

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Swatch AG (Swatch Ltd) (Swatch SA) v. Amine Ben Abdallah, Swatchcollabs
Case No. D2026-3926

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Swatch AG (Swatch Ltd) (Swatch SA), Switzerland, represented by Rentsch Partner AG, Switzerland.

The Respondent is Amine Ben Abdallah, Swatchcollabs, United States of America ("United States"), self-represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <collabswatch.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 September 2, 2026. On the same day, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On the same day, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name that differed from the named Respondent (Individual / entity of unknown nature, Amine Ben Abdallah and Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0174281879) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 3, 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 September 4, 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 4, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 24, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on September 24, 2026.

The Center appointed Matthew Kennedy 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

The Complainant is a manufacturer, seller, and retailer of watches, jewelry, and watch movements and components. The Complainant has used the SWATCH brand in connection with wristwatches since at least 1983. The Complainant holds trademark registrations in multiple jurisdictions, including European Union trademark registration number 226019 for SWATCH, registered on October 2, 1998. The Complainant holds United States trademark registration number 1356512 for a stylized SWATCH mark, registered on August 27, 1985. The Complainant uses the domain name <swatch.com> in connection with a website where it promotes the SWATCH brand and its products and services. It also operates physical branded retail stores in multiple continents, including Europe and North America. The Complainant has engaged in collaborative ventures with other parties, notably, it collaborated with its related company Omega SA in 2022 on the launch of the “MoonSwatch” collection of watches, also known as “Omega X Swatch”, and it collaborated with another related company Blancpain SA in 2023 on the launch of the “Scuba Fifty Fathoms” collection of dive watches, also known as “Blancpain X Swatch”.

The Respondent is identified as an individual and a business name. His contact address is in the United States. His contact telephone is a French mobile number.

According to information presented by the Complainant, a prior UDRP panel ordered the transfer of the domain name <swatchcollabs.com>, registered on January 7, 2024, which the Respondent was using with a website offering straps for MoonSwatch and Scuba Fifty Fathoms watches. The Complainant made a copyright complaint to that website’s hosting provider in about August 2024. See *SWATCH AG v. Amine I am Abdullah, Swatchcollabs*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-5303](#).

The disputed domain name in the present case was registered on August 29, 2024. It formerly resolved to a website that offered for sale watch straps and other watch accessories. On April 2 and April 13, 2026, the Complainant and related companies sent trademark infringement notices to the website’s hosting provider. On April 16, 2026, the Respondent sent a counter-notice, asserting that he operated as an independent retailer of aftermarket accessories and that references to third party brands were strictly descriptive.

According to screenshots presented by the Complainant, as at June 2, 2026, the disputed domain name resolved to an e-commerce website. Under “Collections”, a webpage headed “Omega x Swatch MoonSwatch Straps” offered for sale “MoonSwatch Straps – Omega x Swatch Straps”, displaying images of what purported to be the Complainant’s watches with unbranded straps. Another webpage headed “Blancpain x Swatch Fifty Fathoms Straps” offered for sale “Blancpain x Swatch Straps – Fifty Fathoms”, displaying images of what purported to be the Complainant’s watches with unbranded straps. Under “Products”, a webpage headed “MoonSwatch Glass Screen Protector | Omega x Swatch” offered for sale a protective film for MoonSwatch prominently described as a “MoonSwatch protector”. The website displayed a Collabswatch logo. A page footer displayed a notice that read “Collabswatch is an E-commerce store exclusively offering straps designed for Moonswatch watches and Scuba Fifty Fathoms. These watches are from the Swatch x Omega and Swatch x Blancpain collections.”

According to screenshots presented by the Complainant, since at least August 26, 2026, the disputed domain name has redirected to the domain name <watchcollab.com>, which is associated with an e-commerce website. Under “Collections”, a webpage headed “MoonSwatch Straps by Mission | Omega x Swatch | Watchcollab” offers for sale “Straps by MoonWatch”, displaying images of what purport to be the Complainant’s watches with unbranded straps. The text refers to “our Omega x Swatch straps range”. Another webpage headed “Fifty Fathoms Straps by Ocean | Blancpain x Swatch”, offers for sale “Straps by Fifty Fathoms”, displaying images of what purport to be the Complainant’s watches with unbranded straps.

