

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108844

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108844
Time of filing	2026-08-05 09:52:59
Domain names	americangirlus.com, americangirlx.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Dvořáková (Case admin)
------	-----------------------------

Complainant

Organization	AMERICAN GIRL, LLC
--------------	--------------------

Complainant representative

Organization	Convey srl
--------------	------------

Respondents

Name	Maine Ville
Name	Jony MAICK

OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The Panel is not aware of any other legal proceedings which are pending or decided and which relate to the disputed domain name.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant is the owner of registered trade mark rights in AMERICAN GIRL, including

- EUTM No. 005925961 - AMERICAN GIRL (word mark), Classes 16, 25, and 28, registered on February 27, 2008;
- US Trademark No. 3116340 - AMERICAN GIRL (combined mark), Class 28, registered on July 18, 2006;
- US Trademark No. 3185615 - AMERICAN GIRL (combined mark), Class 35, registered on December 19, 2006;
- China Trademark No. 2017657 - AMERICAN GIRL (word mark), Class 28, registered on March 21, 2004;
- China Trademark No. 11558724 - AMERICAN GIRL (word mark), Class 25, registered on July 21, 2015.

The Complainant also operates its principal online presence at <americangirl.com> and has an established social media and retail presence.

On the evidence before it, the Panel is satisfied that AMERICAN GIRL is a distinctive mark with a reputation.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The AMERICAN GIRL brand of dolls was created in 1986 and has been used extensively in trade in connection with dolls, accessories, books, retail services, audiovisual content and related consumer products. It was later acquired by Mattel.

The disputed domain names <americangirlus.com> and <americangirlx.com> were registered between 24 November 2025 and 12 December 2025.

Before the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain names resolved to websites displaying the AMERICAN GIRL mark and offering for sale purported AMERICAN GIRL products.

Following enforcement action, <americangirlx.com> ceased resolving to an active website.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain name should be transferred to it.

No administratively compliant Response has been filed.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy).

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the Respondent to have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy).

BAD FAITH

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy).

PROCEDURAL FACTORS

The Panel is satisfied that all procedural requirements under UDRP were met and there is no other reason why it would be inappropriate to provide a decision.

The Complaint names two registrants and seeks consolidation of the two disputed domain names into a single proceeding. Under paragraphs 3(c) and 10(e) of the Rules, consolidation may be appropriate where the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control and where consolidation would be fair and equitable to all parties. Procedural efficiency is also relevant.

The Panel grants consolidation. The evidence shows a sufficient pattern of common control or coordinated conduct. Both disputed domain names were registered through the same Registrar, use the same hosting provider, incorporate the Complainant's AMERICAN GIRL mark in closely related forms, and were used for websites with materially the same look and feel and the same essential commercial presentation. The registrations were made within a short period of one another. Those circumstances, considered together, are unlikely to be coincidental and support the inference that the domain names are subject to common control or, at minimum, coordinated action by persons acting in concert.

The Panel has considered the consolidation request by reference to the approach reflected in section 4.11.2 of the WIPO Overview 3.0. The question is not whether the registrant data are identical, but whether the available circumstances establish, on the balance of probabilities, that the domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control and whether consolidation would be fair and equitable. Common registrar or hosting arrangements would not, standing alone, necessarily be sufficient. Here, however, those features form part of a much more specific pattern: the same distinctive trade mark is reproduced in both names; each name adds only a short suffix; the names were registered within a confined period; and the associated websites were presented in materially the same manner for the same commercial purpose.

The website evidence is particularly material to that assessment. The Complaint identifies the printed website material and screenshots in evidence and states that both sites displayed the AMERICAN GIRL mark, purported to offer AMERICAN GIRL

products, and closely imitated the branding, visual presentation and structure of the Complainant's official online presence. The parallel domain-name construction and parallel website use make the inference of coordinated conduct substantially stronger than could be drawn from shared technical providers alone.

Panel also notes that the footer exhibited for <americangirlx.com> states "©2024 Americangirlus. All rights reserved". Far from identifying the operator as an independent reseller, that wording provides an additional connection between the two disputed websites.

The two named Respondents are Maine Ville, the registrant of <americangirlus.com>, and Jony MAICK, the registrant of <americangirlx.com>. Having granted consolidation, the Panel will, except where it is necessary to distinguish between them or the individual disputed domain names, refer to the two named Respondents collectively as the "Respondent" for the remainder of this Decision.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must establish each of the following: (i) the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trade mark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and (iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

The Policy does not provide for an automatic default judgment. Even in the absence of a Response, the Panel must be satisfied on the evidence that each element has been proved.

1. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has rights in the AMERICAN GIRL mark by virtue of its registered trade marks and longstanding use.

