ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Dorrance Publishing Company, Inc. t/d/b/a Dorrance Publishers v. Maxx Jaffer
Case No. D2026-2124

1. The Parties

Complainant is Dorrance Publishing Company, Inc. t/d/b/a Dorrance Publishers, United States of America ("United States"), represented by R. James Law LLC, United States.

Respondent is Maxx Jaffer, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <dorrancepublishinghouse.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 May 15, 2026. On May 18, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 19, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 28, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 17, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on June 19, 2026.

The Center appointed Georges Nahitchevansky as the sole panelist in this matter on July 3, 2026. 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, Dorrance Publishing Company, Inc., is a full service book publishing company that specializes in assisting authors in producing a finished book for release to the market. Complainant was founded by an individual by the name of Gordon Dorrance in or about 1920. The company has used the name Dorrance Publishing or simply Dorrance in connection with its services and owns and uses the domain name <dorrancepublishing.com> for a website concerning Complainant and its services. On the website, Complainant uses a graphic logo of an individual, presumably Gordon Dorrance, along with the name and mark DORRANCE.

Respondent, who appears to be based in Austin, Texas, United States, registered the disputed domain name on May 13, 2024. At some point thereafter, Respondent began using the disputed domain name for a website that offers ghost book writing and related self-publishing services. That website currently appears at the disputed domain name.

On December 8, 2025, Complainant initiated a federal district court action concerning the website and associated domain name in the Western District of Pennsylvania, *Dorrance Publishing Company, Inc. v. Book Publishing Partner and Unnamed Individuals and Corporations,* 2:25-cv-01896-RJC (the "Federal Court Action"). Complainant subsequently served a subpoena on the Registrar for the disputed domain name and obtained the identity of Respondent as the registrant of the disputed domain name. On May 1, 2026, Complainant filed a motion in the Federal Court Action for leave to amend its Complaint to name Respondent as a defendant in the action and on May 15, 2026, Complainant filed the instant proceeding. The Federal Court Action is currently pending.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, Complainant contends that it has used its Dorrance name and marks in commerce throughout the United States since 1920 and the DORRANCE mark standing alone since 1989. Complainant also contends that it is one of the "oldest publishing services compan[ies]" in the United States and has published books written by authors from every state of the United States.

Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its DORRANCE mark and <dorrancepublishing.com> domain name as DORRANCE is fully included in the disputed domain name and was done to attract and divert potential customers of Complainant to Respondent's competing website.

Complainant asserts that Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name as Respondent (i) has "no relationship to the name Dorrance", (ii) is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, (iii) has no trademark rights in the DORRANCE name and mark, and (iv) has used the disputed domain name to attract consumers to a website offering competing publishing services.

Lastly, Complainant argues that Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith as Respondent "registered the Domain Name that is substantially similar to Dorrance's long used domain name" and has done so to attract consumers to Respondent's website to offer competing publishing services.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Preliminary Consideration: Complainant's District Court Action

Under paragraph 18(a) of the UDRP Rules, a panel has discretion to suspend, terminate, or continue a UDRP proceeding where the disputed domain name is also the subject of other pending legal proceedings. Where there are prior or pending court or administrative (e.g., trademark office) proceedings, it is within the panel's discretion to determine the relevance to ascribe to such proceeding in the UDRP context, in light of the case circumstances. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1") at section 4.14.2. To be sure, because a UDRP has a relative expediency that benefits parties by providing an expedited resolution of a domain name dispute, panels are generally reluctant to suspend or terminate a pending proceeding absent good reasons.

Up front it should be noted that Complainant, and not Respondent, initiated the Federal Court Action on December 8, 2025, and filed a motion for leave to amend its complaint in that action on May 1, 2026. Complainant then filed this UDRP Complaint on May 15, 2026.

Although, the complaint in the Federal Court Action addresses the registration and use of the disputed domain name and in many ways mirrors this proceeding, the Panel notes that Respondent has chosen not to appear in this proceeding, has not asked for a suspension or termination of this proceeding, and does not appear from the record before the Panel to have yet contested the Federal Court Action (or to have been served with the complaint). Moreover, the action involves broader trademark concerns, additional parties, and remedies unavailable under the UDRP. Under such circumstances, the Panel sees no reason to suspend or terminate this proceeding. As it is not clear whether Respondent will ultimately be served or choose to defend the pending District Court Action, the Panel believes that moving forward with this proceeding might ultimately be to the benefit of the Parties as it may resolve their dispute.

6.2. Substantive Issues

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed Complainant must satisfy the Panel that:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights;

(ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and

(iii) the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

In this proceeding, Complainant claims that it owns common law rights in the DORRANCE name and mark through its use in commerce since 1989 and through the use of the Dorrance name since 1920 for its publishing services. Complainant has also provided screen shots of its website at the <dorrancepublishing.com> domain name that show prominent use of the DORRANCE mark. [1]

[1]The Panel notes that a quick review of the publicly available archival service The Wayback Machine at <archive.org> shows use of the disputed domain name and the DORRANCE name and mark on Complainant's website since at least 2000. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 4.8.

While Complainant has not provided much of the typical evidence that would establish common law rights, what Complainant has provided in concert with Respondent's use of the disputed domain name as discussed below, is, in the Panel's view, sufficient to establish that for purposes of the first element Complainant has rights in the DORRANCE mark in connection with its publishing services. WIPO Overview 3.1 at section 1.3.

Here, the disputed domain fully incorporates the DORRANCE mark. Although the addition of the common words "publishing house" may bear on the assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such elements does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the DORRANCE mark for purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8.

The Panel thus finds that 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 a 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 3.1, section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds that 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.

Here, the disputed domain name is clearly based on Complainant's DORRANCE mark given the use of the disputed domain name for a website purportedly offering services competing with those of Complainant. Notably, Respondent's website provides no information concerning Respondent and prominently highlights the DORRANCE name and mark. In all, because Respondent's website looks to have been set up to appear as a website connected to Complainant, and absent any explanation from Respondent, such composition and use underscores that Respondent has used the disputed domain name and associated website to conjure up Complainant and its services and to mislead consumers into believing there is a connection between the website and Complainant when none exists. Such use of the disputed domain name for the profit of Respondent is not a legitimate interest. WIPO Overview 3.1 at section 2.5.3.

The Panel thus 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.

There are several factors here that establish that Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name has been done in bad faith, The disputed domain name incorporates Complainant's exact DORRANCE mark with the term "publishing house" which directly relates to the services provided by Complainant. Moreover, the disputed domain name is being used for a website that provides arguably

related self-publishing services. Lastly, as Respondent has failed to appear in the matter to explain or justify its actions, there are serious questions as to why Respondent would have registered and used a disputed domain name that consists of the DORRANCE name and mark.

In all, given the prominent use of the DORRANCE name and mark in the disputed domain name and on Respondent's competing website it is likely that consumers will view the disputed domain name as affiliated with Complainant and its publishing services and perhaps as an additional service offered by Complainant. Such an attempt to ride on the coattails of Complainant for the profit of Respondent is in itself opportunistic and in bad faith.

The Panel thus finds that Complainant has established the third element of the Policy

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 <dorrancepublishinghouse.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Georges Nahitchevansky/
Georges Nahitchevansky
Sole Panelist
Date: July 17, 2026