The text refers to “our Blancpain x Swatch straps range”. The website displays a Watchcollab logo. A page footer displays a disclaimer reading “WatchCollab is an online store dedicated to replacement straps for the Omega x Swatch MoonSwatch, the Blancpain x Swatch Scuba Fifty Fathoms and the Audemars Piguet x Swatch Royal Pop. WatchCollab is an independent brand and is not affiliated with the Swatch Group, Omega, Blancpain or Audemars Piguet.” Below this, there appears the name of a website developer and its contact address.

The Cambridge Dictionary defines “collab” as “an informal short form of the word collaboration, meaning a joint effort where two or more people or groups work together to create, achieve, or promote something”. See <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/collab>.

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 name is confusingly similar to its SWATCH mark.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. Previously, the disputed domain name resolved to an online shop selling, inter alia, watch straps not bearing the Complainant’s trademarks. Currently, it redirects to another URL (“watchcollab.com/de”) resolving to a website offering not only the same watch straps but also others for the Complainant’s new collaboration with Audemars Piguet, known as the “Swatch x AP” or “Royal Pop” collection. Neither is a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The disclaimer on the website is insufficient to cure the character of an inherently misleading domain name. The use of the term “collab” in the disputed domain name directly and misleadingly targets the Complainant’s highly publicized, official brand collaboration. Some of the product images on the websites are the Complainant’s copyright-protected images. By designating his products as “Omega x Swatch Straps” and “Blancpain x Swatch Straps” or describing them as “our Omega x Swatch straps range” and “our Blancpain x Swatch straps range”, the Respondent is misleading Internet users into believing that his watch straps are produced and/or otherwise affiliated with, or endorsed by, the Complainant. For the sake of completeness, the *Oki Data* test does not apply in the present dispute, since that test requires a respondent to use a site to sell only the trademarked goods, whereas the Respondent here is selling some watch straps not bearing the trademark in question. See *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#).

The disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant’s SWATCH trademark is famous. The nature of the disputed domain name itself suggests an affiliation with the Complainant. The disputed domain name and its associated content suggest an affiliation with the Complainant to improperly attract consumers. Where the Respondent is using product images other than the Complainant’s copyright-protected images, counterfeit watches are being used to present the watch straps sold by the Respondent thereby suggesting further illegal activity, namely the sale of counterfeit products.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied the elements required under the Policy and requests that the Panel deny the Complaint.

Notably, the Respondent submits that he operates a legitimate e-commerce business selling aftermarket, third-party watch straps compatible with various watch models issued through brand collaborations, including but not limited to the Omega X Swatch MoonSwatch collection and the Audemars Piguet X Swatch

collaboration. The Respondent does not sell watches, does not claim to be Complainant, and does not claim any affiliation, sponsorship, or endorsement by the Complainant.

The Respondent does not dispute that, read as a continuous string of characters, the disputed domain name contains a sequence identical to the SWATCH mark. However, he submits that the disputed domain name was assembled from two generic, widely-used English words (i.e., “collab” and “watch”).

The Respondent has rights and legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. He is making a bona fide offering of goods selling third-party, aftermarket watch straps. He does not sell counterfeit watches, does not sell any product bearing the Complainant’s mark, and sells only straps, a distinct product category from the Complainant’s watches. He is making a nominative fair use of the trademark within the disputed domain name as a provider of compatible goods. See *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, *supra*. This framework has been applied to providers of compatible or aftermarket products, not only to authorized resellers. See *Volvo Trademark Holding AB v. Auto Shivuk*, WIPO Case No. [D2005-0447](#). Nominative use of a mark to describe compatibility is also standard, accepted industry practice. The Respondent’s product titles are squarely consistent with, not an outlier from, this well-established industry norm. The Respondent’s website carries a disclaimer. The product photography depicts genuine, lawfully-purchased watches.

