ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Henkel AG & Co. KGaA v. Valentina Vorovska
Case No. D2026-4195

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Henkel AG & Co. KGaA, Germany, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Valentina Vorovska, Germany.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <mocodegorilla.com> 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 17, 2026. On September 18, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 21, 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 (DT), Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 21, 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 22, 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 October 1, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 21, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 23, 2026.

The Center appointed Kaya Köklü as the sole panelist in this matter on October 29, 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 German company founded in 1876, which is internationally active in the field of chemical and consumer goods. It employs about 50,000 people worldwide and generated sales of nearly EUR 20.5 billion in 2025.

Among many other products, the Complainant offers hairstyling products under its trademark MOCO DE GORILA, which is registered as a trademark in various jurisdictions. These trademark registrations include the European Union Trademark Registration No. 017875505, registered on August 2, 2018, and United States of America Trademark Registration No. 3448052, registered on June 17, 2008, both for MOCO DE GORILA, covering protection of various products in class 3.

The Complainant further owns and operates the domain name <mocodegorila.com>, which redirects users to the Complainant's primary website at <henkel.mx>.

The Respondent is reportedly located in Germany.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 20, 2026.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website in English language that purportedly offers the Complainant's products for sale. On the website associated with the disputed domain name, the MOCO DE GORILA trademark, official logos of the Complainant and product pictures are prominently used without a visible disclaimer describing the (lack of) relation between the Respondent and the Complainant.

The Respondent did not reply to various attempts by the Complainant to resolve the dispute prior to this administrative proceeding.

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.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, the Panel shall decide the Complaint in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the three following elements is satisfied:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark 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.

As per paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the complainant bears the burden of proving that all these requirements are fulfilled, even if a respondent has not substantively replied to the complainant's contentions. *Stanworth Development Limited v. E Net Marketing Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. D2007-1228.

Concerning the uncontested information provided by a complainant, the panel may, where relevant, accept the provided reasonable factual allegations in a complaint as true. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.3.

It is further noted that the Panel has taken note of the WIPO Overview 3.1 and, where appropriate, will decide consistently with the consensus views captured therein.

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 the MOCO DE GORILA trademark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the MOCO DE GORILA mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name consists of a close misspelling of the Complainant's MOCO DE GORILA trademark, differing only by way of an added letter "l". Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.9.

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 Complainant has credibly submitted that the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has not been authorized or licensed to use the Complainant's MOCO DE GORILA trademark. 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 has particularly failed to demonstrate any of the nonexclusive circumstances evidencing rights or legitimate interests under the Policy, paragraph 4(c) or other evidence of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Bearing in mind that the disputed domain name, which is confusingly similar to the Complainant's MOCO DE GORILA trademark, resolves to a website prominently reproducing the Complainant's trademark (without the misspelling of the disputed domain name) and thus, creating the overall look and feel of a website that is operated or endorsed by the Complainant's, the Panel has no doubt that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its MOCO DE GORILA trademark when registering and while using the disputed domain name. The Panel notes that the inherently misleading nature of the disputed domain name along with the content of the associated website and the lack of a proper disclaimer indicates the Respondent illegitimate intention to mislead Internet users into believing that the associated website is an official website of the Complainant. All this demonstrates the Respondent's deliberate attempt to pass itself off as the Complainant, which in view of the Panel, 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.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.1.

As already indicated above, the Panel notes that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its MOCO DE GORILA trademark when registering the disputed domain name. It is obvious to the Panel that the Respondent has deliberately chosen the inherently misleading disputed domain name, comprising an obvious misspelling of the Complainant's MOCO DE GORILA trademark, to target the Complainant and mislead Internet users.

With respect to the use of the disputed domain name, the Panel once again notes that, for gaining illegitimate commercial gain, the disputed domain name resolves to a website that prominently uses the Complainant's MOCO DE GORILA trademark and respective logos without the misspelling of the disputed domain name, thus creating the overall look and feel as if the associated website was operated by the Complainant or at least with its authorization.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity and/or illegal activity, here, claimed passing off, constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4.

Taking all facts of the case into consideration, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy. Even more, the Panel is convinced that this is a typical cybersquatting case, which the UDRP was designed to stop.

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 <mocodegorilla.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Kaya Köklü/
Kaya Köklü
Sole Panelist
Date: November 12, 2026