

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Rhone Apparel, Inc. v. III ARTIMEZ  
Case No. D2026-3581

### 1. The Parties

Complainant is Rhone Apparel, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Fox Rothschild LLP, United States.

Respondent is III ARTIMEZ, United States.

### 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <rhone.it.com><sup>1</sup> ("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 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 (Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on August 16, 2026, 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 24, 2026.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Panel notes that the disputed domain name is a third-level domain name falling under the .it.com Dispute Resolution Policy which provides that the registrants agree to abide by the results of a Uniform Domain Dispute Resolution Policy proceeding if informal resolution in coordination with IT.com Domains, the registry operator, is unsuccessful. The Complainant has provided evidence that it filed an abuse complaint with IT.com Domains, and the Panel has received no confirmation that any settlement had taken place under the it.com Dispute Resolution Procedure. Further, the Registrar confirmed that the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy applies to the disputed domain name. The Panel will accordingly proceed to a decision under the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy.

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 25, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 14, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on September 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Colin T. O’Brien as the sole panelist in this matter on September 28, 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 performance and activewear apparel brand. Since at least September 1, 2013, Complainant has used the RHONE mark in United States commerce in connection with athletic apparel, including shirts, pants, jackets, footwear, hats and caps, and athletic uniforms. Complainant operates its primary e-commerce website at “www.rhone.com”, through which it markets and sells its products directly to consumers throughout the United States and internationally.

Complainant owns trademark registration in jurisdictions around the world including but not limited to:

RHONE United States Registration Number 4,551,400, Registered on June 17, 2014 in Class 25; and

RHONE International Registration Number 1586576, Registered on March 1, 2021 in Class 25.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on May 27, 2026 and is currently inactive. Complainant has provided evidence that the Disputed Domain Name resolved a website allegedly offering RHONE-branded products at steeply discounted prices.

#### **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 that the Disputed Domain Name wholly incorporates Complainant’s registered and distinctive RHONE Mark in its entirety, adding only the generic/descriptive term “it” and the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.com.”

Thus, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to Complainant’s RHONE Mark for which Complainant owns trademark registrations and has used continuously and exclusively in commerce since at least 2013, over twelve years before Respondent’s registration of the Disputed Domain Name on May 27, 2026.

Respondent lacks rights and legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name as Respondent is not offering any legitimate goods or services, but rather is impersonating Complainant, and appears to be orchestrating a phishing scheme. Complainant has not given Respondent any right to use the RHONE name or mark. Complainant has not licensed the name and mark RHONE to Respondent. “Rhone” is not Respondent’s name, and Respondent is not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name. Respondent simply has no right or authorization to use the RHONE name and mark as a domain name.

Respondent is not using the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or for any legitimate noncommercial use or in a fair manner. The website at the Disputed Domain Name is operating as a near-identical “clone” of Complainant’s legitimate website at “www.rhone.com”. The site copies and reproduces Complainant’s copyrighted works, including its logos, images, and product photographs, and uses Complainant’s RHONE Mark both in the Disputed Domain Name and throughout the site. The site purports to be a legitimate Rhone online store and offers what appears to be counterfeit or non-existent Rhone products at steeply discounted prices (approximately 70 percent off retail).

Respondent’s website lists clearly false and fictitious contact information, including generic placeholder phone numbers (“123-456-7890”) for purported “Expert sales service”, “Customer service”, and “Home install & delivery” departments — none of which are legitimate Rhone contact channels. This use of fake contact information further demonstrates that Respondent has no legitimate connection to Complainant and is operating a fraudulent website designed to deceive consumers and harvest their sensitive personal and financial information — i.e., phishing.

Complainant has strong trademark rights in the mark RHONE, and that Respondent was aware of Complainant’s trademark rights when it registered the confusingly similar Disputed Domain Name on May 27, 2026. Complainant’s RHONE Mark has been in use in United States commerce since at least as early as September 1, 2013 and was registered with the United States Patent and Trademark Office in 2014 — over twelve years before Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name. Respondent’s registration of a domain name that wholly incorporates Complainant’s distinctive RHONE Mark, combined with “.it” (suggesting an authorized regional or affiliated Rhone website), and the creation of a clone website that copied Complainant’s content, makes clear that Respondent had actual knowledge of Complainant and its trademark rights at the time of registration.

Respondent has used the Disputed Domain Name to intentionally attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant’s RHONE Mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website.

## **B. Respondent**

Respondent did not reply to Complainant’s contentions.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

Complainant has demonstrated it owns registered trademark rights in the RHONE mark. The Disputed Domain Name reproduces Complainant’s mark in its entirety at the third-level, under the “.it.com” extension.

Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the mark in which Complainant has rights and the first element of the Policy is established.

## **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

Complainant has presented a prima facie case that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name and has not been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name. The fact that Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name, which incorporates Complainant's registered and well-known RHONE trademark and resolved to a website with the same look and feel as the Complainant's website, indicates to the Panel that Respondent likely sought to impersonate Complainant and piggyback on the mark for potential illegitimate purposes.

After a complainant has made a prima facie case, the burden of production shifts to a respondent to present evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. See, e.g., *Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2003-0455](#) and [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Here, Respondent has failed to participate in the proceedings and as such, it did not provide any evidence of any rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name.

Moreover, the Panel finds that the nature of the Disputed Domain Name carries a risk of an implied affiliation as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by Complainant. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

In the absence of any evidence rebutting Complainant's prima facie case indicating Respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name, the Panel finds that Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

## **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

The Disputed Domain Name was registered years after Complainant first registered and used the RHONE mark. The evidence on the record provided by Complainant is sufficient to satisfy the Panel that, at the time the Disputed Domain Name was registered, Respondent undoubtedly knew of Complainant's RHONE mark.

Further, the Panel finds the use of the Disputed Domain Name by Respondent is in bad faith. Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy states that evidence of bad faith may include a respondent's use of a domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the respondent's website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark. The evidence, including the historical website content and composition of the Disputed Domain Name, shows that Respondent had created a website at the Disputed Domain Name similar to Complainant's official website with the intention to confuse unsuspecting Internet users into believing that the Disputed Domain Name is operated by Complainant.

In the absence of any evidence or explanation from Respondent, the Panel finds that the registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name have been made for bad faith purposes.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(iii) 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 <rhone.it.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Colin T. O'Brien/

**Colin T. O'Brien**

Sole Panelist

Date: October 12, 2026