

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Maneuver Marketing Pte. Ltd. v. yerba magic
Case No. D2026-3572

1. The Parties

1.1 The Complainant is Maneuver Marketing Pte. Ltd., Singapore, represented by Polsinelli, United States of America ("United States").

1.2 The Respondent is yerba magic, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

2.1 The disputed domain name <radiiancy.com> (the "Domain Name") is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

3.1 The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 11, 2026. At that time, publicly available Whois details did not identify the underlying registrant of the Domain Name.

3.2 On August 12, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On August 13, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing underlying registrant and contact information for the Domain Name. The Center sent an email to the Complainant on August 13, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. By email dated August 19, 2026, the Complainant confirmed that it wished to add the registrar-disclosed registrant information to the Complaint and did not intend to make any further substantive amendment. The Center treated the Complaint as amended accordingly.

3.3 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").

3.4 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 9, 2026.

3.5 The Center appointed Matthew S. Harris as the sole panelist in this matter on September 10, 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

4.1 The Complainant is a private limited company incorporated in Singapore. It trades in the health and nutrition sector, marketing and selling dietary and nutritional supplements under and by reference to a house mark, BB COMPANY, including via a website operating from the domain name <thebbco.com>.

4.2 Since around April 2020, the Complainant has marketed a vaginal probiotic supplement under the name "Radiancy" (the "Radiancy Product"). The Radiancy Product is promoted and sold from the Complainant's own website, from an Amazon.com listing, and from social media accounts operated by the Complainant on Instagram and TikTok. The Panel notes, from the material exhibited to the Complaint and from its own review of that material, that as of early August 2026 the Amazon listing for the Radiancy Product had attracted in excess of 1,500 customer ratings and that the Complainant's Instagram account had in excess of 90,000 followers.

4.3 The Complainant is also the owner of United States registered trademark No. 7709202 for BB COMPANY, filed on April 19, 2024, and registered on March 4, 2025, covering, among other things, online retail store services featuring nutritional and dietary supplements and probiotic supplements. The Complainant does not, however, claim any registered trademark for the term "radiancy" itself, relying instead on unregistered or common law rights in that term.

4.4 The Domain Name was registered on April 22, 2026, some six years after the Complainant began marketing the Radiancy Product. The Domain Name was thereafter used for a website that promoted and offered for sale a "vaginal probiotic" product under the name "Radiancy™". That website adopted a similar layout, colour scheme, and product photography to the Complainant's own website, and reproduced marketing claims and language closely resembling those used by the Complainant in the promotion of the Radiancy Product.

4.5 In or around June 2026, a person acting on behalf of the Complainant made a test purchase of the product offered from the website operating from the Domain Name. The product received bore the name "RADIANCY" and the Complainant's own "bb company" house mark and logo. The product label also stated that the product was "Manufactured For: BB Company™" at an address corresponding to the Complainant's own address in Las Vegas, Nevada, and directed purchasers to the Complainant's own website.

4.6 The registrant of the Domain Name uses the name "yerba magic", and, according to the registrant information disclosed by the Registrar, gives an address in Homer, Alaska, United States, an email address with a free email provider, and a telephone number that contains only nine digits after the country code, and which consists of a single repeated digit.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

5.1 The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Name.

5.2 The Complainant contends that it has common law rights in the term RADIANCY by reason of its use of that term as a product name since April 2020, and that the Domain Name, which reproduces that term with the addition of a single letter "i", is a classic example of typosquatting and is accordingly confusingly similar to its mark.

5.3 The Complainant contends that, on inspection of the product obtained through the test purchase referred to in section 4.5 above, it identified small but material differences from its genuine product, and that the product received was accordingly a counterfeit.

5.4 The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name, is not commonly known by the Domain Name, is not licensed or authorised by the Complainant, and has used the Domain Name only to trade on the Complainant's goodwill by selling counterfeit products bearing the Complainant's own branding.

5.5 The Complainant further contends that the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith, in that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website and the products sold from it, contrary to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

6.1 It is generally 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 Domain Name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 1.7.

