

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

JUUL Labs, Inc. v. M Shakib

Case No. DAE2026-0004

1. The Parties

The Complainant is JUUL Labs, Inc., of United States of America, represented by Saba & Co. IP, Lebanon.

The Respondent is M Shakib, of Bangladesh.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <juldubai.ae> is registered with AE Domain Administration (.aeDA).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 10, 2026. On March 11, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to AE Domain Administration (.aeDA) a request for registrant verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 12, 2026, AE Domain Administration (.aeDA) transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the UAE Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy for – UAE DRP approved by .aeDA (the “Policy”), the Rules for UAE Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy – UAE DRP (the “Rules”), and the Supplemental Rules for UAE Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy – UAE DRP (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2(a) and 4(a), the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5(a), the due date for Response was April 12, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any Response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 4, 2026.

The Center appointed Mireille Buydens as the sole panelist in this matter on May 7, 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 JUUL Labs, Inc., a United States of America company operating in the field of vapes and electronic cigarettes. The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations worldwide for JUUL (hereafter “the Trademark” or “the JUUL Trademark”), including:

- United Arab Emirates Trademark Registration No. 303365 for JUUL, registered on April 24, 2019;
- United Arab Emirates Trademark Registration No. 365558 for JUUL, registered on March 16, 2022;
- United Arab Emirates Trademark Registration No. 365559 for JUUL, registered on March 16, 2022.

The Complainant is also the owner of the following domain names: <juul.com> (which resolves to the Complainant’s main website), <juul.ca> and <juul.co.uk>.

According to the information received from the Registry, the disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent on December 18, 2025. It resolves to an active website where the Respondent is offering electronic cigarettes and pods under the JUUL Trademark. The website presents itself as “Juul Dubai” (“At Juul Dubai, we started with a simple goal: to make vaping easy and enjoyable for everyone in the UAE. Our founder, Juul Dubai, saw a need for a reliable place where people could find the best vaping products without confusion or hassle”). The JUUL Trademark is prominently displayed on the website. On the bottom of the page, a disclaimer mentions that “WWW.JULDUBAI.AE is not affiliated with JUUL. All products available on our website are independently sourced and sold.”

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.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the JUUL Trademark as it includes the word “jul” (which is very similar to the JUUL Trademark) followed by the geographical denomination “Dubai”.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent’s name does not contain the word “jul” and, to the best of the Complainant’s knowledge, the Respondent is not commonly known under the name “jul” or “juldubai”. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use the JUUL Trademark in any way, and the Respondent is not an authorized distributor of the Complainant. By using a trademark that is almost identical to the JUUL Trademark without the Complainant’s consent, the Respondent creates the false impression that the website is affiliated with or sponsored by the Complainant.

Finally, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used by the Respondent in bad faith. The Respondent has, without the Complainant’s authorization, registered the disputed domain name which is confusingly similar to the famous JUUL Trademark for selling products presented as “JUUL products”, thereby misleading consumers about the business relationship with the Complainant. The Respondent uses the disputed domain name to resolve to a website presented as “JUUL Dubai”, where the Respondent presents itself as the Complainant’s representative for Dubai, which is not true.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 6(a) of the Policy lists three elements, which the Complainant must satisfy in order to succeed:

- (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 respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark for the purposes of the Policy.

The Panel finds the JUUL Trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name consists of a misspelling of the JUUL Trademark (the JUUL Trademark is reproduced with one letter "u" missing), which is recognizable in the disputed domain name. Domain names which consist of a variation of a trademark (typically a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling, referred to as typosquatting) are considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.9.¹

The fact that the disputed domain name includes an additional term ("dubai") does not affect the confusing similarity. Although the addition of this term may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the JUUL Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

As to the addition of the ccTLD (country code Top Level Domain) ".ae", the ccTLD is merely instrumental to its use on the Internet and shall be disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test.

Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the JUUL Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 6(a)(ii) of the Policy requires the Complainant to prove that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Respondent may establish rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name by demonstrating in accordance with paragraph 6(c) of the Policy any of the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation:

"(i) before any notice to you of the dispute, your use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the domain name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or

¹ In light of the substantive and procedural similarities between the uaeDRP and the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy ("UDRP"), the Panel has cited decisions under the UDRP and the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), where appropriate.

services; or

(ii) you (as an individual, business, or other organization) have been commonly known by the domain name, even if you have acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or

(iii) you are making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue”

According to paragraph 6(a) of the Policy, the Complainant has the burden of proving the three elements of the Policy. However, satisfying the burden of proving a lack of the Respondent’s rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name according to paragraph 6(a)(ii) of the Policy is potentially quite difficult, since proving a negative circumstance is generally more complicated than establishing a positive one. As such, it is well accepted that it is sufficient for the Complainant to make a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name in order to shift the burden of production to the Respondent. If the Respondent fails to demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name in accordance with paragraph 6(c) of the Policy or on any other basis, the Complainant is deemed to have satisfied paragraph 6(a)(ii) of the Policy.

