

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Calvin Broadus v. Adam Cherrington, Wyshmaster Productions

Case No. D2025-0446

1. The Parties

Complainant is Calvin Broadus, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Venable, LLP, United States.

Respondent is Adam Cherrington, Wyshmaster Productions, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <snoopdogpack.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 4, 2025. On February 5, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 5, 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 (Registrant Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on February 6, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on February 7, 2025.

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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on February 7, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 27, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center

notified Respondent's default on March 7, 2025. On March 7, 2025, Respondent submitted a communication to the Center.

The Center appointed Lorelei Ritchie as the sole panelist in this matter on March 13, 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

Complainant is an individual resident of the United States. For decades prior to the registration of the disputed domain name, Complainant has offered goods and services under the name and mark SNOOP DOGG.

Complainant owns several registered trademarks for his SNOOP DOGG mark. These include, among others, United States Registration No. 2,697,128 (registered March 18, 2003) for various goods and services, including entertainment services, clothing, and musical recordings.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 31, 2024. Respondent has used the URL associated with the disputed domain name to resolve to a webpage that includes references to Complainant and his SNOOP DOGG name and mark, and which appears to offer competing entertainment products. Complainant has not authorized any activities by Respondent, nor any use of his trademarks thereby. The disputed domain name then redirected to a third-party website where the Respondent was advertising the sale of "Grammy Nominated Multi-Platinum Selling Producer Pro Quality Beats For Sale." Currently, the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive page.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to Complainant's trademarks; (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; and (iii) Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

In particular, Complainant contends that he has established rights in his SNOOP DOGG name and mark, which refers uniquely to Complainant, a "world-renowned musician and celebrity," as recognized by prior UDRP Panels. See *Calvin Broadus v. LASGAA MOHAMED, acorm*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-4499](#). In addition to owning various trademark registrations for the SNOOP DOGG mark, Complainant contends that he has been recognized with numerous global awards for his various entertainment products.

Complainant contends that Respondent has incorporated in full his SNOOP DOGG mark and merely added the dictionary term "pack." Complainant asserts that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the registration or use of the disputed domain name. Rather, Complainant contends that Respondent has acted in bad faith in setting up a website meant to confuse web users for Respondent's own commercial gain.

B. Respondent

As noted, Respondent sent a communication to the Center, stating, "I have no idea what this is about and don't use this domain." Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

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 of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7. Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark, SNOOP DOGG, for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1. Although the addition of other terms (here, the term "pack") 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 Complainant's mark for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which Complainant has rights in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

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.

Although 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 difficult 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 (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). 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 available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent has not rebutted 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 Panel finds that Complainant has provided sufficient evidence of Respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy which Respondent has not rebutted.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

There are several ways that a complainant can demonstrate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith. As noted in Section 4, Respondent has used the URL associated with the disputed domain name to resolve to a webpage that includes references to Complainant and his SNOOP DOGG name and mark, and which appears to offer competing entertainment products. Given the world renown of Complainant's SNOOP DOGG name and mark, it is apparent that Respondent was, and continues to be, aware of Complainant's rights and is trading on the goodwill of Complainant's trademarks to attract Internet users for Respondent's own commercial gain.

Therefore, the Panel finds sufficient evidence that Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith for purposes of paragraph (4)(a)(iii) of the Policy.

7. Decision

For all 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 <snoopdoggpak.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Lorelei Ritchie/

Lorelei Ritchie

Sole Panelist

Dated: March 27, 2025