

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Kelle Company, LLC v. Jesse Jimenez

Case No. D2026-3855

1. The Parties

Complainant is Kelle Company, LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Maslon LLP, United States.

Respondent is Jesse Jimenez, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <kellecompanylook.shop> 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 24, 2026. On August 28, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 30, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that 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 September 18, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 8, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on October 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Lorelei Ritchie as the sole panelist in this matter on October 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 a limited liability company based in the United States. For decades prior to the registration of the disputed domain name, Complainant has offered dance wear under the mark KELLE. Complainant owns United States Registration No. 2479318 (registered August 21, 2001) for its KELLE mark. Complainant's registration predates the registration and use of the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 4, 2026. Respondent has used the URL associated with the disputed domain name to resolve to a website that masquerades as an official website of Complainant, and purports to offer Complainant's KELLE products, with prominent display of Complainant's KELLE mark and without any disclaimer of affiliation.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to Complainant's trademarks; (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; and (iii) Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Specifically, Complainant contends that it owns rights to the KELLE mark for dance wear. Complainant contends that the disputed domain name incorporates-in-full Complainant's KELLE mark, with only the addition of the descriptive dictionary terms "company" and "look." Complainant further contends that Complainant has its own website, through which Complainant interacts with prospective consumers online.

Complainant asserts that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Complainant further contends that Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith "to mislead and to divert consumers" into believing that they are interacting with Complainant. Complainant contends that Respondent has set up this impersonation scheme presumably for Respondent's own commercial gain.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to 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. Complainant has shown rights in respect of the KELLE mark which is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Although the addition of other terms (here, "company" and "look") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term[s] 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 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.

Panels have categorically held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (e.g., passing off, or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13. Here, the disputed domain name resolves to a website that purports to offer Complainant’s KELLE products, and does not appear to include a disclaimer of affiliation or endorsement by Complainant. Rather, it includes unauthorized display of Complainant’s marks, along with language suggesting an affiliation with Complainant. Such intentionally misleading use does not support a finding of rights or legitimate interests. Moreover, Respondent has not put forward any claims or evidence that would suggest rights or legitimate interests for the purposes of the Policy.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

There are several ways that a complainant can demonstrate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith. As noted in Section 4 of this Panel’s decision, the record includes evidence that Respondent has used the URL associated with the disputed domain name to resolve to a website that purports to offer Complainant’s own KELLE products, with prominent display of Complainant’s marks, and with no disclaimer of affiliation.

The Panel thus finds sufficient evidence that Respondent was aware of Complainant’s rights and Complainant’s marks at the time of registering the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

The Panel finds 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 <kellecompanylook.shop> be transferred to Complainant.

/Lorelei Ritchie/

Lorelei Ritchie

Sole Panelist

Date: October 23, 2026