

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Rican Brands LLC d/b/a STICKERICAN v. Aliz M Sanchez Hernandez Admin,  
StickerRican

Case No. D2025-4167

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Rican Brands LLC d/b/a STICKERICAN, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Ferraiuoli LLC, United States.

The Respondent is Aliz M Sanchez Hernandez Admin, StickerRican, United States.

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

The disputed domain name <stickerricanpr.com> is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 10, 2025. On October 13, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 14, 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 (John Doe, Jane Doe and/or StickerRican / Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0175915750) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 16, 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 amendment to the Complaint on October 16, 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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on October 22, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 11, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on November 13, 2025.

The Center appointed Phillip V. Marano as the sole panelist in this matter on November 18, 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 a Puerto Rican corporation that manufactures and sells stickers. The Complainant offers information about its goods and services on its official “www.stickerican.com” website. The Complainant owns a valid and subsisting registration for the STICKERICAN trademark in the United States (Reg. No. 7,254,701) registered on December 26, 2023, with the earliest priority dating back to November 17, 2022.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on August 16, 2025. At the time of this Complaint, the disputed domain name no longer resolved to any website content, but according to the screengrab evidence submitted by the Complainant it previously resolved to a website titled “Sticker Rican” that purported to sell stickers similar to the Complainant’s official products and used a logo similar to the Complainant’s official design trademark.

#### **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 asserts ownership of the STICKERICAN trademark and has adduced evidence of trademark registration., dated back to December 26, 2023, with the earliest first-use priority on November 17, 2022.

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s STICKERICAN trademark, according to the Complainant, because (i) “the only difference [is] the addition of the letter “r” and the letters “pr” e.g. (<stickerricanpr.com)”, and (ii) the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name to direct Internet users to a website substantially similar to the Complainant’s website.

The Complainant further asserts that the Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name based on: the Complainant’s longstanding rights to its STICKERICAN trademark, which long predate the Respondent’s registration of the disputed domain name; and the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name to resolve to a website that misappropriates the Complainant’s STICKERICAN trademark and falsely suggests an affiliation with the Complainant.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith for numerous reasons, including: the Respondent’s intentional targeting of the Complainant to mimic the Complainant’s official website “stickerican.com”; and the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name in connection with website content that impersonates the Complainant.

##### **B. Respondent**

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

## 6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed in its Complaint, the Complainant must establish in accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy:

- i. the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark 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.

Although the Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions, the burden remains with the Complainant to establish by a balance of probabilities, or a preponderance of the evidence, all three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.3 ("A respondent's default [...] would not by itself mean that the complainant is deemed to have prevailed; a respondent's default is not necessarily an admission that the complainant's claims are true [...] [UDRP] panels have been prepared to draw certain inferences in light of the particular facts and circumstances of the case e.g., where a particular conclusion is prima facie obvious, where an explanation by the respondent is called for but is not forthcoming, or where no other plausible conclusion is apparent."); *The Vanguard Group, Inc. v. Lorna Kang*, WIPO Case No. [D2002-1064](#) ("The Respondent's default does not automatically result in a decision in favor of the complainant. The Complainant must still prove each of the three elements required by Policy paragraph 4(a)").

### 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.

Ownership of a nationally or regionally registered trademark serves as prima facie evidence that the Complainant has trademark rights for the purposes of standing to file this Complaint. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1. The Complainant submitted evidence that the STICKERICAN trademark has been registered in the United States as of December 26, 2023, with the earliest priority dating back to November 17, 2022, nearly three years before the disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent. Thus, the Panel finds that the Complainant's rights in the STICKERICAN trademark have been established pursuant to the first element of the Policy.

The only remaining question under the first element of the Policy is whether the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's STICKERICAN trademark. In this case, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's STICKERICAN trademark because, disregarding the ".com" generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD"), the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. ("This test typically involves a side-by-side comparison of the domain name and the textual components of the relevant trademark to assess whether the mark is recognizable within the domain name [...] [in cases where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark, or where at least a dominant feature of the relevant mark is recognizable in the domain name, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar [...)]. gTLDs, such as ".com" in the disputed domain name, are generally viewed as a standard registration requirement and are disregarded under the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.

