ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Schylling Inc. v. Name Redacted
Case No. D2026-4035

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Schylling Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by The GigaLaw Firm, Douglas M. Isenberg, Attorney at Law, LLC, United States.

The Respondent is Name Redacted.[1]

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <needoh.org> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 9, 2026. On September 9, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 10, 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 Purposes / Privacy service provided by WITHHELD FOR PRIVACY LLC.) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 11, 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 amendment to the Complaint on September 11, 2026.

The Respondent sent an informal email communication to the Center on September 11, 2026, indicating to be available to explore an amicable solution. The Center sent an email communication to the Parties, on September 14, 2026, regarding possible settlement of the dispute, to which the Parties both replied, on the same day, indicating that they did not wish to pursue settlement discussions.

[1] Due to the reasons explained in the Decision, the Panel has redacted the Respondent's name from said Decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this Decision an instruction to the Registrar regarding transfer of the disputed domain name, which includes the name of the Respondent. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in this proceeding and has indicated Annex 1 to this decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST-12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. D2009-1788.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 15, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 5, 2026. On October 1, 2026, the Respondent requested the automatic four-calendar-day extension of the deadline for submitting the Response. On October 5, 2026, the Center sent an email communication to the Parties notifying the extension of the due date for Response to October 9, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on October 9, 2026.

The Parties filed Supplemental Filings on October 12, 2026 and October 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Luca Barbero as the sole panelist in this matter on October 19, 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 United States toy company founded in 1974. It distributes its products directly to customers in the United States and Canada, via more than 5,000 independent toy and gift stores, over 200 retailers including Walmart, Target, Amazon, Barnes & Noble, and Fred Meyer, and via international distributors.

The Complainant's NEEDOH products were launched in 2017 and are small, squeezable items filled with a non-toxic, dough-like compound that returns to its original shape after being manipulated.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademark registrations for NEEDOH, including the following:

- United States trademark registration No. 5502863 for NEEDOH (word mark), filed on November 21, 2017, and registered on June 26, 2018, in International Class 28;

- European Union Trade Mark registration No. 1650839 for NEEDOH (word mark), registered on April 26, 2021, in classes 20 and 28;

- Canada trademark registration No. TMA1206610 for NEEDOH (word mark), filed on April 26, 2021, and registered on November 1, 2023, in International Classes 20 and 28.

The Complainant also owns the domain name <needoh.com>, which was registered on November 24, 2009, and is redirected to an internal page of the Complainant's corporate website "www.schylling.com" dedicated to the Complainant's NEEDOH products.

The disputed domain name <needoh.org> was registered on April 1, 2026, and currently resolves to a website that offers information about the Complainant's NEEDOH products, publishing images of NEEDOH toys, and providing links to the Amazon website where NEEDOH and third parties' squeeze toys are offered for sale.[2] The website prominently features at the top of the website the wording "NeeDoh Hub", in orange, and the heading "NeeDoh Toys", in black characters, and includes the following description: "NeeDoh.org is a catalog of authentic NeeDoh® toys made by Schylling - iconic squishy sensory toys, fidgets, and stretchy stress balls loved by millions of kids and adults. Browse the full collection and shop original NeeDoh from trusted retailers". The browser title reads "NeeDoh toys – Original NeeDoh Squishes Website". A disclaimer

[2]Noting in particular the general powers of a panel articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the UDRP Rules, it has been accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record if it would consider such information useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision, in particular to affirm or corroborate a party's contention. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.8.

in small characters at the top of the website reads: "NeeDoh is a trademark of Schylling Inc. NeeDoh.org is not affiliated with Schylling Inc. Links on this site may be affiliate links, meaning we may earn a commission at no extra cost to you". At the bottom of the website, a section titled "Manufacturer resources - Schylling Inc." provides the Complainant's contact information. The website footer includes the following additional disclaimer: © 2026 NeeDoh.org - independent catalogue of authentic NeeDoh® toys by Schylling. Not affiliated with Schylling Inc. NeeDoh® is a trademark of Schylling. Amazon and the Amazon logo are trademarks of Amazon.com, Inc. or its affiliates. eBay is a trademark of eBay Inc.".

