

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

EE Holding Group LLC v. Muhammad Saleem  
Case No. D2024-0377

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is EE Holding Group LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by The Sladkus Law Group, United States.

The Respondent is Muhammad Saleem, United Kingdom.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <ericmanuel.ltd> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 27, 2024. On January 29, 2024, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 29, 2024, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 30, 2024, 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 amendment to the Complaint on January 30, 2024.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 February 5, 2024. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 25, 2024. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 26, 2024.

The Center appointed Edoardo Fano as the sole panelist in this matter on February 29, 2024. 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.

The Panel has not received any requests from the Complainant or the Respondent regarding further submissions, waivers or extensions of deadlines, and the Panel has not found it necessary to request any further information from the Parties.

Having reviewed the communication records in the case file provided by the Center, the Panel finds that the Center has discharged its responsibility under the Rules, paragraph 2(a), "to employ reasonably available means calculated to achieve actual notice to [the] Respondent". Therefore, the Panel shall issue its Decision based upon the Complaint, the Policy, the Rules and the Supplemental Rules and without the benefit of a response from the Respondent.

The language of the proceeding is English, being the language of the Registration Agreement, as per paragraph 11(a) of the Rules.

#### **4. Factual Background**

The Complainant is EE Holding Group LLC, a United States company owning the intellectual property of the fashion designer Eric Emmanuel, including all trademark rights, among which the following trademark registrations for ERIC EMANUEL:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 6,721,224 for ERIC EMANUEL, registered on May 24, 2022;
- International Trademark Registration No. 1762468 for ERIC EMANUEL, registered on October 11, 2023.

The Complainant also operates on the Internet, its official website being "www.ericmanuel.com".

The Complainant provided evidence in support of the above.

According to the Whois records, the disputed domain name was registered on October 29, 2023. It resolves to a website in which the Complainant's trademarks and logo are reproduced and goods bearing the Complainant's trademark are purportedly offered for sale.

#### **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 states that the disputed domain name is identical to its trademark ERIC EMANUEL.

Moreover, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name since it has not been authorized by the Complainant to register the disputed domain name or to use its trademark within the disputed domain name, is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and is not making either a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name resolves to a website on which the Complainant's trademark and logo are reproduced, and counterfeit goods bearing the Complainant's trademark are offered for sale.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in bad faith, since the Complainant's trademark ERIC EMANUEL is distinctive and well known in the field of fashion. Therefore, the Respondent targeted the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name and the Complainant contends that the use of the disputed domain name to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website, creating a likelihood of confusion with the

Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website, qualifies as bad faith registration and use.

## **B. Respondent**

The Respondent has made no reply to the Complainant's contentions and is in default. In reference to paragraphs 5(f) and 14 of the Rules, no exceptional circumstances explaining the default have been put forward or are apparent from the record.

A respondent is not obliged to participate in a proceeding under the Policy, but if it fails to do so, reasonable facts asserted by a complainant may be taken as true, and appropriate inferences, in accordance with paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, may be drawn. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.3.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Paragraph 4(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; 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.

### **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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7.

It is also well accepted that a generic Top-Level Domain, in this case ".ltd", is typically ignored when assessing the similarity between a trademark and a domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

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.

While the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the often impossible 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. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

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

The disputed domain name resolves to a website in which the Complainant's trademarks and logo are reproduced and goods bearing the Complainant's trademark are purportedly offered for sale. Should the Complainant's products sold on the website to which the disputed domain name is directing Internet users be genuine products, legitimately acquired by the Respondent, the question that would arise is whether the Respondent would therefore have any rights or legitimate interests in using the disputed domain name that is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark in circumstances that are likely to give rise to confusion.

According to the current state of UDRP decisions in relation to the issue of resellers as summarized in the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), 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; and
- (iv) the respondent must not try to 'corner the market' in domain names that reflect the trademark."

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

Even if the products sold by the Respondent were the Complainant's genuine products, from inspection of the Respondent's website, the Panel finds that the use of the Complainant's trademark and logo on the homepage and the lack of any prominent and accurate disclaimer disclosing the lack of relationship with the Complainant would falsely suggest to Internet users, under the *Oki Data* principles (see above), that the website to which the disputed domain name resolves is owned by the Complainant or at least somehow affiliated to the Complainant.

The Panel therefore concludes that the disputed domain name is not being used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Moreover, the Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name carries a high risk of implied affiliation as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

Based on the available record, 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, regarding the registration in bad faith of the disputed domain name, the reputation of the Complainant's trademark ERIC EMANUEL in the field of fashion is clearly established, and the Panel finds that the Respondent must have known of the Complainant, and deliberately registered the disputed domain name in bad faith, especially because of the content of the Respondent's website at the disputed domain name, on which the Complainant's trademark and logo are reproduced, and goods bearing the Complainant's trademark are purportedly offered for sale.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name is also being used in bad faith since the Respondent is trying to attract Internet users to its website by creating likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the disputed domain name's source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement, an activity clearly detrimental to the Complainant's business.

The above suggests to the Panel that the Respondent intentionally registered and is using the disputed domain name in order both to disrupt the Complainant's business, and to attract Internet users to its website in accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Furthermore, the Panel considers that the nature of the inherently misleading disputed domain name, which is identical to the Complainant's trademark, further supports a finding of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

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

## **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 <ericemanuel.ltd> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Edoardo Fano/*

**Edoardo Fano**

Sole Panelist

Date: March 7, 2024