6.2 The Complainant does not claim a registered trade mark for the term "radiancy", relying instead on unregistered or common law rights in that term. Unregistered rights of this sort are sufficient to satisfy the first element where a complainant demonstrates that the claimed mark has become a distinctive identifier associated with it or its goods or services (see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.3). The Panel is satisfied on the evidence before it that the Complainant has used the term RADIANCY continuously since 2020 as the name of a specific product, and that this use, together with the scale of the Complainant's sales, advertising and consumer engagement in respect of that product (including several thousand consumer reviews and ratings and tens of thousands of social media followers), is sufficient to have generated the necessary distinctiveness and association with the Complainant for the purposes of the Policy. In this respect the Panel also notes that the Complainant is based in Singapore, which is a territory that recognises the existence of unregistered trade mark rights in the form of rights under the law of passing off.

6.3 The Panel's conclusion that the Complainant holds the necessary unregistered rights is reinforced by the manner in which the Respondent has used the Domain Name. As discussed later on in this decision, the website operating from the Domain Name did not merely adopt a similar-sounding term, but specifically impersonated the Complainant, reproducing its house mark, product name, marketing language and imagery. Such deliberate and detailed targeting of the Complainant and its RADIANCY product would make little sense unless that name already possessed the kind of recognition capable of being exploited in this way.

6.4 The Domain Name reproduces the RADIANCY mark in its entirety, save for the insertion of an additional letter "i" immediately after the letter "d" (i.e., "radi" + "i" + "ancy"). This is a minor misspelling of a kind that leaves the RADIANCY mark clearly recognisable within the Domain Name and constitutes a classic example of typosquatting (see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9).

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

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests, and Registered and Used in Bad Faith

6.6 It is usual for panels under the Policy to consider the issues of rights or legitimate interests, and registration and use in bad faith, in turn. However, in this case it is more convenient to consider those issues together (see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.15).

6.7 The reason for this is that the Complainant's case is, in substance, that the Domain Name was registered and has been used to sell counterfeit goods from a website that impersonates the Complainant. A respondent engaging in such activities has no right or legitimate interest in a domain name, and such activities are positive evidence that no such right or legitimate interest exists (see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13). Further, the registration and use of such a domain name is registration and use in bad faith, falling within the scope of circumstances evidencing bad faith set out in paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

6.8 The Panel accepts the Complainant's contentions in this respect. Panels are rightly cautious about accepting allegations of counterfeiting that are merely conclusory or unsupported (see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.2). However, the Complainant has provided evidence of an actual test purchase made from the website operating from the Domain Name. The product supplied was represented as a genuine product of the Complainant: it bore the RADIANCY mark and the Complainant's own "bb company" house mark and logo, together with a label stating that it had been "Manufactured For: BB Company™" at an address corresponding to the Complainant's own address. But when the product was examined, it displayed small but material differences from the Complainant's genuine product. The Panel, therefore, accepts that un rebutted evidence and finds that the product supplied was counterfeit.

6.9 Further, the website operating from the Domain Name also adopted a colour scheme, layout, and product photography and marketing language similar to that used by the Complainant in the promotion of its own Radiancy Product, and used the term "Radiancy™" throughout as if it were the Respondent's own brand. The Panel accepts that the website is likely to be understood by Internet users as a website operated or authorised by the Complainant when it is not, and that this is a case of deliberate impersonation on the part of the Respondent.

6.10 The Panel's conclusions in this respect are reinforced by the use of a contact name which is unlikely to be the real name of any individual, and the contact telephone number provided. In the case of the telephone number, it is one digit short of the ten digits required for a valid North American number and consists of a single repeated digit, which is clearly not a genuine, functioning contact number. The provision of invalid contact details of this kind is a further indication of bad faith.

6.11 The Panel, therefore, finds that each of the second and third elements of the Policy have been established.

7. Decision

7.1 For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the Domain Name <radiiancy.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Matthew S. Harris/

Matthew S. Harris

Sole Panelist

Date: September 11, 2026