Visiting the website, a pop-up message appears displaying the heading: "Sold out? No worries! Find your NeeDoh on these other shops" and providing links to the website "www.groveflowerandtoys.com" and to the Amazon and eBay websites, where NEEDOH and third-party toys are offered for sale. The pop-up message includes the disclaimer: "Some of these links may be affiliate links, meaning we may earn a small commission at no extra cost to you". The "Contact" section of the website displays the Complainant's contact details and a link to the Amazon website to obtain support regarding orders. For questions about the website, users are invited to use the Registrar-provided contact form to contact the Respondent.

According to the screenshots provided at Annex 10 to the Complaint – which have not been contested by the Respondent – at the time of the filing of the Complaint, the website featured a prominent "NeeDoh" logo at the top of the website, in pink and orange characters, the heading "NeeDoh Toys" and did not include any disclaimer at the top of the website. The website included an advertising image taken from the Complainant's website and its description read: "NeeDoh.org is the home of authentic NeeDoh® toys by Schylling - squishy sensory toys, fidgets, and stretchy stress balls loved by millions of kids and adults. Browse the full collection and shop original NeeDoh". The footer included the Complainant's contact details and a disclaimer in small characters reading: "2026 NeeDoh.org. Authentic NeeDoh® toys by Schylling. NeeDoh® is a trademark of Schylling. As an Amazon Associate, we earn from qualifying purchases. Amazon and the Amazon logo are trademarks of Amazon.com, Inc. or its affiliates. eBay is a trademark of eBay Inc. AliExpress is a trademark of Alibaba Group Holding Limited. Product availability and pricing may vary by retailer".

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 identical to the trademark NEEDOH in which the Complainant has rights as it reproduces the trademark in its entirety with the mere addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".org".

The Complainant states that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name because:

i) it has never assigned, granted, licensed, sold, transferred or in any way authorized the Respondent to register or use the NEEDOH mark in any manner;

ii) the Respondent has never been commonly known by the disputed domain name and has never acquired any trademark or service mark rights in the disputed domain name;

iii) the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name does not meet the requirements set forth in the landmark decision *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. D2001-0903 and WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.8.1, for a reseller to have rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name encompassing a third-party mark, since the Respondent's website, which has been used in connection with the Amazon's affiliate marketing program, originally included a prominent "NeeDoh" logo at the top of every page and the headline "NeeDoh Toys", describing the website as the "home of authentic NeeDoh® toys by Schylling" and providing links to the Complainant's social media accounts and the Complainant's contact details, showing that the Respondent attempted to convey the false impression that its website was operated

by or associated with the Complainant, without clarifying that its website was unauthorized by the Complainant;

iv) there is a risk of impersonation and misrepresentation since the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's trademark;

v) by creating a website that falsely states to be the home of authentic NEEDOH toys by the Complainant and using the Complainant's copyrighted images, the Respondent has used the disputed domain name for illegal activity, namely creating a copycat website and passing off; and

vi) at least one security vendor has reported that the disputed domain name is being used in connection with suspicious activities.

The Complainant also states that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith because:

i) the Respondent is using the disputed domain name in connection with a website that falsely purports to be a website for, or otherwise associated with, the Complainant, by stating to be "the home of authentic NeeDoh® toys by Schylling" and (purportedly) offering for sale Complainant's NEEDOH-branded toys by using without permission the Complainant's copyrighted images;

ii) the Respondent earns commissions on the sale of the Complainant's products through Amazon affiliate links, via a website that clearly intends to appear to be associated with the Complainant;

iii) the Respondent has used the Complainant's copyrighted images on its website, without permission;

iv) at least one security vendor, Gridinsoft, has reported that the disputed domain name is associated with suspicious activity; and

v) the disputed domain name was registered eight years after the Complainant's first registration for the NEEDOH mark;

vi) the Respondent is a "repeat cybersquatter" as he engaged in a pattern of conduct pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy, having registered not only the disputed domain name but also the five domain names included in a prior UDRP case which was concluded with the transfer of the domain names to the complainant.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied all elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Whilst the Respondent does not dispute the Complainant's rights in the NEEDOH mark or the identity of the disputed domain name with the Complainant's trademark, he denies the Complainant's allegations regarding the second and third elements, stating that he registered the disputed domain name on April 1, 2026, to personally develop an informational resource about NEEDOH products with the purpose of documenting the product range, distinguishing genuine NEEDOH products from unofficial alternatives, explaining use and care, and helping shoppers find products in stock.

