

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Starbucks Corporation v. Marina Bashirian, Guido Lehner, Hope Moen,
Maureen Herman, Ivory Fahey and Jennyfer Kunde
Case No. D2026-3498

1. The Parties

Complainant is Starbucks Corporation, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Focal PLLC, United States.

Respondents are Marina Bashirian, Guido Lehner, Hope Moen, Maureen Herman, Ivory Fahey and Jennyfer Kunde, United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <starbuckscareeraccess.com>, <starbuckscareerconnect.com>, <starbuckscareerfinder.com>, <starbuckscareergroup.com>, <starbuckscareerlink.com>, <starbuckscareermatch.com>, <starbuckscaresnow.com>, <starbuckscaresonline.com>, <starbuckscareerplatform.com>, <starbuckscarespoint.com>, <starbuckscarescenter.com>, <starbuckscarescommunity.com>, <starbuckscaresconnect.com>, <starbuckscaresdirect.com>, <starbuckscaressearch.com>, <starbuckscaresgateway.com>, <starbuckscaresglobal.com>, <starbuckscareshub.com>, <starbuckscaresinternational.com>, <starbuckscaresnetwork.com>, <starbuckscaresspace.com>, <starbuckscaresportal.com>, <starbuckscaresstalenthub.com>, <starbuckscaressteam.com>, <starbuckscaresworldwide.com>, <starbuckscareserteam.com>, <starbuckscaresertrack.com>, <starbuckscareservision.com>, <starbuckscareserworld.com>, <starbuckscareshiringcenter.com>, <starbuckscareshiringhub.com>, <starbuckscareshiringnetwork.com>, <starbuckscareshiringportal.com>, <starbuckscaresjobnetwork.com>, <starbuckscaresjobportal.com>, <starbuckscaresopportunities.com>, <starbuckscarespeopleops.com>, <starbuckscarespeopleteam.com>, <starbuckscaresrecruiting.com>, <starbuckscaresrecruitingconnect.com>, <starbuckscaresrecruitingnetwork.com>, <starbuckscaresrecruitingportal.com>, <starbuckscaresrecruitmentcenter.com>, <starbuckscaresrecruitmentconnect.com>, <starbuckscaresrecruitmentteam.com>, <starbuckscaresstalentcareers.com>, <starbuckscaresstalentconnect.com>, <starbuckscaresstalentnetwork.com>, <starbuckscaresstalentportal.com> and <starbuckscaresstalentteam.com> are registered with Unstoppable Domains Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 7, 2026. On August 7, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On August 8, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondents and contact information in the Complaint (Unstoppable Privacy Service LLC). The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 11, 2026, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting Complainant to either file separate complaints for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on August 15, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 18, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 7, 2026. Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondents’ default on September 8, 2026.

The Center appointed Georges Nahitchevansky as the sole panelist in this matter on September 18, 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, Starbucks Corporation, is a global coffeehouse chain and manufacturer of specialty coffee based in the United States. Complainant owns and uses the STARBUCKS name and mark in connection with a variety of goods and services and owns a number of trademark registrations for the STARBUCKS mark in a number of jurisdictions around the world. Of particular relevance to this proceeding, Complainant owns several registrations for the STARBUCKS mark in the United States, including Registration No. 1,372,630, 1,452,359, 1,444,549, 3,259,720, 3,330,858, and 3,907,156, the earliest of which issued to registration in 1985. Complainant also owns and uses the domain name <starbucks.com> for a website providing information concerning Complainant and its products.

Respondents all appear to be based in the United States in the same area. Respondents registered the disputed domain names in June and July 2026. Since registering the disputed domain names, Respondents have not used them for an active website or page. However, Complainant contends that two of the disputed domain names, <starbuckscaresdirect.com> and <starbuckscaresportal.com>, have been used for emails soliciting personal information under the guise of recruiting for employment opportunities with Complainant. Complainant provides evidence of such fraudulent email using an email address connected to <starbuckscaresdirect.com>, but provides no such evidence for the email related to <starbuckscaresportal.com>.

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 names.

Complainant requests that Respondents be consolidated in this proceeding, as the disputed domain names are likely owned or controlled by the same party. Complainant has provided evidence in that regard.

Complainant maintains that it has strong rights in the STARBUCKS marks on account of the many registrations it owns for the STARBUCKS mark in many jurisdictions, including the United States, and by virtue of its use of the mark for 55 years in over 85 markets around the world.

Complainant asserts that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its STARBUCKS mark as they each include the STARBUCKS mark in its entirety in connection with non-distinguishing generic or descriptive terms.

Complainant contends that Respondents do not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names as Respondents (i) were likely aware of the STARBUCKS mark when they registered multiple domain names that include the STARBUCKS mark, (ii) are not commonly known by the disputed domain names, (iii) have no authorization, permission or license from Complainant to use the STARBUCKS mark in any domain names, and (iv) have passively held the disputed domain names and have done so to capitalize on Complainant's brand,

Lastly, Complainant argues that Respondents have registered and used the disputed domain names in bad faith. In that regard, Complainant notes that there is no credible dispute that Respondents were well aware of the STARBUCKS mark when they registered multiple domain names that fully incorporate the STARBUCKS mark. Complainant also notes that the disputed domain names all appear related to a career or employment with Complainant and thus part of a scheme to take advantage of the STARBUCKS mark for the benefit of Respondents. In that respect, Complainant maintains that Respondents used email addresses associated with two of the disputed domains to send fraudulent emails soliciting sensitive personal information under the premise of recruitment for nonexistent employment opportunities with Complainant.

