

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Magnificent Baby L.L.C., d/b/a Magnetic Me, Arisam LLC v. Danica Barron
Case No. D2026-3508

1. The Parties

Complainants are Magnificent Baby L.L.C., d/b/a Magnetic Me, and Arisam LLC, United States of America (or “U.S.”), represented by Wolf, Greenfield & Sacks, P.C., United States of America.

Respondent is Danica Barron, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <magneticmeboutique.shop> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 7, 2026. On August 7, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On August 11, 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, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on the same day, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 12, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 1, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on September 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Douglas M. Isenberg as the sole panelist in this matter on September 14, 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 Complaint states that Complainants, Magnificent Baby L.L.C. and Arisam LLC, “are related entities at least by the fact that Arisam LLC has licensed the marks at issue in this Complaint to Magnificent Baby L.L.C. and Magnificent Baby L.L.C. has used those marks in commerce”. Therefore, references herein to “Complainant” shall be deemed to include either or both entities, as the context may allow or require.¹

Complainant states that it “offers MAGNETIC ME-branded children’s and infant’s apparel, featuring patented magnetic fasteners, through its website at <magneticme.com>”.

Complainant states, and provides documentation in support thereof, that it is the owner of U.S. Reg. No. 5,272,749 for MAGNETIC ME (registered August 22, 2017) for use in connection with “children’s and infant’s apparel, namely, jumpers, overall sleepwear, pajamas, rompers and one-piece garments; infant wear; Infants’ trousers; one piece garment for infants and toddlers” (the “MAGNETIC ME Trademark”).

Complainant states, and provides documentation in support thereof, that it is the owner of U.S. Reg. No. 5,884,437 for MM (registered October 15, 2019) for use in connection with “children’s and infant’s apparel, namely, jumpers, overall sleepwear, pajamas, rompers and one-piece garments; infant wear; infants’ trousers; one piece garment for infants and toddlers” (the “MM Trademark”).

The Disputed Domain Name was created on May 19, 2026, and, as stated in the Complaint, “utilizes Complainant’s MAGNETIC ME marks and reinforces a false connection or association with Complainant by featuring Complainant’s word mark, stylized logo, product names, product descriptions, and copyrighted product photographs throughout the website resolving from the Domain Name, which is largely a wholesale copy of Complainant’s legitimate website at <magneticme.com>. The website even lists Complainant’s own customer-service email address, [redacted]@magneticme.com, as its contact address, and purports to offer Complainant’s genuine products at steep discounts, likely in order to steal or ‘phish’ personally identifiable information and other confidential information such as credit card information from confused consumers”.

Complainant states that it sent a demand letter on July 15, 2026, to the “apparent hosting provider” for the website associated with the Disputed Domain Name, but “[n]o response was received.”

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Disputed Domain Name. Notably, Complainant contends, in relevant part, that:

- The Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to the MAGNETIC ME Trademark

¹ Given the legal relationship between Magnificent Baby L.L.C. and Arisam LLC, it is appropriate for both of these entities to participate in this Complaint. As set forth in WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), section 1.4: “A trademark owner’s affiliate such as a subsidiary of a parent or of a holding company, or an exclusive trademark licensee, is considered to have rights in a trademark under the UDRP for purposes of standing to file a complaint. The same holds true for a parent company filing a UDRP case on the basis of rights held in the name of one of the companies or brands under its corporate umbrella.” As a result, “[t]he majority of UDRP panels have accepted complaints filed by multiple complainants”. *Diler Demir Çelik Endüstri Ve Ticaret Anonim Şirketi, Diler Yatırım Bankası Anonim Şirketi v. Dr. Mehmet Kahveci*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-0060](#).

because the Disputed Domain Name incorporates the MAGNETIC ME Trademark “in its entirety” and “[t]he addition of the descriptive term ‘boutique’ does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity” and “[i]f anything, the term ‘boutique’ exacerbates the likelihood of confusion, as it falsely suggests to consumers that the Domain Name is an official online retail store operated by or affiliated with Magnetic Me”.

- Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name because “Respondent is not associated with or authorized by Magnetic Me”; “Respondent is not a licensee of Complainant’s marks, and Complainant has never authorized Respondent to use the MAGNETIC ME marks or to sell its goods”; “Respondent has not been commonly known by the mark MAGNETIC ME or by the Domain Name”; and “Respondent has used the Domain Name to impersonate Complainant”, which “can never give rise to rights or legitimate interests.”
- The Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith because “[t]he website resolving from the Domain Name... is a wholesale copy of Magnetic Me’s legitimate website, used for the purpose of impersonating Magnetic Me and deceiving Magnetic Me’s customers”, which creates a likelihood of confusion.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant’s contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Based upon the trademark registrations cited by Complainant, it is apparent that Complainant has rights in and to the MAGNETIC ME Trademark.

As to whether the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to the MAGNETIC ME Trademark, the relevant comparison to be made is with the second-level portion of the Disputed Domain Name only (i.e., “magneticmeboutique”) because “[t]he applicable Top Level Domain (‘TLD’) in a domain name (e.g., ‘.com’, ‘.club’, ‘.nyc’) is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test”. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

As set forth in section 1.7 of [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), “in cases where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark,... the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark”. Further, as set forth in section 1.8 of [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), “[w]here the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element”. Here, the Disputed Domain Name contains the entirety of the MAGNETIC ME Trademark, and the addition of the word “boutique” does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Complainant has argued that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name because, inter alia, “Respondent is not associated with or authorized by Magnetic Me”; “Respondent is not a licensee of Complainant’s marks, and Complainant has never authorized Respondent to use the MAGNETIC ME marks or to sell its goods”; “Respondent has not been commonly known by the mark MAGNETIC ME or by the Domain Name”; and “Respondent has used the Domain Name to impersonate Complainant”, which “can never give rise to rights or legitimate interests”.

[WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1, states: “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 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.”

The Panel finds that Complainant has established its prima facie case and without any evidence from Respondent to the contrary, the Panel is satisfied that Complainant has satisfied the second element of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Whether a domain name is registered and used in bad faith for purposes of the Policy may be determined by evaluating four (non-exhaustive) factors set forth in the Policy: (i) circumstances indicating that the registrant has registered or acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the registrant’s documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or (ii) the registrant has registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the registrant has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or (iii) the registrant has registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or (iv) by using the domain name, the registrant has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the registrant’s website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the registrant’s website or location or of a product or service on the registrant’s website or location. Policy, paragraph 4(b).

Here, Complainant specifically argues that bad faith exists pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy because the website using the Disputed Domain Name “is a wholesale copy of Magnetic Me’s legitimate website”. Documents submitted with the Complaint support this assertion. For example, Respondent’s website uses the same stylized version of the MAGNETIC ME Trademark that appears on Complainant’s website, as well as images that also appear on Complainant’s website. Respondent’s website also includes a copyright notice that says, “© 2026 Magnetic Me. All rights reserved”.

As numerous decisions under the Policy have made clear, creating a website that appears to be a website for a complainant, as Respondent has done in the instant case, is “likely fraudulent” and “indicates an intent to deceive or, at a minimum, act in bad faith with the intent for commercial gain”. *DocuSign, Inc. v. Traffic CPMIPV, Maria Carter*, WIPO Case No. [D2010-0344](#). See also, e.g., *Emu (Aus) Pty Ltd. and Emu Ridge Holdings Pty Ltd. v. Antonia Deinert*, WIPO Case No. [D2010-1390](#) (“a reasonable person who visited the Respondent’s website was likely to be misled in relation to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and the products purportedly made available for online sale on the website”).

The Panel finds that 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 <magneticmeboutique.shop> be transferred to Complainant.

/Douglas M. Isenberg/

Douglas M. Isenberg

Sole Panelist

Date: September 24, 2026