The Respondent submits that he did not register the disputed domain name to sell NEEDOH products or impersonate the company and contends that from the outset, his website identified the Complainant as the manufacturer and rights holder and made a clear distinction between the product questions for the Complainant and order support from retailers.

The Respondent also states that he never demanded payment for transferring the disputed domain name, nor did he register another domain name incorporating NEEDOH or another trademark of the Complainant.

With regards to the Complainant's allegations concerning the use of Amazon affiliate links, the Respondent rebuts that most product referrals lead to NEEDOH offers on the Amazon website and other retailers and submits that he cannot control what a shopper purchases after reaching a marketplace, particularly during shortages or when shoppers choose additional products.

The Respondent further submits that though retailer affiliate programs pay the commissions, he neither invoices the Complainant nor charges users extra, and states that revenue alone does not establish intentional deception as paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy requires an intentional attempt to attract users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion.

With reference to the use of the Complainant's logo and of the phrase "NeeDoh Toys" on the homepage, the Respondent rebuts that while the Complainant's NEEDOH graphic logo uses two lines, decorative lettering, and a pronounced black outline, his header used one line, a different typeface, and no such outline and constituted distinct compositions and submits that a shared wording and pink and orange colors do not make the text heading a reproduction of the Complainant's figurative mark. Whilst, with regards to the *"*NeeDoh.org is the home of authentic NeeDoh® toys by Schylling*"* claim, the Respondent asserts that the term "home" is to describe the catalog rather than assert website ownership and submits that the wording "NeeDoh Hub" and the non-affiliation notice further clarify this distinction.

The Respondent also states that the references to the Complainant's contact details and social media accounts available on his website were included for the purpose of identifying the products' manufacturer.

With reference to the use of product photographs from the Complainant, the Respondent rebuts that such use does not equate to impersonation of a website owner and asserts that simply illustrating products with images does not convert catalogs and guides into copies of the Complainant's website.

Moreover, the Respondent asserts that the mere inclusion of product images is insufficient to demonstrate commercial confusion or intent to mislead and indicates that, in view of the Complainant's objection, the Respondent made changes to ensure that the photographs were perceived as serving informational purposes rather than facilitating impersonation.

With reference to the Complainant's contention regarding the suspicion on malicious activity carried out on the website, the Respondent contends that, after the Respondent requested Gridinsoft to review his website, the latter was found to be devoid of malicious code, phishing or malware content and the malicious flag was removed and submits that an automated reputation score is not a finding of malicious activity, particularly after the underlying detection has been removed.

The Respondent also addresses the Complainant's contentions as to the Respondent's engagement in a pattern of conduct based on his involvement in a prior UDRP case, stating that that case was closed with an agreement to voluntary transfer without admission of liability or wrongdoing and, therefore, the decision did not establish bad faith registration, use, or pattern.

The Respondent also argues that despite having provided indication of the Registrar's contact form for the purpose of delivering messages to his attention, he never received prior communications from the Complainant before the filing of the Complaint.

The Respondent further states that it had settlement discussions with the Complainant on September 11, 2026, before receiving formal notification of the Complaint, and that he had offered to stop using the disputed domain name and move his project to another domain name, subject to an agreed transition. The Respondent asserts that he also separately confirmed that he would not register or control additional NEEDOH domain names and offered to discuss a shorter redirect period than he had initially proposed. According to the Respondent's submissions, the Complainant's proposal, however, required immediate transfer, followed by a 30-day redirect conditional on its approval of his new domain name and content, and, since the Respondent was being asked to relinquish control immediately while essential transition

arrangements remained conditional, no settlement was concluded, and he did not give unconditional consent to transfer the disputed domain name.

Lastly, the Respondent requests that the Panel identify him as "Name Redacted" throughout any published decision and related public case listing, and omit his postal address, personal email address, and telephone number from public materials noting personal privacy and safety concerns.