The confusing similarity is not prevented by combination with the descriptive term "PR", which is the official alpha-2 code for Puerto Rico established by the International Organization for Standardization. WIPO Overview, section 1.8 (Additional terms "whether descriptive, geographic, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise" do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name).

Furthermore, it is well established that domain names which consist of common, obvious or intentional misspellings of trademarks (for example, an additional letter “r” in the Complainant’s STRICKERIAN trademark) are considered to be confusingly similar for the purposes of the first element of the Policy. WIPO Overview, section 1.9 (“Examples of such typos include (i) adjacent keyboard letters, (ii) substitution of similar-appearing characters [...] (iii) the use of different letters that appear similar in different fonts, (iv) the use of non-Latin internationalized or accented characters, (v) the inversion of letters and numbers, or (vi) the addition or interspersing of other terms or numbers”). See e.g. *Edmunds.com, Inc. v. Digi Real Estate Foundation*, WIPO Case No. [D2006-1043](#) (“This is clearly a “typosquatting” case where the disputed domain name is a slight misspelling of a registered trademark to divert internet traffic [...] In fact, the domain name comprises the Complainant’s trademark [...] with a single misspelling of an element of the mark: a double consonant “s” at the end.”)

Therefore, 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. 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 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. Where, as in this case, the Respondent fails to come forward with any relevant evidence, the Complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element of the Policy. WIPO Overview, section 2.1.

It is unclear from the limited record in this case whether the Respondent had previously configured the disputed domain name to website content that attempts to impersonate the Complainant in furtherance of illegal activity, or merely attempts to compete with the Complainant with putative offers to sell stickers branded with the Complainant’s STICKERIAN trademark. Ultimately however, neither such use constitutes legitimate rights or interests.

It is well established that a respondent’s use of a complainant’s trademark to redirect users to a competing website would not support a claim to rights or legitimate interests. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), Section 2.5.3; *Richemont International SA v. Turvill Consultants*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-0862](#) (“Complainant has not consented to, licensed, or otherwise authorized the Respondent to use or register the disputed domain names and sell similar products”); *G4S Limited v. Serkouh Abderrahmane, Devarch Digital*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-5171](#) (“The fact that Respondent offers services [on its website] in competition with Complainant’s services supports a finding that Respondent has targeted Complainant’s mark and has sought to enhance its own business by creating a false impression among consumers that Respondent’s website is somehow associated with Complainant.”). And alternatively, UDRP panels have categorically held that use of a domain name for illegal activity—including the impersonation of the complainant and other types of fraud—can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. Circumstantial evidence can support a credible claim made by the Complainant asserting the Respondent is engaged in such illegal activity, including that the Respondent has masked its identity to avoid being contactable, or that the Respondent’s website has been suspended by its hosting provider. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13. See e.g. *Graybar*

*Services Inc. v. Graybar Elec, Grayberinc Lawrence*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1017](#) (“Respondent has used the domain name to pretend that it is the Complainant and in particular to create false emails pretending that they are genuine emails coming from the Complainant and one of its senior executives”) See also *The Commissioners for HM Revenue and Customs v. Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-0501](#) (“In addition, the disputed domain names ... have had their web hosting suspended as a result of fraudulent activities. This is evidence of bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain names.”).

To either end, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name appears to have been selected specifically to target the Complainant, the Complainant’s registered STICKERIAN trademark, and the Complainant’s specific industry and goods. The disputed domain name appears to have been selected as a typographical variation of the Complainant’s official <stickerican.com> domain name. And, based on the Panel’s independent review of the Complainant’s official website and comparison to the Respondent’s website, the Panel agrees that the Respondent appears to have intentionally copied the overall look and feel and trade dress of the Complainant’s website, inclusive of the website background, font type, layout, sticker prices, and even catch phrases on the putative stickers sold by the Respondent.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy proscribes the following non-exhaustive circumstances as evidence of bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name:

- i. Circumstances indicating that the Respondent has registered or the Respondent has acquired the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the disputed domain name registration to the Complainant who is the owner of the trademark to a competitor of that Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the Respondent’s documented out of pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name; or
- ii. the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- iii. the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- iv. by using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent’s website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent’s website or location or of a product or service on the Respondent’s website or location.

