

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Pipes & Shaw, LLC d/b/a Veronica Beard v. Yanyan3 Wang
Case No. D2022-4805

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Pipes & Shaw, LLC d/b/a Veronica Beard, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Fixer Advisory Group, United States.

The Respondent is Yanyan3 Wang, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <veronica-us.com> (“Domain Name”) is registered with Name.com, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 19, 2022. On December 19, 2022, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 22, 2022, the Registrar 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 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 January 6, 2023. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 26, 2023. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on January 27, 2023.

The Center appointed Marina Perraki as the sole panelist in this matter on February 10, 2023. 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

Complainant has owned and operated the VERONICA BEARD e-commerce site since 2009.

Complainant owns trademark registrations for VERONICA BEARD, including the United States trademark registration no 5,434,938 (word), filed on January 31, 2017 and registered on March 27, 2018, for goods in international class 25.

Complainant also owns the domain name registration <veronicabeard.com> registered on November 20, 2009.

The Domain Name was registered on July 9, 2022 and leads to a website mimicking that of Complainant (“the Website”), prominently displaying Complainant’s trademarks and logos and using the same stylized VB logo in the website tab, the same VERONICA BEARD stylized logo on the landing page, nearly identical model images and “VERONICA BEARD” on each product image, mimicking not only the exact same products, such as dickey jackets, which the Complainant is known for, but also copying font usage, product descriptions, styling images, color scheme and overall presentation. Although Complainant was unable to complete any transactions, per the Complaint there were fraudulent transaction attempts on the card used following attempts to purchase.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant asserts that it has established all three elements required under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists the three elements, which Complainant must satisfy with respect to the Domain Name:

- (i) the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Domain Name incorporates Complainant’s VERONICA BEARD trademark in its first and dominant part. This is sufficient to establish confusing similarity.

The letters “us”, short for United States, and the hyphen, which are added in the Domain Name, do not avoid a finding of confusing similarity (WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), section 1.8). The Panel also notes the content of the Website, which reproduces Complainant’s trademark and website content.

The generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.com” is disregarded, as gTLDs typically do not form part of the comparison on the grounds that they are required for technical reasons (*Rexel Developpements SAS v. Zhan Yequn*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-0275](#); *Hay & Robertson International Licensing AG v. C. J. Lovik*, WIPO Case No. [D2002-0122](#)).

The Panel finds that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark.

Complainant has established Policy, paragraph 4(a)(i).

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Pursuant to paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, Respondent may establish its rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name, among other circumstances, by showing any of the following elements:

- (i) before any notice to Respondent of the dispute, Respondent’s 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) Respondent (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) 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 Panel concludes that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name.

Respondent has not submitted any response and has not claimed any such rights or legitimate interests with respect to the Domain Name. As per Complainant, Respondent was not authorized to register the Domain Name.

Respondent has not demonstrated any preparations to use, or has not used the Domain Name or a trademark corresponding to the Domain Name in connection with a *bona fide* offering of goods or services.

On the contrary, as Complainant demonstrated, the Domain Name was used to host the Website to impersonate Complainant and attempt to mislead consumers into thinking that the goods purportedly offered for sale on the Website originate from Complainant. Such use demonstrates neither a *bona fide* offering of goods nor a legitimate interest of Respondent (*Arkema France v. Aaron Blaine*, WIPO Case No. [D2015-0502](#)).

A distributor or reseller can be making a *bona fide* offering of goods and thus have a legitimate interest in a domain name only if the following cumulative requirements are met (*Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#); [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.8.1: (i) respondent must actually be offering the goods at issue; (ii) respondent must use the site to sell only the trademarked goods; (iii) the site must accurately and prominently disclose the registrant’s relationship with the trademark holder; and (iv) respondent must not try to “corner the market” in domain names that reflect the trademark.)

These requirements are not fulfilled in the present case.

The Domain Name above all falsely suggests that the Website is an official site of Complainant or of an entity affiliated to or endorsed by Complainant. The Website extensively reproduces, without authorization by Complainant, Complainant’s trademarks and logos, website content, product description and photos without any disclaimer of association (or lack thereof) with Complainant. Additionally, although Complainant was unable to complete any transactions, per the Complaint there were fraudulent transaction attempts on the card used following attempts to purchase.

The Panel finds that these circumstances do not confer upon Respondent any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name.

Complainant has established Policy, paragraph 4(a)(ii).

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides that the following circumstances, “in particular but without limitation”, are evidence of the registration and use of the Domain Name in “bad faith”:

- (i) circumstances indicating that Respondent has registered or has acquired the Domain Name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the Domain Name registration to 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 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 Respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) that Respondent has registered the Domain Name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) that by using the Domain Name, Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to Respondent’s website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of Respondent’s website or location or of a product or service on Respondent’s website or location.

The Panel concludes that Respondent has registered and used the Domain Name in bad faith.

Because Complainant’s mark had been used and registered by Complainant before the Domain Name registration, and noting the content of the corresponding website, it is clear Respondent had Complainant’s mark in mind when registering the Domain Name (*Tudor Games, Inc. v. Domain Hostmaster, Customer ID No. 09382953107339 dba Whois Privacy Services Pty Ltd / Domain Administrator, Vertical Axis Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-1754](#); *Parfums Christian Dior v. Javier Garcia Quintas and Christiandior.net*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0226](#)).

Furthermore, the content of the Website gives the impression that it originates from Complainant, prominently displaying Complainant’s trademarks and logos, website content, product description and photographs on the Website, thereby giving the false impression that the Website emanates from Complainant. This further supports registration in bad faith reinforcing the likelihood of confusion, as Internet users are likely to consider the Domain Name as in some way endorsed by or connected with Complainant ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4).

The above further indicates that Respondent knew of Complainant and chose the Domain Name with knowledge of Complainant and its industry (*Safepay Malta Limited v. ICS Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2015-0403](#)).

As regards bad faith use, Complainant demonstrated that the Domain Name is employed to host a Website which appeared falsely to be that of Complainant. Additionally, although Complainant was unable to complete any transactions, per the Complaint there were fraudulent transaction attempts on the card used following attempts to purchase.

Furthermore, the Domain Name has been operated by intentionally creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant’s trademark and business. This further supports the finding of bad faith use (*Arkema France v.*

Aaron Blaine, supra; Aktiebolaget Electrolux v. Priscilla Quaiotti Passos, WIPO Case No. [D2011-0388](#); and [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 3.1.4 and 3.2.1).

Under these circumstances and on this record, the Panel finds that Respondent registered and used the Domain Name in bad faith.

Complainant has established Policy, paragraph 4(a)(iii)

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 <veronica-us.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Marina Perraki/

Marina Perraki

Sole Panelist

Date: February 24, 2023