C. Complainant's Supplemental Filing

On October 12, 2026, the Complainant sent a Supplemental Filing addressing two specific issues in the Response that were not – and could not have been – known to the Complainant when it filed the Complaint.

The first being related to the printout of the Respondent's website supplied as Annex R-2 by the Respondent in his Response. The Complainant contends that the website illustrated in the annex is not the same as the website that existed when the Complainant filed the Complaint (also supplied as Annex 10 to the Complaint) and submits that the Respondent clearly made changes to the website upon notification of the Complaint, in order to establish rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and avoid accusations of bad faith registration and use.

The Complainant notes that in changing the website, the Respondent added a disclaimer at the top of the page, changed the logo to reflect a single color, changed the website description, contact references to manufacturer resources, deleted the logo and description and deactivated the navigation link in the footer.

In view of the above, the Complainant contends that the changes made by Respondent to his website after the Complaint was filed constitute implicit admission by Respondent that he lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and that he has acted in bad faith.

Secondly, the Complainant contends that the Respondent's privacy concerns play no role in this domain name dispute proceeding and suspects that the Respondent is attempting to use such as a pretext to avoid publication of yet another decision under the Policy identifying him as a respondent, since he provides no explanation as to how his "personal privacy and safety" are affected by his identification as the registrant of a domain name that is being used to impersonate Complainant.

The Complainant concludes by inviting the Respondent to contact the Complainant's counsel to discuss a settlement, which might avoid publication of any decision.

D. Respondent's Supplemental Filing

The Respondent sent his reply to the Complainant's Supplemental Filing on October 13, 2026.

With regards to the Complainant's assertions reference the Respondent's changes to his website after notification of the Complaint, the Respondent states that the Respondent himself repeatedly referred to the Complainant's Annex 10 and submitted his screenshots of his website defining them as "current". The Respondent however notes that, despite changes to shared headers, footers, and presentation, the substantive project, the website structure and content, particularly a 134-entry catalog, the composition and safe-use information page, the FAQs page, and links to the tracker and three guides already existed before receiving notice of the dispute and were not altered thereafter.

The Respondent also points out that the fact that the current version of his website shows the "Manufacturer resources - Schylling Inc." heading more prominently does not alter the fact that an explanatory text referring to the manufacturer and his contact details was already present before the Respondent received notice of the dispute.

Further rebuttals on Respondent's part include the change of the logo coloring where the Respondent claims that the change to "NeeDoh Hub" and a single color was expressly disclosed as a further clarification of independence and submits that repeating the instance that a change was made in that sense, does not establish the alleged intent to impersonate the Complainant.

Moreover, while the Complainant treats the changes to his website as an implicit admission of both lack of legitimate interests and bad faith, the Respondent rebuts such allegations claiming that his legitimate interest rests on the website's activities before notice of the dispute, not on rights supposedly created by later edits and that he relies on the revisions as evidence of his response to the objection, not as a substitute for the pre-dispute activity documented in the record.

With regards to the Complainant's allegations regarding the Respondent's request for redaction of his name, the Respondent rebuts that the reason for the Respondent's request is not linked to the fact that he wishes to avoid publication of yet another decision under the Policy identifying him as a respondent, but to the fact that publication of his name could facilitate identification of close relatives.

With reference to the Complainant's settlement invitation, the Respondent refers to the settlement attempts already cited in the Response and states that he remains open to a mutually agreed resolution.

The Respondent concludes with the requests that the Panel decline to admit the Complainant's Supplemental Filing or, in case it decides to admit it, that his reply to the Supplemental Filing be considered, that the Complaint be denied and that his name be redacted in the Decision.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Supplemental Filings

Before entering into the merits of the case, the Panel addresses the issue of the unsolicited supplemental filings submitted by the Parties to the Center.

No provision concerning supplemental filings is made in the Rules or Supplemental Rules, except at the request of the panel according to paragraph 12 of the Rules, which states the panel, in its sole discretion, may request any further statements or documents from the parties it may deem necessary to decide the case.

According to paragraph 10 of the Rules, the Panel has the authority to determine the admissibility, relevance, materiality and weight of the evidence, and also to conduct the proceedings with due expedition, ensuring that the Parties are treated with equality and that each Party is given a fair opportunity to present its case.

