

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Calvin Broadus v. Miroslava Garmider
Case No. D2025-0228

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Miroslava Garmider, Ukraine.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <snoopdoggbush.com> (the "Domain Name") is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on January 21, 2025. On January 22, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On January 22, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent ("Registrant Unknown") and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 23, 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 amended Complaint on January 30, 2025.

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 January 31, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 20, 2025. The Respondent had sent email communications to the Center on January 23, 2025 enquiring as to the grounds of the Complaint. On February 21, 2025, the Center informed the Parties about the commencement of the panel appointment process.

The Center appointed Ian Lowe as the sole panelist in this matter on February 27, 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, Calvin Broadus, is a world-renowned musician and celebrity, also known as “Snoop Dogg”. He conducts business on the Internet, including a website at “www.snoopdogg.com” featuring news, music, campaigns, and appearances, as well as links to social media accounts, and a link to the Complainant’s store at “www.snoopermarket.com” for purchasing authentic SNOOP DOGG merchandise. Over some 30 years since 1994, the Complainant has won a wide variety of music industry and related awards.

The Complainant is the proprietor of a substantial number of registered trademarks comprising SNOOP and SNOOP DOGG, including European Union trademark number 001296177 SNOOP DOGG registered on October 3, 2000 and the comparable United Kingdom trademark number UK00901296177, created following the United Kingdom’s exit from the European Union and also treated as registered on October 3, 2000; United States trademark number 2697128 SNOOP DOGG registered on March 18, 2003; and Australia trademark number 2343651 SNOOP DOGG registered on March 22, 2023.

The Complainant has expended many millions of dollars advertising, promoting, developing, and protecting the SNOOP DOGG marks.

The Domain Name was registered on November 2, 2024. It does not now resolve to an active website, but at the time of filing of the Complaint it resolved to a website associated with a mobile application called “Snoop Cube”, apparently to be used in connection with a surveillance camera for pets. It directed consumers to an “Install” button for the application.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to its SNOOP DOGG trademark (the “Mark”), that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name, and that the Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith within the meaning of the Policy.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant’s contentions. Prior to receiving the Notification of Complaint and Commencement of Administrative Proceedings, the Respondent sent email communications to the Center on January 23, 2025, stating “What are the problems with my domain? And what specific facts or arguments are being discussed in the letter? I didn't see them”, followed by “I never received the essence of the complaint”.

6. Discussion and Findings

For this Complaint to succeed in relation to the Domain Name the Complainant must prove that:

- (i) the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Preliminary Consideration

Under paragraph 10 of the Rules, the Panel is required to ensure that the Parties are treated with equality and that each Party is given a fair opportunity to present its case, and also that the administrative proceeding takes place with due expedition. Since the Respondent's mailing address is stated to be in Ukraine, which is subject to an international conflict at the date of this Decision that may affect case notification, it is appropriate for the Panel to consider, in accordance with its discretion under paragraph 10 of the Rules, whether the proceeding should continue.

Having considered all the circumstances of the case, the Panel is of the view that it should. The Respondent answered to some email communications from the Center prior to receiving the Notification of Complaint and Commencement of Administrative Proceedings. The Center sent the Notification of Complaint by email to Respondent at its email address as registered with the Registrar. There is no evidence that the case notification email to the disclosed Respondent email addresses was not successfully delivered. The Panel also notes that the Complainant has specified in the Complaint that any challenge made by the Respondent to any decision to transfer or cancel the disputed domain name shall be referred to the jurisdiction of the courts of the location of the principal office of the concerned registrar. In this case, the principal office of the Registrar is in the United States. The Panel concludes that the Parties have been given a fair opportunity to present their case and decides that the administrative proceeding should continue.

B. Identical or Confusingly Similar

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The 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.

Based on the available evidence, the Panel finds the Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Domain Name comprises the entirety of the Mark with the addition of the word "bush", the name of the Complainant's thirteenth studio album. The Panel finds that this addition does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the first element required under the Policy has been established.

C. 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 that 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. Accordingly, 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 evidence, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the 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 Domain Name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Respondent has not used the Domain Name for a bona fide offering of goods or services, but rather for a website promoting a mobile application named “Snoop Cube”, unrelated to the Complainant. In the Panel’s view, it is difficult to conceive a legitimate purpose for registering a domain name comprising the Mark (with its unusual spelling of “dogg”) with the addition of the word “bush”, the name of the Complainant’s thirteenth studio album, or any possible justification for the Respondent having registered the Domain Name.

Having reviewed the available evidence, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the 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 Domain Name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

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

D. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

In light of the notoriety of the Complainant and use by the Respondent of the Mark in the Domain Name together with the word “bush”, the Panel considers that there is no doubt that the Respondent had the Complainant and its rights in the Mark in mind when it registered the Domain Name.

The Panel considers that the Respondent has registered and used the Domain Name to deceive Internet users into believing that the Domain Name is operated or authorized by the Complainant, and to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Mark, presumably for commercial gain.

It follows that, based on the available evidence and absent any explanation from the Respondent, the Panel finds that the 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 Domain Name <snoopdoggbush.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ian Lowe/

Ian Lowe

Sole Panelist

Date: March 10, 2025