

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

The Village Company, LLC v. Nikck Walker
Case No. D2026-3573

1. The Parties

The Complainant is The Village Company, LLC, United States of America ("U.S"), represented by Fredrikson & Byron, P.A., United States of America.

The Respondent is Nikck Walker, U.S.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <mrbubblestore.com> 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 12, 2026. On August 12, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 13, 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 ("John Doe") and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 17, 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 17, 2026, withdrawing one domain name from the Complaint.

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 11, 2026.

The Center appointed R. Eric Gaum as the sole panelist in this matter on September 16, 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

Complainant is the owner of the following registered and pending trademarks for MR. BUBBLE (the “Mr. Bubble Trademarks”):

Mark	U.S. Reg. No. or Serial No.	Reg. Date.	Goods/Services
MR. BUBBLE	761076	Dec. 3, 1963	Powdered Detergent Used as a Bubble Bath Preparation
MR. BUBBLE	2338710	Apr. 4, 2000	Bubble bath, skin soap
MR. BUBBLE	2740656	Jul. 22, 2003	Body soap wash
MR. BUBBLE	2978733	Jul. 26, 2005	Liquid skin soap
MR. BUBBLE	5032342	Aug. 30, 2016	Toys, namely, toy figures, dolls, plush toys, bath toys, pet toys, bubble blowing toys, water toys, board games
MR. BUBBLE	99136342	Pending	Skin soap; Body scrub; Body lotion; Body cream soap; Bath bombs; Shower bombs; Non-medicated bath salts; Bubble bath; Non-medicated skin care preparation, namely, body mist; Lip balm; Skin moisturizer; Body wash; Hair shampoo; Hair conditioner; Non-medicated hand soaps; Bath fizzies; Bath melts; Non-medicated bath preparations

The disputed domain name was first registered on March 4, 2026. According to the Complainant, the Respondent is using the Complainant’s trademarks and other intellectual property such as copyrighted product images throughout its website at the disputed domain name to intentionally create a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of Respondent. The website at the disputed domain name featured links to a third party website where the Complainant’s products could be purchased. The disputed domain name does not currently resolve to a website.

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 the following:

Respondent’s domain name includes the entirety of Complainant’s trademark. The addition of the generic word “store” at the end of Complainant’s trademark does not lessen the confusing similarity. It is likely that consumers would believe that the disputed domain is associated with Complainant and the famous Mr. Bubble brand.

Respondent should be considered as having no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the contested domain name. More than 60 years after Complainant, via its predecessors, established rights to the Mr. Bubble Trademarks, Respondent registered a domain name that is confusingly similar to Complainant's domain and trademarked name. Respondent was clearly aware of Complainant's rights to the Mr. Bubble Trademarks when it registered its domain name.

Respondent is not using its website for a bona fide offering of goods or services. Instead, Respondent is using its website and the disputed domain to attempt to impersonate or pass off as the Complainant.

The disputed domain name promotes or suggests a connection or relationship between Respondent and Complainant where none exists. The domain name consists of Complainant's trademark plus an additional generic term—store—which strongly suggests sponsorship or endorsement by Complainant.

Complainant has never authorized Respondent to register or use the disputed domain name or to provide any goods or services for Complainant. There is no connection or relationship of any kind or nature between Complainant and Respondent.

Respondent is using Complainant's mark in its domain name as a principal identifier of its website. By using the domain name, and creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract visitors to its website for commercial gain.

Respondent uses Complainant's trademarks and other intellectual property throughout the disputed website, falsely claiming to be affiliated with Complainant and the Mr. Bubble brand. Upon information and belief, Respondent has set up the disputed domain and copied Complainant's official product images, logos, and descriptions so Respondent's website looks like an authorized manufacturer website.

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 the term "store" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term 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 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 Panel notes that the Respondent used the Complainant’s trademarks, logos, and other intellectual property throughout its website at the disputed domain name, falsely claiming to be affiliated with the Complainant and the Mr. Bubble brand. The Respondent clearly knew of and copied the Complainant’s official product images, logos, and descriptions to make its website at least appear to be authorized by Complainant.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent’s registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate and/or illegal activity here, claimed copycat sites, passing off, or other types of fraud constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute bad faith under the Policy.

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 <mrbubblestore.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/R. Eric Gaum/

R. Eric Gaum

Sole Panelist

Date: September 30, 2026