As stated in the WIPO Overview 3.1, section 4.6, unsolicited supplemental filings are generally discouraged – unless specifically requested by the panel – and the party submitting an unsolicited supplemental filing should clearly show its relevance to the case and why it was unable to provide the information contained therein in its complaint or response.

Accordingly, UDRP panels generally accept supplemental filings only when they provide material new evidence or a fair opportunity to respond to arguments that could not reasonably have been anticipated. See, along these lines, *Welcomemat Services, Inc. v. Michael Plummer Jr., MLP Enterprises Inc.*, WIPO Case No. D2017-0481.

In the case at hand, the Panel notes that the Complainant's Supplemental Filing addresses facts and arguments in the Response that could not have been known at the time of the filing of the Complaint, namely, i) the fact that the Respondent made some changes to the content of his website after being notified of the Complaint, and ii) the Respondent's request to have his name redacted from the Decision.

The Panel therefore has decided to admit the Complainant's Supplemental Filing. The Panel has also decided to admit the Respondent's Supplemental Filing to the extent that it addresses statements included in the Complainant's Supplemental Filing regarding the two issues referenced above. A summary of the Parties' Supplemental Filings is provided under Sections 5.C and 5.D above.

The Panel notes that, in the conclusion of its Supplemental Filing, the Complainant states that, if the Respondent "truly desires to avoid publication of a decision under the Policy identifying him as the respondent, Complainant encourages Respondent to contact Complainant's counsel immediately to discuss a settlement, which might avoid publication of any decision at all". In his Supplemental Filing, the Respondent replies to the settlement invitation referring to the prior settlement discussions between the Parties and indicating to be open to a "mutually agreed resolution" but also requests the Panel to deny the Complaint and identify him as "Name Redacted" in the published decision.

Having reviewed the documents and statements submitted by the parties, in order to ensure that the proceeding be conducted with due expedition and considering the settlement attempts already pursued – as detailed in the Procedural History – and the fact that the Parties have not submitted an explicit request to suspend the proceedings to further explore settlement options, the Panel does not deem it necessary to suspend the proceeding or to request further supplemental submissions from the Parties. The Panel will therefore proceed to Decision.

6.2 Redaction of Respondent's Identity

Paragraph 1 of the UDRP Rules defines the respondent as "the holder of a domain-name registration against which a complaint is initiated".

Paragraph 10(a) of the UDRP Rules states that "the Panel shall conduct the administrative proceeding in such manner as it considers appropriate in accordance with the Policy and these Rules".

The Respondent has requested that his name be redacted from the Decision for privacy reasons and safety concerns.

Under the circumstances, the Panel is prepared to redact the Respondent's name and finds that the redaction will not cause inconvenience to the Complainant.

6.3. Substantive Issues

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules: "A Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable." Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that the Complainant must prove each of the following:

(i) that the disputed domain name registered by the Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;

(ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and

(iii) that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 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. Indeed, the Complainant has provided evidence of valid trademark registrations for the NEEDOH mark.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

As to the generic Top-Level Domain ".org", it is a standard registration requirement and can be disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1.

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. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1.

According to the evidence on record, there is no relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent, and the Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to register or use its trademark or the disputed domain name. Moreover, there is no element from which the Panel could infer the Respondent's rights over the disputed domain name, or that the Respondent might be commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Panel shall now assess whether the Complainant has demonstrated that the Respondent, before receiving notice of the dispute, has used or made preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

As highlighted above and shown by the screenshots in Annex 10 to the Complaint, at the time of the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website featuring a prominent "NeeDoh" logo at the top of the website and the heading "NeeDoh Toys", reproducing the pink and orange colors of the Complainant's logo, publishing images of NEEDOH products taken from the Complainant's official website and described as "the home of authentic NeeDoh® toys by Schylling". The website displayed images and information about the Complainant's products and links to purchase them on third-party e-commerce websites. The footer included in small characters the Complainant's information, which was presented as the manufacturer's contacts "for product questions" and a disclaimer reading: "2026 NeeDoh.org. Authentic NeeDoh® toys by Schylling. NeeDoh® is a trademark of Schylling. As an Amazon Associate, we earn from qualifying purchases. Amazon and the Amazon logo are trademarks of Amazon.com, Inc. or its affiliates. eBay is a trademark of eBay Inc. AliExpress is a trademark of Alibaba Group Holding Limited. Product availability and pricing may vary by retailer".

