

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

E2INTERACTIVE, INC. v. antoniovaleriano, antoniovaleriano
Case No. D2026-3547

1. The Parties

The Complainant is E2INTERACTIVE, INC., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Bates & Bates, LLC, United States.

The Respondent is antoniovaleriano, antoniovaleriano, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <vanillaprepaidca.com> is registered with Dominet (HK) Limited (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 10, 2026. On August 11, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 12, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 16, 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 on August 18, 2026.

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 of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 20, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 9, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 12, 2026.

The Center appointed Kathryn Lee as the sole panelist in this matter on September 18, 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 provides prepaid debit and stored-value card services under the VANILLA brand, with use dating back to 2005. The Complainant, in cooperation with its affiliate, Interactive Communications International, Inc., offers its products and services through websites at the domain names <vanillaprepaid.com>, <vanillagift.com>, <myvanillagiftcard.com>, <myvanillacard.com>, and <myvanillabalance.com>. The domain name <vanillaprepaid.com> was created on February 18, 2011.

The Complainant owns trademark registrations for the VANILLA mark, including International Registration No. 1270960, registered on January 19, 2015, and United States Registration No. 4,907,289, registered on March 1, 2016. The Complainant also owns registrations for stylized VANILLA marks and VANILLA-formative marks.

The Respondent appears to be an individual with an address in the United States.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 26, 2026. It previously resolved to a purported informational website providing guides concerning VANILLA prepaid cards. The website displayed the Complainant's stylized VANILLA mark and the notice "Vanilla Prepaid Gift Card Balance @2026." According to the Complainant, a "Check your balance" link did not enable users to check their card balances, while a "Read the full guide" link directed users to a contact section advertising services. Other pages contained template content, contact details alleged to be fictitious, and stock photographs presented as members of the website operator's leadership team.

At the time the Complaint was filed, the disputed domain name redirected to <manageyourgifts95.net>. A screenshot submitted with the Complaint shows a Chrome security warning headed "Dangerous site," advising that attackers might trick visitors into installing software or revealing passwords, telephone numbers, or credit card numbers.

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 disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark in which the Complainant has rights since the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's VANILLA mark in its entirety, only adding the terms "prepaid" and "ca".

The Complainant also contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and that the Respondent has not been authorized to use the Complainant's mark and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent's purported informational website falsely suggested affiliation, sponsorship, or endorsement by the Complainant and therefore extended beyond fair use.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is used in bad faith. The Complainant contends that its VANILLA mark is well known and that the disputed domain name is nearly identical to its legitimate domain name, <vanillaprepaid.com>. Therefore, the Complainant contends, the Respondent knew or should have known of the Complainant's trademark rights, and that it registered the disputed domain name intending to exploit the recognition and reputation associated with the mark. The Complainant also contends that the Respondent concealed its identity and used the disputed domain name in a manner falsely suggesting affiliation, sponsorship, or endorsement by the Complainant, potentially as part of a phishing scheme.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 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 entirety of the mark is reproduced 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.

Although the addition of other terms – here, “prepaid” and “ca” – may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

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 Respondent has not been authorized to use the Complainant's VANILLA mark, and there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name previously resolved to a purported informational website displaying the Complainant's stylized VANILLA mark and offering a nonfunctional “Check your balance” link. In the circumstances, the website misleadingly suggested affiliation with the Complainant and did not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or legitimate noncommercial or fair use. The subsequent redirection to a website that triggered a browser security warning further supports the Complainant's prima facie case.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, such as phishing or distributing malware, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1. Here, the Complainant alleges that the disputed domain name was potentially used for phishing. The Panel need not determine whether phishing actually occurred, as the misleading use described above is sufficient to support its finding under this element.

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, the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's VANILLA mark in its entirety, together with the terms "prepaid" and "ca", and closely resembles the Complainant's <vanillaprepaid.com> domain name. The disputed domain name was registered long after the Complainant's trademark rights arose. Its composition, together with the website's display of the Complainant's stylized VANILLA mark and content specifically concerning the Complainant's prepaid cards, demonstrates that the Respondent knew of the Complainant and its mark when registering the disputed domain name and targeted the Complainant.

The Respondent used the disputed domain name for a website that misleadingly suggested affiliation with the Complainant, offered a nonfunctional "Check your balance" link, and directed users through a "Read the full guide" link to a contact section advertising services. These circumstances support a finding that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website.

The disputed domain name subsequently redirected to a website that triggered a browser security warning concerning possible theft of sensitive information or installation of harmful software. While this warning does not by itself establish that phishing or malware distribution occurred, it further supports the finding of bad faith in 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 <vanillaprepaidca.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Kathryn Lee/

Kathryn Lee

Sole Panelist

Date: October 6, 2026