Having reviewed the 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 evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name for a legitimate noncommercial or fair use or in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services because the Respondent is offering for sale the Complainant’s products, without being an authorized distributor or reseller nor having any link with the Complainant, and thereby using a domain name that is confusingly similar to its JUUL Trademark.

Should the pods and electronic cigarettes purportedly sold on the website under the disputed domain name be genuine products, legitimately acquired by the Respondent, the question that would arise is whether the Respondent would therefore have a legitimate interest in using the disputed domain name that is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s Trademark.

According to the current state of UDRP decisions in relation to the issue of resellers as summarized in the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.8.1: “(...) resellers, distributors, or service providers using a domain name containing the complainant’s trademark to undertake sales or repairs related to the complainant’s goods or services may be making a bona fide offering of goods and services and thus have a legitimate interest in such domain name.

Outlined in the “Oki Data test”, the following cumulative requirements will be applied in the specific conditions of a UDRP case: (i) the respondent must actually be offering the goods or services at issue; (ii) the respondent must use the site to sell only the trademarked goods or services; (iii) the site must accurately and prominently disclose the registrant’s relationship with the trademark holder; (iv) and the respondent must not try to ‘corner the market’ in domain names that reflect the trademark.” .

These criteria are cumulative.

This summary is based on the UDRP decision in *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#).

In the present case, it is not argued that the products offered for sale on the website under the disputed domain name are counterfeited products, and the website does not offer other products than the JUUL products. The Panel further notes that the website at the disputed domain name contains a disclaimer explaining that “WWW.JULDUBAI.AE is not affiliated with JUUL. All products available on our website are independently sourced and sold.” However, this disclaimer, placed at the bottom of the website, is contradicted by the content of the website itself, as the website presents itself as being the Complainant’s website for Dubai: on the top of the first page, it is indeed mentioned “At Juul Dubai, we started with a

simple goal: to make vaping easy and enjoyable for everyone in the UAE. Our founder, Juul Dubai, saw a need for a reliable place where people could find the best vaping products without confusion or hassle". The Respondent presents itself as "JUUL Dubai" and explains that its founder is JUUL Dubai. Taking also into account that the JUUL Trademark is prominently displayed on various places on the website, the Internet users will be misled into falsely believing that the website under the disputed domain name is the Complainant's website for Dubai. The declarations on the website, where the Respondent presents itself as "JUUL Dubai", are not sufficiently clarified by the disclaimer on the bottom of the page, which can go unnoticed to the Internet users.

Moreover, the Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered or is Being Used in Bad Faith

While paragraph 6(a)(iii) of the Policy requires a demonstration that a domain name has either been registered or is being used in bad faith, the Complainant has argued that the Respondent has both registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Paragraph 6(b) of the Policy provides that "for the purposes of paragraph 6(a)(iii), the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration or use of a domain name in bad faith: (i) circumstances indicating that [the respondent has] registered or has acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of the complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of its documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or (ii) that [the respondent has] registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that [the respondent has] engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or (iii) that [the respondent has] registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of the complainant; or (iv) that by using the 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] website or location".

Regarding the registration in bad faith of the disputed domain name, the Panel notes that the Complainant has filed evidence of the reputation of the Complainant's trademark JUUL in the field of vapes and electronic cigarettes (reputation also recognized by a former decision, see e.g. *Juul Labs v. emon xii*, WIPO Case No. [DAE2024-0017](#)). Taking this reputation into account, the Panel finds that the Respondent must have known of the Complainant, and deliberately registered the disputed domain name in bad faith for being-fitting of its reputation.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name is also being used in bad faith since the Respondent prominently displays the JUUL Trademark and presents itself as "JUUL Dubai". The Respondent is thereby trying to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's Trademark as to the disputed domain name's source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement.

The above suggests to the Panel that the Respondent intentionally registered and is using the disputed domain name in order to attract Internet users to its website in accordance with paragraph 6(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The foregoing conclusion is not affected by the fact that the website under the disputed domain name contains a disclaimer explaining that “WWW.JULDUBAI.AE is not affiliated with JUUL. All products available on our website are independently sourced and sold”. 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. In assessing the impact of a disclaimer – in addition to the composition of the disputed domain name itself – panels will also look at the manner of the respondent’s use of the complainant’s mark on the relevant site, to ascertain whether such use is truly referential and does not overtake any claimed fair use, or whether the overall impression created is one of affiliation with the complainant which does not in fact exist. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), Section 3.7. In the case at hand, the Panel considers that the prominent use of the JUUL Trademark on every page of the website and the content of the website (where Respondent presents itself as being “JUUL Dubai”) implies that the overall impression created is one of affiliation with the Complainant. The Respondent has intentionally attempted to create the false impression that the website is affiliated to the Complainant as “JUUL Dubai”, and the disclaimer at the bottom of the page only confirms that the Respondent perfectly knew of the existence of the Complainant and of the risk of confusion (risk that is not cured by this disclaimer as it is contradicted by the content of the website itself).

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 6(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <juldubai.ae> be transferred to the Complainant

/Mireille Buydens/

Mireille Buydens

Sole Panelist

Date: May 21, 2026