The Panel notes that the content of the website as highlighted by Annex 10 to the Complaint was apt to suggest that the website was operated by the Complainant or one of its affiliated or authorized entities with the Complainant's consent, and the disclaimer provided at the bottom of the website was not sufficient to prevent confusion. Moreover, the presence of links such as "Shop Now", "Shop All NeeDoh Products", "Buy NeeDoh Classic", and "Start Shopping" along with the explicit indication that the Respondent was earning from qualifying purchases through the Amazon affiliation program, suggests that the Respondent clearly registered and used the disputed domain name to gain revenues, i.e., for commercial purposes.

The Panel has reviewed the current version of the website and notes that, despite the changes made by the Respondent after receiving notice of the Complaint, it still prominently features the NEEDOH trademark and product visuals and clarifies that it is an independent catalogue of NEEDOH toys manufactured by the Complainant only in a description and in the disclaimer published in the footer, where also the Complainant's contact details are provided. The Panel further notes that the browser title, "NeeDoh toys – Original NeeDoh Squishes Website", suggests an affiliation with the Complainant and the disclaimer in small characters added

at the top of the website is not sufficiently prominent. Furthermore, the links currently displayed on the website redirect to third-party e-commerce websites where not only NEEDOH products, but also third-party squeeze toys are offered for sale, and the disclaimers displayed at the top of the website and in a pop-up message appearing while visiting the website inform that "Some of these links may be affiliate links, meaning [the Respondent] may earn a small commission".

In view of the above, the Panel finds that the Respondent has not used, and is currently not using, the disputed domain name in connection with a genuine informational website, as the website is clearly aimed at advertising offerings of NEEDOH and similar toys on affiliate websites allowing the Respondent to derive revenues from such affiliations.

Even considering the Respondent as a reseller of the Complainant's genuine NEEDOH products, the Panel does not find that his use of the disputed domain name, both before and after receiving notice of the dispute, satisfies the conditions set forth in the Oki Data test for a reseller to make a bona fide offering of goods and services and thus have a legitimate interest in a domain name. Indeed, the disclaimers provided by the Respondent are not prominent and clearly visible and the content of the website before the Respondent received notice of the dispute was apt to reinforce the impression of an affiliation with the Complainant. Moreover, the links published on the Respondent's website lead users to third-party e-commerce websites where also products of the Complainant's competitors are advertised and offered for sale. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.8.1.

In addition to the above, the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's trademark NEEDOH and, therefore, carries a high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.1.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that, in light of the prior registration and use of the Complainant's trademark NEEDOH in the United States and other countries, and considering the popularity reached by the NEEDOH mark and products in the recent years, the Respondent was or could have been aware of the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name, which occurred only on April 1, 2026.

Moreover, the composition of the disputed domain name, which is identical to the Complainant's trademark NEEDOH, and its redirection to a website featuring the Complainant's trademark and images of NEEDOH products suggest that the Respondent was actually aware of, and intended to target, the Complainant and its trademark at the time of registration.

Furthermore, in view of the contents of the website to which the disputed domain name resolved, both before and after the Respondent received notice of this dispute, publishing information on the Complainant's products with links to third-party affiliate websites allowing the Respondent to earn commissions, the Panel finds that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract users to its website for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of his website according to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel notes that the presence of the disclaimer in small characters at the bottom of the website, before the filing of the Complaint, and also of the additional disclaimer inserted at the bottom of the site after the Respondent became aware of the dispute, are not sufficient to cure the likelihood of confusion, especially considering the identity of the disputed domain name with the Complainant's mark. Indeed, as stated in WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.7, "where the overall circumstances of a case point to the respondent's bad faith, the mere existence of a disclaimer cannot cure such bad faith. In such cases, panels may consider the respondent's use of a disclaimer as an admission by the respondent that users may be confused".

Based on the records, the Panel concludes that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

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 <needoh.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Luca Barbero/
Luca Barbero
Sole Panelist
Date: November 3, 2026