Each disputed domain name incorporates the AMERICAN GIRL mark in a form in which it remains immediately recognizable. In <americangirlus.com>, the mark is reproduced in its entirety with the addition of the geographic abbreviation "us". In <americangirlx.com>, the mark is reproduced in its entirety with the addition of the letter "x". Neither addition prevents a finding of confusing similarity.

The addition of "us" may reinforce rather than dispel association because it is apt to be understood as referring to the Complainant's United States operations. The additional letter "x" is an obvious minor variation of the mark. The overall pattern across both registrations is characteristic of typosquatting or typo-variant targeting: the distinctive mark is retained, while a small suffix is added in a way that preserves immediate recognition of the mark and is liable to divert users seeking the Complainant.

The Panel distinguishes between the precise mechanics of the two names. The addition of "x" is a classic minor-letter variation of the kind commonly associated with typosquatting. The addition of "us" is more naturally understood as a geographic or market designation than as a typographical error. But the legal result under the first element is the same: in each case AMERICAN GIRL remains immediately recognisable and dominant. Taken together, the two registrations disclose a pattern of targeting directed at users seeking the Complainant's official United States retail presence.

The generic Top-Level Domain ".com" is disregarded for the purposes of this first element. The Panel therefore finds that each disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trade mark in which the Complainant has rights. The first element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is satisfied.

2. Rights or Legitimate Interests

It is well established that a complainant is required to make out a prima facie case that a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. Once that is done, the burden of production shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests, while the ultimate burden of proof remains on the complainant. See *Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. D2003-0455.

The Complainant has made out the required prima facie case. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by either disputed domain name, has any trade mark rights corresponding to AMERICAN GIRL, or has been licensed, authorised or otherwise permitted by the Complainant to use the mark.

More importantly, the actual use shown in the record is inconsistent with any bona fide offering of goods or services or any legitimate non-commercial or fair use. The websites associated with the disputed domain names displayed the Complainant's mark, presented purported AMERICAN GIRL dolls for sale, and closely imitated the branding, structure and appearance of the Complainant's official site. Indeed, on the evidence, these are not websites that look like ordinary third-party resellers carrying American Girl products among their stock. They are presented as American Girl itself. For example, *americangirlus.com*'s title is "American Girl Dolls, Clothes & Accessories | American Girl®", and its footer describes American Girl dolls in the first person-brand presentation while copyrighting the domain itself. *Americangirlx.com* similarly uses the title "American Girl® – Shop 18" Dolls, Clothing, Playsets & More" and the American Girl logo throughout. The Panel also notes that the footer exhibited for <americangirlx.com> states "©2024 Americangirlus. All rights reserved". Far from identifying the operator as an independent reseller, that wording provides an additional connection between the two disputed websites and reinforces the impression that the

sites were presented as related AMERICAN GIRL-branded retail locations. There was no test purchase. But the Panel does not need to determine conclusively whether the products displayed were genuine or counterfeit.

The Panel has considered whether the use might nevertheless qualify as legitimate reseller use under the principles in *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. D2001-0903. The evidence does not support that conclusion. Even assuming in the Respondent's favour that the goods displayed on the websites were genuine AMERICAN GIRL goods and that the first two Oki Data requirements could therefore be satisfied, the third requirement is plainly problematic. A reseller relying upon the Complainant's mark must accurately and prominently disclose its relationship with the trade mark owner. The exhibited websites do the opposite. They prominently reproduce the AMERICAN GIRL mark and logo, employ the Complainant's product imagery and branding, and present themselves throughout as American Girl retail websites. The evidence before the Panel contains no accurate and prominent statement that either website is operated by an independent reseller, is unauthorised by the Complainant, or is otherwise unaffiliated with American Girl. The ordinary footer links to matters such as "About Us", "Contact Us", privacy, refunds or terms do not themselves constitute such a disclosure. Indeed, the presentation is calculated to leave the opposite impression: that the visitor has reached an official AMERICAN GIRL retail site.

The fourth Oki Data consideration also points against legitimate reseller use. The Respondent is not merely using a single domain name reasonably necessary to identify the goods being resold. The record concerns two closely related domain names, <americangirlus.com> and <americangirlx.com>, each appropriating the Complainant's mark and each used for substantially similar branded retail sites. That pattern is inconsistent with the limited nominative use contemplated by Oki Data and instead supports the inference that the Respondent sought to capture Internet traffic looking for the Complainant's own online retail presence.

This is therefore not a case in which a reseller has used the mark only so far as reasonably necessary to identify genuine goods while clearly distinguishing its own business from the trade mark owner. The domain names themselves are apt to be read as brand-controlled variants and the websites, as described and shown in the evidence, compound rather than dispel that impression. The Respondent has produced no evidence of authorisation, transparent reseller status, genuine nominative use, or any other basis on which rights or legitimate interests could arise. The Oki Data analysis thus independently supports the Panel's conclusion on the second element.

The Respondent has not come forward with any explanation capable of rebutting the Complainant's prima facie case. The second element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is satisfied.

3. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel also finds that both disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

The AMERICAN GIRL mark is distinctive, longstanding and well established. The disputed domain names were registered decades after the Complainant acquired rights in the mark. Their composition is itself strongly indicative of targeting. One domain adds the geographic abbreviation "us" to the Complainant's mark; the other adds only the letter "x".

The pattern is properly characterised as typosquatting. Such registrations depend on the pre-existing recognition of the mark and are designed to take advantage of user expectation, mistake or assumption of affiliation. That inference is especially strong where, as here, two closely related variants were registered within a short period and used in materially similar ways.

The associated website content confirms actual knowledge and deliberate targeting. The Respondent did not merely register domain names resembling the mark. The websites displayed the AMERICAN GIRL trade mark, purported to offer the Complainant's products, and closely imitated the visual presentation and structure of the Complainant's official website. That conduct makes it implausible that the Respondent selected either domain name without knowledge of the Complainant and its rights.

The website evidence is especially probative of intent. A registrant who independently and innocently selected these domain names would have no apparent reason to reproduce the AMERICAN GIRL branding and to present the corresponding sites as retail outlets for AMERICAN GIRL products. That use removes any realistic possibility of coincidence. It demonstrates that the Respondent knew of the Complainant, selected the disputed domain names because of the AMERICAN GIRL mark, and used them to exploit the resulting association.

The same conclusion follows even if the case is tested on the hypothesis most favourable to the Respondent, namely that the sites were intended to resell genuine goods. As explained above, the presentation does not satisfy the Oki Data principles because it does not accurately and prominently disclose independence from the Complainant and instead adopts an appearance of official affiliation. A domain name and website combination which represents, expressly or by its overall presentation, that the operator is the trade mark owner or an authorised outlet cannot be converted into good-faith reseller activity merely because genuine goods might be offered. The misleading presentation is itself evidence of an intention to attract users by confusion.

The use falls squarely within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. By using confusingly similar domain names and impersonating websites, the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement. The absence of a Response leaves that inference unrebutted.

The Panel regards the sequence of conduct as a coherent whole. The Respondent first selected two domain names built around the Complainant's distinctive mark; it then used those names for materially similar sites adopting AMERICAN GIRL branding and presenting purported AMERICAN GIRL goods; and at least one of the sites became inactive only after enforcement action. That pattern is characteristic of deliberate trade mark targeting rather than an accidental registration or an independent business making descriptive use of ordinary words.

The two disputed domain names also reinforce one another in the bad-faith analysis. <americangirlx.com> uses a minimal additional letter, a familiar typosquatting technique. <americangirlus.com> adds a geographic abbreviation which is apt to suggest a United States version of the Complainant's site. In each case, the domain name is capable of attracting a user who is looking for AMERICAN GIRL and who may assume that the additional element denotes an official variant, regional site or other authorised online location. The impersonating website content then confirms and exploits precisely that expectation.

The Complainant also relies on further circumstances which it submits reinforce the inference of bad faith. Following disclosure of the underlying registrant information, the Complainant contends that the address supplied in respect of <americangirlus.com> is false or inaccurate and relies upon evidence for that. It also relies upon five previous UDRP decisions involving Jony MAICK, the disclosed registrant of <americangirlx.com>. These were Rothy's, Inc. v. Jony MAICK, D2025-0794; Dreams USA, Inc. v. Jony MAICK, D2025-0908; The Ridge Wallet LLC v. Jony Maick, D2025-4729; Osprey Publishing Limited v. Jony MAICK, D2026-0702; and Lindt v Jony MAICK CAC-UDRP-108439. The Panel notes those matters. However, given the strength of the evidence concerning the composition of the disputed domain names and, in particular, their use for websites reproducing the Complainant's branding and presenting themselves as AMERICAN GIRL retail websites, the Panel does not need to rely upon those additional circumstances in order to reach its conclusion as to bad faith.

The Panel has also considered the Complainant's reliance on privacy-protected WHOIS details, the Respondent's failure to respond to enforcement communications, and the subsequent suspension or inactivity of <americangirlx.com>. Those matters are not necessary to the Panel's conclusion, and the Panel does not rely upon them in finding bad faith.

Taking the circumstances together - the reputation of the AMERICAN GIRL mark, the closely related typo-style domain names, the common pattern of registration and use, the impersonating websites, the absence of any legitimate explanation, and the commercial diversion created by the sites - the Panel concludes that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) and paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The third element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is satisfied.

For the foregoing reasons, the Panel grants consolidation and finds that the Complainant has satisfied each of the three elements required under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

The Panel orders that the disputed domain names <americangirlus.com> and <americangirlx.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

AND THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME(S) IS (ARE) TO BE

- 1. **americangirlus.com**: Transferred
- 2. **americangirlx.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Victoria McEvedy
------	------------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-09-08

Publish the Decision