ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Todd McClure v. Will Hudson, Hudson Shuffleboards
Case No. D2026-2419

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Todd McClure, United States of America ("United States"), self-represented.

The Respondent is Will Hudson, Hudson Shuffleboards, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <mcclureshuffleboards.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 June 3, 2026. On June 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 6, 2026, 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 (Registration Private) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 8, 2026, 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 amended Complaint on June 8, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended 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 June 11, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 1, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any formal response. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on June 16, 2026.

The Center appointed Evan D. Brown as the sole panelist in this matter on July 17, 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

The Complainant is in the business of manufacturing and selling handcrafted shuffleboard tables. He owns the mark MCCLURE TABLES, which is used on these goods, and enjoys the benefits of registration of a stylized version of that mark (United States Reg. No. 8065539, registered on December 16, 2025). The Panel notes that the Complainant also previously obtained two earlier United States registrations for slightly different stylized MCCLURE TABLES marks: United States Reg. No. 3322655 (registered October 30, 2007) and United States Reg. No. 5194555 (registered May 2, 2017). Both prior registrations were subsequently canceled due to the Complainant's failure to file post-registration maintenance declarations under Section 8 of the Lanham Act.

According to the WhoIs information, the disputed domain name was registered on April 4, 2013. It redirects to the website at “www.hudsonshuffleboards.com” which sells shuffleboards.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark; that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has engaged in a “predatory commercial diversion scheme” by setting the disputed domain name to redirect to the Respondent’s own commercial website which the Respondent uses to directly compete with the Complainant. This is not the only situation in which the Respondent has engaged in this sort of activity. Another WIPO panel has already ordered the transfer of another domain name that the Respondent registered and used to target the Complainant’s mark. See *Todd McClure v. Will Hudson*, WIPO Case No. D2026-1224 (panel ordered transfer of the disputed domain name <mccluretable.com>).

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not formally reply to the Complainant's contentions. It submitted an email to the Center on June 16, 2026 asserting principally that it had proactively reached out to the Complainant in good faith to resolve the matter amicably and had expressed a willingness to explore reasonable accommodations and mutually beneficial solutions. The email communication did not otherwise address the substance of the Complainant’s assertions.

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied: (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark 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. The Panel finds that all three of these elements have been met in this case.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

This first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 1.7. 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. *Id*. This element requires the Panel to consider two issues: first, whether the Complainant has rights in a relevant mark; and second, whether the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to that mark.

A registered trademark provides a clear indication that the rights in the mark shown on the trademark certificate belong to its respective owner. See *Advance Magazine Publishers Inc., Les Publications Conde Nast S.A. v. Voguechen*, WIPO Case No. D2014-0657. The Complainant has demonstrated its rights in the MCCLURE TABLES mark by providing evidence of its trademark registrations. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The test for confusing similarity under this element typically involves a side-by-side comparison of the disputed domain name and the textual components of the relevant trademark to assess whether the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7. In some cases, such assessment may also entail a more holistic aural or phonetic comparison of the complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name to ascertain confusing similarity. *Id*.

Guided by these principles, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's MCCLURE TABLES mark. The word "McClure" is the dominant portion of the Complainant's mark. See *Lima One Capital v. Chase Lima*, WIPO Case No. D2024-2414, citing *La Quinta Worldwide, L.L.C. v. PrivacyProtect.org / Pantages, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. D2011-1530 (the disputed domain name <quintainns.com> was found to be confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark LA QUINTA because it incorporated the dominant portion of the Complainant's mark).

Although the addition of other terms, here, "shuffleboards" 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 the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established this first element under the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Panel evaluates this element of the Policy by first looking to see whether the Complainant has made a prima facie showing that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. If the Complainant makes that showing, the burden of production of demonstrating rights or legitimate interests shifts to the Respondent (with the burden of proof always remaining with the Complainant). See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1; *AXA SA v. Huade Wang*, WIPO Case No. D2022-1289.

On this point, the Complainant asserts, among other things, that: (1) the Complainant has not licensed, permitted, or otherwise authorized the Respondent to utilize the MCCLURE TABLES mark or trade name in any manner, (2) the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, (3) the Respondent has not used the disputed domain name for any noncommercial or fair use, and (4) the Respondent has not used the disputed domain name in connection with any bona fide offering of goods or services. Instead, the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to "siphon" website traffic to its own commercial website.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has made the required prima facie showing. The Respondent has not presented evidence to overcome this prima facie showing. And nothing in the record otherwise tilts the balance in the Respondent's favor.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established this second element under the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Policy requires a complainant to establish that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Policy describes several non-exhaustive circumstances demonstrating a respondent's bad faith registration and use.

Under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, a panel may find bad faith when a respondent "[uses] the domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [respondent's] website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of [respondent's] website or location or a product or service on [the respondent's] website or location".

The facts of this case fall squarely within the scope of this sort of conduct contemplated under the Policy. The Respondent has used the disputed domain name to redirect to its own competing commercial site – a clear example of bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel also notes that the composition of the disputed domain name consisting in the dominant portion of the Complainant's trademark and the term "shuffleboards" which is descriptive of the Complainant's activity, supports a finding of bad faith registration.

The Complainant has established this third Policy element.

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 <mcclureshuffleboards.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Evan D. Brown/
Evan D. Brown
Sole Panelist
Date: July 31, 2026