

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

WD Plus GmbH v. Stimmel Winnie, Stimmel Winnie, SmithStephanie,
Stephanie Smith
Case No. D2026-3583

1. The Parties

The Complainant is WD Plus GmbH, Germany, represented by BEITEN BURKHARDT
Rechtsanwaltsgesellschaft mbH, Germany.

The Respondents are Stimmel Winnie, Stimmel Winnie, and SmithStephanie, Stephanie Smith, United
States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names: <brandsonstore.com> is registered with Dominet (HK) Limited; and
<brandsonshop.com> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (collectively the "Registrars").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint, originally relating to <brandsonstore.com>, 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 <brandsonstore.com>. On August 13, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (Unknown, The RDAP server redacted the value) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 14, 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.

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 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 14, 2026.

On September 15, 2026, the Center received an enquiry from the Complainant regarding the addition of the disputed domain name <brandsonshop.com> (the “Additional Domain Name”).

Under the instruction of the Panel, on September 17, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar, NameSilo, LLC, a request for registrar verification in connection with the Additional Domain Name. On September 17, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Additional Domain Name. On September 21, 2026, the Panel issued Procedural Order No. 1, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar for the Additional Domain Name, giving the Complainant until September 26, 2026, to amend the Complaint adding the Additional Domain Name, and giving the Respondents until October 3, 2026, to respond to the Complainant’s submission. The Complainant responded to Procedural Order No. 1 on September 26, 2026. The Respondents did not respond to Procedural Order No. 1. On October 5, 2026, the Panel issued Procedural Order No. 2, informing the Parties of the new Decision due date.

The Center appointed Jeremy Speres as the sole panelist in this matter on September 17, 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 provides sparse detail concerning the nature and extent of the Complainant’s business, other than to state that an authorized subsidiary of the Complainant operates an online store accessible via the domain name <brandson.de> (registered in 2018), which it uses to sell fans, among other things. The Panel has independently¹ visited the Complainant’s website and has established that the Complainant sells – in addition to fans – heaters, air purifiers, and other electrical appliances, all branded with the BRANDSON mark.

The Complainant owns International Trademark Registration No. 1326035 BRANDSON (word) in classes 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 19, and 22, having a registration date of September 19, 2016.

The disputed domain name <brandsonshop.com> was registered on August 6, 2026. The disputed domain name <brandsonstore.com> was registered on July 2, 2026. Both of the disputed domain names presently resolve to websites prominently entitled “Brandson”, offering fans, heaters, and other electrical appliances for sale at discounted prices. Most of the products appear to be branded with the BRANDSON mark, but there are other, unrelated third-party brands for sale on both websites, too.

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 names have been used to mislead consumers by using the Complainant’s BRANDSON trademark without any authorization, and masquerading as authorized resellers of the Complainant’s products.

¹ In accordance with its powers articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, the Panel is entitled to conduct limited independent research into matters of public record. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), section 4.8.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The Complainant requested the addition of a second disputed domain name following complaint notification. While such requests are generally not encouraged post-notification, here the Panel found it appropriate to consider the Complainant's request noting inter alia the related registrant emails, and thus allowed submission of an amended Complaint to fully address consolidation. The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes the following, much of which the Panel has established independently:

- The contact details on the "Kontakt" pages of the websites for both of the disputed domain names are nearly identical. The telephone numbers and street addresses are identical, and the email addresses are highly similar. The rest of the wording on the "Kontakt" pages is identical.
- Both websites have highly similar structures, color schemes and a highly similar look and feel.
- The products that are advertised for sale by both websites are priced identically.
- The domain names of the email addresses contained within the Whois records for both of the disputed domain names are identical.

The Panel therefore considers it more likely than not that the disputed domain names are under common control.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party, especially considering the fact that no responses have been submitted, and given the evidence of targeting discussed below.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

B. 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 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 names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are 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 “store” and “shop”, 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 names 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.

C. 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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

As discussed in relation to bad faith below, it is likely that the disputed domain names have been used to impersonate the Complainant. UDRP panels have categorically held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here impersonation, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1. To the extent that the disputed domain names’ websites might be considered those of a reseller of the Complainant’s products, they do not meet the requirements of the well-known Oki Data test given that the sites do not accurately and prominently disclose the Respondent’s relationship with the Complainant, and the websites also appear to sell unrelated third-party products and not just those of the Complainant. *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#); and [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.8.

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

D. 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.

For the reasons discussed below, the Panel finds that paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy is applicable to this case.

The Panel viewed the HyperText Markup Language (“HTML”) code for the Respondent’s websites and established that the product images displayed on the Respondent’s websites are loaded from online retailer Amazon’s image servers. The Panel also noted that the URL for each of the products listed on the Respondent’s websites ends in a unique alphanumeric code that the Panel recognized to be highly similar to Amazon Standard Identification Numbers (“ASINs”), which are unique codes assigned to products sold on Amazon. The Panel searched Amazon for a few of the alphanumeric codes taken from the Respondent’s websites’ product URLs and found that they led to listings for the Complainant’s products on Amazon, offered for sale by the Complainant’s official Amazon store. The Respondent therefore appears to scrape the Complainant’s listings on Amazon and populates its websites with those images and other product details.

The Respondent’s websites create the impression, through prominent use of the Complainant’s mark on the sites, that they are the official presence of the Complainant. There is also nothing on the websites indicating that they are not associated with the Complainant. As a result, an Internet user viewing the disputed domain names’ websites is left with the impression that they are operated by the Complainant, which clearly points to bad faith targeting. The composition of the disputed domain names themselves, consisting of the Complainant’s mark plus the terms “store” and “shop”, suggests that the disputed domain names each relate to an official online store of the Complainant. This, too, points to an intention to impersonate the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

The Panel has independently established that at least one security vendor has flagged the disputed domain name <brandsonstore.com> for malicious activity, which is a clear indicator of bad faith. *The Commissioners for HM Revenue and Customs v. WhoisGuard Protected, WhoisGuard, Inc. / Hoshyar Marshall*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-0344](#).

The Panel draws an adverse inference from the Respondent’s failure to take part in the present proceeding where an explanation is certainly called for. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.3.

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 names <brandsonstore.com> and <brandsonshop.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Jeremy Speres/

Jeremy Speres

Sole Panelist

Date: October 7, 2026