The Respondent has not registered or used the disputed domain name in bad faith. None of the illustrative circumstances of bad faith set out in paragraph 4(b) of the Policy is present. The Respondent operates a single, active commercial website with genuine product content and customer service infrastructure. The Respondent’s products are complementary aftermarket accessories, not competing watches, and do not disrupt the Complainant’s business. When the Complainant raised its concerns with the Respondent’s hosting provider, the Respondent did not conceal his identity or ignore the process: he engaged transparently, submitting a formal counter-notice under his own name. The Respondent proactively took concrete corrective steps: (a) product titles were revised to consistently use descriptive, compatibility-oriented phrasing (“Strap for [model]”) rather than any formulation implying an official product or partnership; (b) marketing text across the website was reviewed and revised to remove any language that could be read as suggesting an official collaboration, exclusive partnership, or endorsement; and (c) a clear, prominent disclaimer was put in place stating that the Respondent’s business is independent and not affiliated with the Swatch Group, Omega, Blancpain, or Audemars Piguet. These are precisely the kind of good faith remedial measures consistent with the absence of bad faith under the Policy, and they were taken voluntarily before the filing of the Complaint. The present case must be assessed on its own facts, which differ materially from those considered in the prior decision regarding the domain name <swatchcollabs.com>, which the Respondent no longer owns or operates.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that a complainant must prove each of the following elements:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The burden of proof of each element is borne by the Complainant.

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

The disputed domain name wholly incorporates the SWATCH mark. Despite the addition of the word “collab” (short for “collaboration”), the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. The only other element of the disputed domain name is a generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) extension (“.com”) which, as a standard requirement of domain name registration, may be disregarded in the assessment of confusing similarity for the purposes of the Policy. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7, 1.8, and 1.11.1.

The Respondent submits that the disputed domain name was assembled from two generic, widely-used English words (“collab” and “watch”). However, even though it is possible to distinguish the words “collabs” (the plural of “collab”) and “watch” in the disputed domain name, this does not alter the fact that the mark SWATCH remains clearly recognizable in it.

Therefore, 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. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

In the present case, the disputed domain name wholly incorporates the SWATCH mark, adding the word “collab” (short for “collaboration”). Given that “collab” refers to a joint effort where two or more people or groups work together to create, achieve, or promote something (as defined in Section 4 above), the composition of the disputed domain name triggers a high inference of affiliation. The Internet user is likely to believe that the disputed domain name will resolve to a website regarding a collaboration with the SWATCH brand authorized by the Complainant. That inference is borne out by the content of the website to which the disputed domain name redirects (and the website to which it formerly resolved), insofar as it presents watch collections created in authorized collaboration with the Complainant (i.e., Omega X Swatch and Blancpain X Swatch). However, the inference in the disputed domain name is in fact misleading because neither the Respondent nor the products offered for sale on the website are part of any such authorized collaboration. The misleading nature of the disputed domain name is compounded by website content that displays product descriptions such as “MoonSwatch straps” and “Straps by Fifty Fathoms”, giving the false impression that they are sourced from, or affiliated with, or endorsed by, the Complainant as part of its “MoonSwatch” and “Fifty Fathoms” watch collections. It is not clear that the website is not operated by the Complainant or an affiliate. The Respondent’s logo is not particularly conspicuous and his disclaimer of affiliation, shown in a footer on the Watchcollab website, is insufficiently prominent to avoid confusion. The use of the disputed domain name is clearly commercial. These circumstances do not indicate that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services, nor that he is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Further, the Registrar has verified that the Respondent is named “Amine Ben Abdallah” and “Swatchcollabs”, neither of which is the disputed domain name. A Collabswatch logo was displayed on the website formerly associated with the disputed domain name. However, the evidence on record does not indicate that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

