well-accepted that a generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD"), in this case ".fit", is typically ignored when assessing the similarity between a trademark and a domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Based on the available record, 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.

While 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 often impossible 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.

The Complainant in its Complaint, and as set out above, has established a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. It asserts that the Respondent, who is not associated with the Complainant in any way, is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The prima facie case presented by the Complainant is enough to shift the burden of production to the Respondent to demonstrate that it has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. However, the Respondent has not presented any evidence of any rights or legitimate interests it may have in the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name resolved to a website in which the Complainant’s trademark NAKED was reproduced using the same typography as the Complainant’s, together with substantial elements of the Complainant’s official website, and purportedly offering for sale the Complainant’s products.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here impersonation/passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel therefore concludes that the disputed domain name is not being used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Based on the available record, 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.

In the present case, noting the use to which the disputed domain name had been put, the Panel finds that the Respondent must have known of the Complainant, and deliberately registered the disputed domain name in bad faith, especially because the disputed domain name resolved to a website in which the Complainant’s trademark NAKED was reproduced using the same typography as the Complainant’s, together with substantial elements of the Complainant’s official website, and purportedly offering for sale the Complainant’s products.

As regards the use in bad faith of the disputed domain name, the Panel notes that the Respondent was trying to attract Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark as to the website’s source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement, an activity clearly detrimental to the Complainant’s business.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here impersonation/passing off, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

The above suggests to the Panel that the Respondent registered and was using the disputed domain name in order both to disrupt the Complainant’s business and to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website in accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

As regards the current use of the disputed domain name, being inactive, panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or “coming soon” page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the record, the Panel notes the reputation of the Complainant’s trademarks in the field of nutritional and dietary supplements, the nature of the disputed domain name (being a typo of the Complainant’s trademark NAKED NUTRITION as well as its domain name, by adding the letter “s” at the end), the Respondent’s previous use of the disputed domain name, and the failure of the Respondent to submit a response, and finds that in the circumstances of this case, the current passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under 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.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 <nakednutritions.fit> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Edoardo Fano/

Edoardo Fano

Sole Panelist

Date: September 25, 2026