

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Radical22 Limited v. Gary Matai, Dua Lipa SE Asia
Case No. D2026-3789

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Radical22 Limited, United Kingdom ("UK"), represented by Stobbs IP Limited, UK.

The Respondent is Gary Matai, Dua Lipa SE Asia, Hong Kong, China ("Hong Kong").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <dualipa-asiastore.com> is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 25, 2026. On August 25, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 25, 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 (Unknown/Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0173252845) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 26, 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 28, 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 September 1, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 21, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 23, 2026.

The Center appointed Tommaso La Scala as the sole panelist in this matter on September 29, 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 is a UK-based company co-owned by the world-renowned singer Dua Lipa and her father, mainly engaged in the promotion and exploitation of the Dua Lipa productions, including online/offline retail of official merchandise bearing the Dua Lipa name.

Dua Lipa is one of the internationally successful pop artists, and a three-time Grammy Award winner, whose recordings have been streamed billions of times and who enjoys a very substantial social media following, including 88.7 million followers on Instagram and 24.6 million subscribers on YouTube. Her music is also officially distributed and promoted in Asia, where the Respondent allegedly operates.

The Complainant owns several national and international trademarks for DUA LIPA, including – as a mere example – the following registrations:

- International Registration No. 1527175 for DUA LIPA (word), granted on October 3, 2019, for classes 3, 9, 14, 16, 18, 25, 35, and 41, designating, inter alia, Indonesia, the Philippines, Singapore, Republic of Korea, Viet Nam, China, Canada, and the United States of America;
- United Kingdom Registration No. UK00003204883 for DUA LIPA (word), granted on March 24, 2017, for classes 3, 9, 16, 25, and 41; and
- Hong Kong Registration No. 305074407 for DUA LIPA (word), granted on May 8, 2020, for classes 3, 9, 14, 16, 18, 25, 35, and 41.

The Complainant also owns the domain name <dualipa.com> since 2013, which resolves to Dua Lipa's official website, and operates an official online store at the subdomain name <ukshop.dualipa.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 18, 2024. It previously resolved to an online store prominently displaying the DUA LIPA trademark and purportedly offering for sale DUA LIPA-branded goods such as clothing, canvas bags, and headwear, without any disclaimer as to the lack of relationship with the Complainant. At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a password-protected "Opening soon" page hosted on the Shopify platform with the browser tab title "Dua Lipa Official SE Asia Store", displaying the DUA LIPA trademark, and links to Dua Lipa's official social media channels.

According to the registrant information disclosed by the Registrar, the Respondent is an individual located in Hong Kong with "Dua Lipa SE Asia" listed as registrant organization.

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:

(a) the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark DUA LIPA, which is entirely reproduced therein with the mere addition of a hyphen and the geographical/descriptive terms "asia" and "store";

(b) the Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, as it is neither authorized by the Complainant nor commonly known by the disputed domain name, and has not used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Its websites fail the so-called Oki Data test and falsely presenting themselves as an official "Dua Lipa" store; and

(c) the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith, namely for impersonating the Complainant in order to mislead Internet users for undue commercial purposes with the current "opening soon" page not preventing a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding.

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 the DUA LIPA trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The DUA LIPA mark is entirely reproduced within the disputed domain name, with the addition of a hyphen and of the terms "asia" and "store", while the generic Top-Level Domain ".com" is disregarded as a standard registration requirement. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11. This Panel agrees with the Complainant's assertion that the Complainant's mark is clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name. Although the addition of other terms may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that 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.

Therefore, the Panel finds the disputed domain name to be confusingly similar to the DUA LIPA trademark in which the Complainant has rights. Accordingly, 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.

This Panel finds that the Complainant has made a prima facie case that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. As a matter of fact, the Respondent has no connection to or affiliation with the Complainant, and the Complainant has not licensed or otherwise authorized the Respondent to use or register any domain name incorporating the Complainant's trademark.

The Respondent does not appear to be commonly known by the disputed domain name. The mere indication of "Dua Lipa SE Asia" as registrant organization in the registration details – which, in the absence of any supporting evidence, appears to have been chosen to create a confusion with Dua Lipa – does not confer any rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent under the circumstances of this case. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.3.

Nor does the Respondent appear to make any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, or any use in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Even assuming that the DUA LIPA-branded goods previously offered on the website associated with the disputed domain name were genuine, such website did not accurately and prominently disclose the Respondent's (lack of) relationship with the Complainant. The requirements set out in *Ok! Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#), are therefore not met. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.8.1. Further, although the website is currently inactive, it has a browser tab title "Dua Lipa Official SE Asia Store".

Moreover, the composition of the disputed domain name, combining the Complainant's mark with the terms describing the Complainant's retail activity in a specific geographical area, carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

Having reviewed the available record and considering that 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 Complainant has established that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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 DUA LIPA trademark was registered and widely known well before the registration of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name reproduces such trademark in its entirety, together with the terms referring to the Complainant's retail activity in a specific geographical area, and resolved to a website displaying the Complainant's trademark, and a photograph of Dua Lipa on the date of the registration of the disputed domain name. This conduct is, in the Panel's view, sufficient to show that the Respondent not only knew of the Complainant and its trademark but intentionally targeted them when registering the disputed domain name (see, in this regard, *Radical22 Limited v. company seo, company777*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-1393](#)).

The Respondent's prior use of the disputed domain name for an online store displaying the Complainant's DUA LIPA mark and purportedly offering DUA LIPA-branded merchandise, without accurately disclosing the lack of any relationship with the Complainant, demonstrates an intentional attempt to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website. The Panel therefore finds that the circumstances fall within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The fact that the disputed domain name currently resolves to a password-protected "Opening soon" page does not alter that conclusion. The current page continues to display the DUA LIPA trademark with a browser tab title "Dua Lipa Official SE Asia Store", and links to Dua Lipa's official social media channels. In any event, having regard to the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's mark, the composition of the disputed domain name, the Respondent's prior use of the disputed domain name, the absence of any disclaimer, and the Respondent's failure to provide any explanation, the present use of the website would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith and that the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 <dualipa-asiastore.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Tommaso La Scala/

Tommaso La Scala

Sole Panelist

Date: October 13, 2026