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 submits that he is making a bona fide offering of goods selling third-party, aftermarket watch straps, selling neither actual watches nor counterfeit goods. He asserts that his straps are compatible with the Complainant’s watches and that he satisfies the criteria set out in *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, *supra*, because his site actually offers “goods genuinely *related to* the mark” (emphasis added). However, the relevant criterion is whether he uses his site to sell “only the trademarked goods or services”. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.8.1. Here, the Respondent does not sell SWATCH-branded goods at all. The Respondent maintains that the *Oki Data* framework has been applied to providers of compatible or aftermarket products but the decision that he cites (*Volvo Trademark Holding AB v. Auto Shivuk*, *supra*) concerns a respondent who used its domain name to sell only the complainant’s trademarked car parts, unlike the present case.

The Respondent argues that nominative use of a mark to describe compatibility with a trademark owner’s product is a standard, accepted industry practice. It suffices to note that none of the three businesses that he offers as specific examples uses a trademark in its domain name, unlike the disputed domain name, none uses product descriptions such as “[BRAND] straps” or “straps by [BRAND]”, unlike the Respondent’s website, and the prominence of their respective disclaimers is not disclosed. The Respondent submits that his website carries an explicit non-affiliation disclaimer. However, while there is a disclaimer of affiliation on the current website, it is displayed in a footer far too discreetly to avoid confusion, particularly where the site content uses product descriptions that clearly imply the Respondent’s straps are part of the watch collections of the Complainant and its related companies. In any case, the composition of the disputed domain name itself triggers a high inference of affiliation.

The Respondent submits that his website does not sell counterfeit goods but depicts only genuine, lawfully-purchased watches. In the circumstances, it is not necessary or possible to determine whether any straps or other accessories offered for sale on his website are counterfeit.

In summary, the Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant’s prima facie showing.

Based on the record, 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. The fourth circumstance is as follows:

“(iv) by using the [disputed] domain name, [the respondent has] intentionally attempted 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 as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of [the respondent’s] website or location or of a product or service on [the respondent’s] web site or location.”

In the present case, the disputed domain name was registered in 2024, many years after the registration of the Complainant’s SWATCH trademarks. The disputed domain name wholly incorporates that mark, and has resolved and redirects to websites presenting certain of the Complainant’s watch collections in detail. Clearly, the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its SWATCH mark at the time when he registered the disputed domain name. The Respondent argues that the disputed domain name was assembled from two generic, widely-used English words and that “watch” refers to the product category for

which it sells accessories. However, this reading appears constrained given (i) the order of those words in the disputed domain name (“collabs + watch” rather than the reverse); (ii) the fame of the SWATCH mark as a result of its longstanding and widespread use by the Complainant, and (iii) the content of the associated sites regarding collaboration with SWATCH. Accordingly, the Panel finds it more likely than not that the disputed domain name was registered with the Complainant and its mark in mind.

As regards use, the disputed domain name is intended to operate by attracting Internet users searching for the Complainant, its SWATCH products or, more specifically, collaborative SWATCH collections. This use is intentional and for commercial gain. Given the Panel’s findings in Section 6.B above, the Panel finds that, by using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to his website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of his website or of a product on his website, within the terms of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

In addition, product images displayed on the Respondent’s former and current website show the Respondent’s straps on what purport to be the Complainant’s watches, at least two of which appear to be copies. Specifically, images promoting a glass protector for use on the MoonSwatch collection show two models lacking “Omega X Swatch” branding on their faces. Even though the Respondent’s website does not sell watches, the use of what appear to be counterfeit products in marketing of accessories is a further indication of bad faith.

The Panel has relied on the latest evidence provided by the Complainant, which dates from shortly before the Complaint was filed. The Respondent claims to have taken corrective steps to change his website content but provides no evidence in support.

Therefore, 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 <collabswatch.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Matthew Kennedy/

Matthew Kennedy

Sole Panelist

Date: October 6, 2026