ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Boll & Branch LLC v. Summer mile
Case No. D2026-3945

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Boll & Branch LLC, United States of America ("US"), represented by Keating Muething & Klekamp PLL, US.

The Respondent is Summer mile, US.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <bollcraft.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 September 3, 2026. On September 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 4, 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 (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 7, 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 8, 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 9, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 29, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 2, 2026.

The Center appointed Angela Fox as the sole panelist in this matter on October 13, 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 luxury textile business based in the US, selling high-quality luxury bedding products, linens, and apparel, including robes, towels, and sleepwear. It was founded in 2014 and has been trading ever since under the name and trademark BOLL & BRANCH and a logo mark resembling two back-to-back letters "B". The Complainant is the owner of a number of US and Canadian trademark registrations and applications for BOLL & BRANCH and its logo mark, details of which were annexed to the Complaint, including the following:

- US trademark registration No. 4769218 for BOLL & BRANCH in Class 24, registered on July 7, 2015;
- US trademark registration No. 7498960 for BOLL & BRANCH in Classes 20, 25 and 27, registered on September 10, 2024; and
- US trademark registration No. 5585449 for BOLL & BRANCH in Classes 20 and 24, registered on October 16, 2018.

The Complainant offers its goods for sale inter alia through its website at the domain name <bollandbranch.com>, which prominently displays the BOLL & BRANCH trademarks and the Complainant's logo.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 25, 2026. Screenshots annexed to the Complaint show that it has been used to host a website which impersonates the Complainant, offering luxury bedding and towels for sale and using the Complainant's BOLL & BRANCH trademark and logo. The Respondent's website states, "At Boll & Branch, we believe your sanctuary deserves the finest touch of nature and craftsmanship," the reference to "craftsmanship" appearing to evoke the "craft" element of the disputed domain name.

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 the Complainant's trademark, BOLL & BRANCH. The disputed domain name incorporates BOLL, which the Complainant submits is the first and leading element of its word trademark, combined with the generic word, "craft" and the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".shop", which the Complainant argues creates the impression of a domain name at which it is possible to shop for and purchase the Complainant's high-quality textile goods from the Complainant itself.

The Complainant further submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent, or anyone acting in concert with the Respondent, to register and use the disputed domain name. In addition, there is no evidence that the Respondent used or made any demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services before notice of the dispute, nor that the Respondent has been commonly known by a name corresponding to the disputed domain name, or that it is making any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Rather, the Respondent has been using the disputed domain name to host an impersonation website targeting the Complainant and purporting to offer the Complainant's own goods for sale.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and has been used in bad faith. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name well after the Complainant had established rights in its BOLL & BRANCH trademark, and the Respondent's knowledge of the Complainant is apparent from the fact that the Respondent is hosting a website impersonating the Complainant's own BOLL & BRANCH website. The Complainant submits that by using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website 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 of the products offered for sale through it.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions and is in default. No exceptional circumstances explaining the default have been put forward. Therefore, in accordance with paragraphs 14(a) and (b) of the Rules, the Panel will decide the Complaint and shall draw such inferences as it considers appropriate from the Respondent's default.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, a complainant can only succeed in an administrative proceeding under the Policy if the panel finds that:

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

All three elements must be present before a complainant can succeed in an administrative proceeding under the Policy.

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 trademark BOLL & BRANCH for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name is <bollcraft.shop>. The first element is the word "boll", which is identical to the leading element of the Complainant's trademark, followed by the term "craft". The gTLD ".shop" is a standard registration requirement and is disregarded in the comparison under the first element.

Taking into account that the first element of the Policy is essentially a standing requirement, the Panel is satisfied that the dominant feature of the Complainant's trademark is recognizable in the disputed domain name, and the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

The Panel also notes that under WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7, panels have found in certain cases that the broader case context, such as website content, may also support a finding of confusing similarity with a complainant's mark. In this case, the evidence shows that the Respondent has been using the disputed domain name to host a commercial website impersonating the Complainant. This further reinforces the conclusion that there is confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark.

Although the addition of other terms, such as the word “craft”, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of these 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.

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.

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 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.

In this case, moreover, the record shows that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name in respect of a website impersonating the Complainant, using the Complainant’s own trademark and logo and purporting to offer the Complainant’s goods for sale. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity such as the hosting of a copycat site can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1.

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.

Under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, such circumstances include that by using the domain name, the respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its 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 its website or location or of a product or service on its website or location.

In the present case, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark, and the Respondent has used it in connection with a website impersonating the Complainant, copying the Complainant’s word and logo mark and purportedly offering the Complainant’s goods for sale under the guise of being the Complainant. The descriptive word “craft” may communicate to Internet users that the disputed domain name denotes a website where high-quality BOLL & BRANCH goods in line with the Complainant’s standards of craftsmanship are available for purchase. It is evident from this that the Respondent was aware of and targeting the Complainant when it registered and used the disputed domain

name, and that it intended to create the impression of a connection with the Complainant in order to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant.

Panels have also held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity such as impersonation or other types of fraud constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4. The Complainant has provided evidence that the disputed domain name has been used in connection with a commercial website impersonating the Complainant and purportedly offering its goods for sale.

Taking all of the above into account, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and has been used in bad faith. The Complainant has therefore 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 <bollcraft.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Angela Fox/
Angela Fox
Sole Panelist
Date: November 2, 2026