ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
419studios Ltd v. Adeel Abbas
Case No. D2026-4064

1. The Parties

The Complainant is 419studios Ltd, United Kingdom ("UK"), represented by BrandShelter, France.

The Respondent is Adeel Abbas, Pakistan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <corteizstoreuk.com> is registered with CloudFlare, 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 10, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 11, 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 (DATA REDACTED) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 14, 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 25, 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 28, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 18, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 22, 2026.

The Center appointed William A. Van Caenegem as the sole panelist in this matter on October 27, 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, 419STUDIOS LTD, is a UK-based private limited company trading as the streetwear brand Corteiz, specializing in artistic creation and apparel.

The Complainant is owner of a number of trademark registrations, including CORTEIZ, United Kingdom Trademark Registration No UK00003976277, registered on March 1, 2024; CORTEIZ RULES THE WORLD, International Trademark Registration No 1816106, registered on May 3, 2024; and CORTEIZ, European Union Trademark Registration No 018963656, registered on May 3, 2024.

The Complainant is also the owner of domain names composed of CORTEIZ alone or combined with another element, including the domain name <corteiz.com> registered since January 22, 2021.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 15, 2025 and resolves to “a fraudulent boutique proposing for sale supposed CORTEIZ’s products”..

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 points out that the disputed domain name consists of the term CORTEIZ and the generic terms “store” and “uk”. The Complainant contends that it is well-established that in cases where the distinctive and prominent element of a disputed domain name is a registered trademark and the only variation is the addition of a generic word or a number, such variation does not typically negate the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the trademark. The Complainant contends that in the result, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its registered trademark CORTEIZ.

The Complainant further asserts that the Respondent identified by the Registrar does not appear to have any trademark rights in relation to the term CORTEIZ. Nor has the Respondent been authorized by the Complainant to make any use whatsoever of that term. The Complainant further argues that given the composition of the disputed domain name and the activities conducted at the website to which it resolves, the Respondent could not have been ignorant of the Complainant’s prior trademark rights at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. The term CORTEIZ is not descriptive and not required by the Respondent to describe goods or services, the Complainant adds.

The Complainant says that it suspects goods offered for sale at the offending website under the disputed domain name are counterfeit. Nothing at the said website discloses the actual relationship between the Respondent and the Complainant, which is in any case nonexistent. The most likely conclusion an Internet user would arrive at is that the said website is affiliated with the Complainant, the latter contends, and an Internet user would thus be diverted from the Complainant’s own web presence. This amounts to willful conduct that establishes that the Respondent is not interested in using the disputed domain name in connection with any legitimate purpose.

Further, the Complainant contends that given the composition of the disputed domain name, consisting of its distinctive trademark and a term descriptive of its activities, the Respondent could not have been ignorant of the existence of the Complainant's trademark registrations for the term CORTEIZ. A simple Internet search would in any case have revealed the Complainant's trademark rights. The website to which the disputed domain name resolves offers for sale products supposedly coming from the Complainant, and therefore, the latter says, it is unlikely that the Respondent could have been ignorant of the existence of the Complainant's trademark rights in respect of the sign CORTEIZ at the time of registration of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant adds that the website to which the disputed domain name resolves is a fraudulent boutique offering for sale supposed CORTEIZ products. The Complainant points out that in this regard, the Respondent does not hesitate to reproduce the Complainant's trademarks, logos and visuals. The Complainant says that such use demonstrates the Respondent's intention to make unfair commercial use of the Complainant's distinctive trademark by creating a risk of confusion with its trademarks and activities. Creating a likelihood of confusion in this manner is in bad faith, the Complainant contends. The Complainant concludes that it is obvious that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in order to pass off its related website as a website of or licensed by the Complainant, and that for commercial gain.

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 registered trademark CORTEIZ for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Although the addition of other terms, here "store" and "uk" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that in this case 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.

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.

The Respondent is not known by the disputed domain name or the term CORTEIZ and there is no indication that the Respondent had legitimately acquired trademark rights in that term prior to registration of the disputed domain name. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here the establishment of a passing off website that replicates, without authorization, the Complainant's insignia and representations of its goods, does not give rise to the recognition of rights or legitimate interests in a Respondent who engages in it.

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 Respondent acquired a domain name that comprises a highly distinctive registered trademark that was well established in the UK market at the time of registration, and that belongs to the Complainant. A simple Internet or trademark search would have revealed the rights of the Complainant in the mark. The composition of the disputed domain name also indicates that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its rights in the CORTEIZ mark at the time of registration, as does the fact that goods appearing to be CORTEIZ branded are purportedly offered for sale there. The term "store" makes reference to the retail activities in which the Complainant engages, and the term "uk" to the location of its commercial undertaking.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website that by unauthorized replication of the Complainant's trademark, logos, and goods, and by presenting itself as "Corteiz: The Streetwear Revolution from London", gives the false impression of being authorized or established by the latter. In reality there is no legitimate connection between the Complainant and the Respondent and its offending website. The latter is more likely than not established for the purpose of misleading Internet users and deceiving them into thinking they have arrived at a website operated by the Complainant. This is quite obviously not the case, and the Respondent's actions thus amount to a use in bad faith of the disputed domain name.

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 <corteizstoreuk.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/William A. Van Caenegem/
William A. Van Caenegem
Sole Panelist
Date: November 10, 2026