B. Respondents

Respondents did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

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

- (i) the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights;
- (ii) Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and
- (iii) the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

A. Complainant's Request for Consolidation of Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The registrants of the disputed domain names did not comment on Complainant's request. Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder. In addressing Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that in view of Respondents' failure to appear in this proceeding, it is more likely than not that the registrants of the disputed domain names are merely aliases of one party that owns or controls the disputed domain names. First, the disputed domain names were all registered through the same registrar in June and July 2026 and use the same hosting provider, namely, Cloudflare. Second, the alleged registrants all appear to be based in the same area in the United States, in relatively close proximity of each other. Third, the disputed domain names all follow a common pattern of featuring the STARBUCKS mark in its entirety with words related to careers, employment, recruitment or work. Lastly, all of the disputed domain names registrants have used Gmail email addresses in their contact information,

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of Respondents would be unfair or inequitable to any Party, particularly in view of Respondents' failure to appear in this proceeding to argue otherwise.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "Respondent") in a single proceeding.

B. 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 Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain names. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) at section 1.7.

Complainant has shown rights in its STARBUCKS mark for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1. Here, the STARBUCKS mark is fully incorporated and clearly visible in each of the disputed domain names. Although the addition of common words such as "career", "recruitment", "talent portal", "hiring", and many others may bear on the assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such common words does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and Complainant's STARBUCKS mark for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

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

C. 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 names. Respondent, who has chosen not to appear in this proceeding, 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Here, the disputed domain names fully incorporate Complainant’s exact STARBUCKS marks with common words that all relate to careers, employment, recruiting or work. As such, the disputed domain names are likely to be mistakenly seen by consumers as related to or associated with Complainant and employment or work opportunities with or for Complainant. And while most of the disputed domain names have not been put to use with an active website or page, there does not seem to be any justification for registering a large number of domain names based on the STARBUCKS name and mark with terms related to employment or work with Complainant. Indeed, Complainant has provided some evidence that one of the disputed domain names have already been used for emails soliciting sensitive personal information under the guise of recruiting for nonexistent employment opportunities with Complainant, and alleges the same for a second disputed domain name, thus suggesting that Respondent registered the disputed domain names as part of an illicit scheme to impersonate Complainant for Respondent’s benefit.

Further underscoring Respondent’s lack of legitimacy is the fact that Respondent has failed to come forward with any evidence justifying its actions of registering a plethora of disputed domain names that conjure up Complainant and which on their face suggest employment, work or careers with Complainant.

In all, the evidence before the Panel makes it more likely than not that Respondent has registered the disputed domain names for the profit of Respondent as part of a likely illicit scheme. Such actions do not constitute a legitimate interest. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) at sections 2.5.1 and 2.13.

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

D. 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.

In view of Respondent’s actions, and failure to appear in this proceeding, it seems more likely than not that Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain names, which are clearly based on Complainant’s STARBUCKS mark, has been done opportunistically and in bad faith for the benefit or profit of Respondent. The disputed domain names essentially impersonate Complainant and were registered well after Complainant had established rights in its STARBUCKS mark. Moreover, at least one of the disputed domain names (<starbuckscaresdirect.com>), if not more, has been used as part of a nefarious scheme for Respondent’s benefit, thus suggesting that Respondent more likely than not has registered the many disputed domain names based on the STARBUCKS mark for the same purpose (although many do not yet appear to have been put to use). At the very least, such use of the disputed domain name <starbuckscaresdirect.com> to attract unsuspecting consumers for profit constitutes bad faith. And certainly while most of the remaining disputed domain names have yet to be used or deployed by

Respondent, the fact that they all include words that relate to employment, work or, or careers with Complainant in total suggest that Respondent more likely than not registered such in bad faith in furtherance of a potentially y illicit scheme such as the one conducted through the <starbuckscaresdirect.com> disputed domain name as shown by the evidence provided by Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) at sections 3.1.4, 3.3 and 3.4.

The Panel 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 names set forth below:

<starbuckscaeraccess.com>, <starbuckscaerconnect.com>, <starbuckscaerfinder.com>, <starbuckscaergroup.com>, <starbuckscaerlink.com>, <starbuckscaermatch.com>, <starbuckscaernow.com>, <starbuckscaeronline.com>, <starbuckscaerplatform.com>, <starbuckscaerpoint.com>, <starbuckscaerscenter.com>, <starbuckscaerscommunity.com>, <starbuckscaersconnect.com>, <starbuckscaersdirect.com>, <starbuckscaersearch.com>, <starbuckscaersgateway.com>, <starbuckscaersglobal.com>, <starbuckscaershuh.com>, <starbuckscaersinternational.com>, <starbuckscaersnetwork.com>, <starbuckscaerspace.com>, <starbuckscaersportal.com>, <starbuckscaerstalenthub.com>, <starbuckscaersteam.com>, <starbuckscaersworldwide.com>, <starbuckscaerteam.com>, <starbuckscaertrack.com>, <starbuckscaervision.com>, <starbuckscaerworld.com>, <starbuckscaeshiringcenter.com>, <starbuckscaeshiringhub.com>, <starbuckscaeshiringnetwork.com>, <starbuckscaeshiringportal.com>, <starbucksjobnetwork.com>, <starbucksjobportal.com>, <starbucksopportunities.com>, <starbuckspeopleops.com>, <starbuckspeopleteam.com>, <starbucksrecruiting.com>, <starbucksrecruitingconnect.com>, <starbucksrecruitingnetwork.com>, <starbucksrecruitingportal.com>, <starbucksrecruitmentcenter.com>, <starbucksrecruitmentconnect.com>, <starbucksrecruitmentteam.com>, <starbucksstalentscareers.com>, <starbucksstalentsconnect.com>, <starbucksstalentsnetwork.com>, <starbucksstalentsportal.com>, and <starbucksstalentsteam.com>

be transferred to Complainant.

/Georges Nahichevansky/

Georges Nahichevansky

Sole Panelist

Date: October 1, 2026