As established above, the Panel views the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name as either (at worst) an attempt to impersonate the Complainant in furtherance of illegal activity, or (at best) an attempt to compete with the Complainant with putative offers to sell inauthentic versions of the Complainant’s stickers.

Wrongful use of others’ trademarks for impersonation is considered abusive registration of the disputed domain name under the Policy. See *CareerBuilder, LLC v. Stephen Baker*, WIPO Case No. [D2005-0251](#); *The Boots Company, PLC v. The programmer adviser*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1383](#). See e.g. *WSI Holdings Ltd. v. WSI House*, WIPO Case No. [D2004-1089](#) (“Respondent appears to be engaged in “phishing” for mistaken potential employees of the Complainant ... Respondent (1) has adopted a confusingly similar domain name, (2) it has used the trade dress of the Complainant’s website, and (3) it has sought to attract users to its site by creating confusion between its site and the Complainant’s. It has clearly engaged in activity which fulfils the bad faith requirements of Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.”). And use of a domain name incorporating a complainant’s trademark to redirect Internet users to the respondent’s website,

where putative goods are offered in competition with that complainant, is strong evidence of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. WIPO Overview, section 3.1.4 (“Panels have moreover found the following types of evidence to support a finding that a respondent has registered a domain name to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark: [...] seeking to cause confusion for respondent’s commercial benefit, even if unsuccessful [...] the lack of a respondent’s own rights to or legitimate interests in a domain name [or] redirecting the domain name to a different respondent-owned website).

Here, the disputed domain name misappropriates the Complainant’s STICKERICAN trademark, with a typographical added “r” letter and a geographically descriptive “pr” suffix, and resolves to the Respondent’s website, which is titled “Sticker Rican” and is substantially similar to the Complainant’s official “www.stickerican.com” website, to offer to sell putative stickers that are similar to authentic goods sold by the Complainant. Accordingly, the Panel finds that use of the disputed domain name will (at a minimum) divert potential customers from the Complainant’s business to the website under the disputed domain name by attracting Internet users who mistakenly believe that the disputed domain name is affiliated with the Complainant, and which may further mistakenly believe that the products offered on this website are authentic products offered by the Complainant, or by an entity affiliated to the Complainant.

Indeed, the act of “typosquatting” or registering a domain name that is a common misspelling of a mark in which a party has rights has often been recognized as evidence of bad faith registration *per se*. WIPO Overview, section 3.2.1 (“Particular circumstances UDRP panels take into account in assessing whether the respondent’s registration of a domain name is in bad faith include: (i) the nature of the domain name (e.g., a typo of a widely known mark”). See also *Paragon Gifts, Inc. v. Domain.Contact*, WIPO Case No. [D2004-0107](#) (citing *National Association of Professional Baseball Leagues, d/b/a Minor League Baseball v. Zuccarini*, WIPO Case No. [D2002-1011](#)); *ESPN, Inc. v. XC2*, WIPO Case No. [D2005-0444](#) (finding that the practice of “typosquatting”, of itself, is evidence of the bad faith registration of a domain name). The Panel concurs with this approach. It is evident that the Respondent registered and used the typosquatted disputed domain name to intentionally attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the website linked to disputed domain name in a manner that confuses and misleads Internet users. Thus, the Panel infers the Respondent’s bad faith based on the fact that the Respondent is trying to gain profit of mistakes such as typographical errors made by Internet users, when inputting the expression “stickerricanpr.com” instead of “stickerican.com” into a web browser.

And, where it appears that a respondent employs a proxy service, or purposefully selects a Registrar that applies proxy services by default, merely to avoid being notified of a UDRP proceeding filed against it, UDRP panels tend to find that this supports an inference of bad faith. WIPO Overview section 3.6. Use of a proxy registration service to shield a respondent’s identity and elude or frustrate enforcement efforts by a legitimate complainant demonstrates bad-faith use and registration of a disputed domain name. See *Fifth Third Bancorp v. Secure Whois Information Service*, WIPO Case No. [D2006-0696](#) (the use of a proxy registration service to avoid disclosing the identity of the real party in interest is also consistent with an inference of bad faith when combined with other evidence of evasive, illegal, or irresponsible conduct).

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 <stickerricanpr.com> be cancelled.

/Phillip V. Marano/

**Phillip V. Marano**

Sole Panelist

Date: December 8, 2025