

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

CHARLI D'AMELIO LLC v. Piyush Roy
Case No. DCO2025-0081

1. The Parties

The Complainant is CHARLI D'AMELIO LLC, United States of America ("United states" or "U.S."), represented by Chipperson Law Group, P.C., United States.

The Respondent is Piyush Roy, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <charlidameliomerch.co> (the "Disputed Domain Name") is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 22, 2025. On September 23, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On September 24, 2025, 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, Privacy service provided by Withheld Privacy ehf*) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 26, 2025, 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 October 1, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint 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 2, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 22, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 23, 2025.

The Center appointed Nick J. Gardner as the sole panelist in this matter on October 30, 2025. 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 the worldwide exclusive licensee of the personal name and likeness of Ms. Charli D'Amelio, a social media influencer and reality television personality who rose to prominence on the TikTok platform in 2019.

Ms. D'Amelio posted her first dance video to gain traction on TikTok in 2019. By November 2020, she became the first TikTok star to reach 100 million followers, earning her a 2021 Guinness World Record. Her career achievements prior to the registration of the Disputed Domain Name include:

- In January 2020, signing with United Talent Agency;
- In February 2020, appearing in a Super Bowl commercial for Sabra hummus;
- In March 2020, partnering with Procter & Gamble for the #DistanceDance TikTok campaign;
- In May 2020, securing a podcast deal with Ramble Podcast Network and starring in the animated film "Star Dog and Turbo Cat";
- In August 2020, launching a nail polish collection with Orosa Beauty and publishing "Essentially Charli: The Ultimate Guide to Keeping It Real," which became a New York Times bestseller; and
- From September 2021 to September 2023, starring in the Hulu docuseries "The D'Amelio Show."

The Complainant operates an e-commerce store at "www.charlidamelio.com" (registered on October 25, 2019) selling branded clothing and fashion accessories. The Charli D'Amelio name has been licensed for various consumer products including fashion items, beauty products, mattresses, books, and beverages (notably "The Charli" drink offered by Dunkin' Donuts in September 2020).

The Complainant owns multiple United States federal trademark registrations for CHARLI D'AMELIO, including:

- U.S. Registration No. 7,043,410, filed March 24, 2020, registered May 2, 2023, for "t-shirts, sweatshirts, hats" in International Class 25;
- U.S. Registration No. 7,262,421, filed March 24, 2020, registered January 2, 2024, for entertainment services in International Class 41.

These trademarks are referred to as the CHARLI D'AMELIO trademark in this decision.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on November 19, 2022. According to evidence submitted, the website associated with the Disputed Domain Name (the "Respondent's Website") offers merchandise purporting to be related to Ms. D'Amelio, including t-shirts, hoodies, shorts, and jackets.

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 main points the Complainant makes are as follows:

- (i) The Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to the CHARLI D'AMELIO trademark in which the Complainant has rights, as it incorporates the trademark in its entirety with only the addition of the descriptive term "merch" and the country-code Top-Level Domain ("ccTLD") ".co";
- (ii) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name as the Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, nor is the Respondent otherwise affiliated with or authorized by the Complainant to use the CHARLI D'AMELIO trademark or to sell merchandise bearing this mark;
- (iii) The Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith, as evidenced by the Respondent's registration of the domain name well after Ms. D'Amelio achieved worldwide fame, the offering of unauthorized counterfeit merchandise trading on the Complainant's trademark and Ms. D'Amelio's personality rights.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not submit a Response.

6. Discussion and Findings

Preliminary Matters

The Panel notes that no Response was filed. However, given the Complaint and Written Notice were sent to the relevant addresses disclosed by the Registrar, the Panel considers that this satisfies the requirement in paragraph 2(a) of the UDRP Rules to "employ reasonably available means calculated to achieve actual notice". Accordingly, the Panel considers it is able to proceed to determine this Complaint and to draw inferences from the Respondent's failure to file any Response. While the Respondent's failure to file a Response does not automatically result in a decision in favor of the Complainant, the Panel may draw appropriate inferences from the Respondent's default (see, e.g., *Verner Panton Design v. Fontana di Luce Corp*, WIPO Case No. [D2012-1909](#)).

Substantive Matters

To succeed, in accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must satisfy the Panel that:

- (i) the Disputed Domain Name is identical with 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 and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has established rights in the CHARLI D'AMELIO trademark through its United States federal trademark registrations. The Panel finds the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to this trademark.

Previous UDRP panels have consistently held that domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark for purposes of the Policy “when the domain name includes the trademark, or a confusingly similar approximation, regardless of the other terms in the domain name” (*Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Richard MacLeod d/b/a For Sale*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0662](#)).

The Disputed Domain Name incorporates the CHARLI D’AMELIO trademark in its entirety. The addition of the descriptive term “merch” (a common abbreviation for “merchandise”) does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

It is also well established that the ccTLD, in this case “.co”, does not affect the Disputed Domain Name for the purpose of determining whether it is identical or confusingly similar. See, for example, *Rollerblade, Inc. v. Chris McCrady*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0429](#).

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark and hence the first condition of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been fulfilled.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Panel finds that CHARLI D’AMELIO is a distinctive personal name that has become strongly associated with Ms. D’Amelio as a prominent social media personality and with the Complainant’s commercial activities conducted under license.

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances any of which is sufficient to demonstrate that a respondent has rights or legitimate interests in a domain name:

- (i) before any notice to the respondent of the dispute, 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 services; or
- (ii) the respondent has been commonly known by the domain name, even if the respondent has acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or
- (iii) the respondent is 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.

The Complainant has not authorised, licensed, or permitted the Respondent to register or use the Disputed Domain Name or to use the CHARLI D’AMELIO trademark. Based on the facts and circumstances referred above the Panel considers the Complainant has prior rights in the CHARLI D’AMELIO (common law) trademark which precede the Respondent’s registration of the Disputed Domain Name. The Complainant has therefore established a prima facie case that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name and thereby the burden of production shifts to the Respondent to produce evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name (see for example *Do The Hustle, LLC v. Tropic Web*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0624](#); *Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2003-0455](#)).

There is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name or that the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of it.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has failed to produce any evidence to establish any rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. Accordingly the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name and the second condition of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been fulfilled.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel finds clear evidence of bad faith registration and use in this case. Under paragraph 4(b) of the Policy, evidence of registration and use in bad faith includes:

“(iv) by using the domain name, you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your web site or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your web site or location or of a product or service on your web site or location.”

This provision directly applies here. The Respondent is using the Disputed Domain Name to operate a commercial website selling counterfeit merchandise that falsely suggests association with Ms. D’Amelio and the Complainant. The Disputed Domain Name itself – combining the famous name with “merch” – is calculated to attract Internet users seeking Charli D’Amelio merchandise.

The Panel also notes that the Respondent has not availed itself of the opportunity to present any case of good faith use and the Panel infers that none exists.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith and the third condition of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been fulfilled.

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 <charlidamelio merch.co> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nick J. Gardner/

Nick J. Gardner

Sole Panelist

Date: November 13, 2025