

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Dansko, LLC v. asdasd, asdasd  
Case No. D2025-0277

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Dansko, LLC, United States of America, represented by Cozen O'Connor, United States of America.

The Respondent is asdasd asdasd, Hong Kong, China.

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

The disputed domain name <dansko-usa.shop> 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 23, 2025. On January 24, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 24, 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 (Unknown Registrant) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 27, 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 28, 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 29, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 18, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on February 19, 2025.

The Center appointed Adam Samuel as the sole panelist in this matter on February 24, 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 manufactures and sells shoes. The Complainant owns among others a United States trademark DANSKO, registration no. 2712957, registered on May 6, 2003. The Complainant promotes its services through <dansko.com>, which was registered on August 23, 1996. The disputed domain name was registered on November 28, 2024. It resolves to a website selling shoes, including what appear to be the Complainant's products.

#### **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 contends that the disputed domain name is virtually identical to the Complainant's DANSKO trademark and domain name apart from the descriptive geographic term "usa", which does nothing to distinguish the disputed domain name from the Complainant's trademark and in fact increases the likelihood of confusion as it indicates that it is a place to shop for the Complainant's footwear in the United States where the Complainant is based.

The fact that the disputed domain name uses a new generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".shop" does not create a meaningful distinction between itself and the Complainant's DANSKO trademark.

The Respondent has no connection or affiliation with the Complainant and has not received any license or consent to use the Complainant's trademark. The Respondent is not commonly known as "dansko" or any of the terms in the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name resolves to a website with infringing content, prominently featuring the Complainant's DANSKO trademark and purporting to offer identical footwear goods. The Respondent has made every effort to confuse consumers into believing that the disputed domain name is related to the Complainant by offering footwear products via its website that is confusingly similar to the Complainant's website.

The Respondent had the Complainant in mind when registering the disputed domain name because it uses the DANSKO trademark material to offer unauthorized or counterfeit goods. Additionally, the Respondent has concealed its true identity by registering the disputed domain name through a privacy service. It is likely that the Respondent plans to use the disputed domain name to obtain personal information from individuals who believe that the disputed domain name is related to the Complainant.

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

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

#### **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.

### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

The disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's trademark, the abbreviated country name "USA", and the gTLD ".shop". The gTLD is irrelevant here as it is a standard registration requirement. See section 1.11.1 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)).

Section 1.8 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) says:

"Where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, [...] or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element."

Here, the letters "usa" appear to refer to the Complainant's principal location. It does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark.

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

### **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

The Respondent is not called "dansko" or anything similar. There is no evidence that the Complainant has ever authorised the Respondent to use its trademarks. The Respondent is using the Complainant's trademark and logo on its website to sell what purport to be the Complainant's products.

For these reasons, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has met this element. See section 2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

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

Since registering the disputed domain name, the Respondent appears to have been using the website to which the disputed domain name resolves to sell what purport to be the Complainant's footwear products. When registering the disputed domain name, the Respondent clearly knew of the Complainant's business. The Respondent has since been using the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark to sell shoes. The Respondent appears to have done this to make money from people who think that the website to which the disputed domain name resolves was somehow associated with the Complainant when that is not the case.

For these reasons, 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 disputed domain name <dansko-usa.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Adam Samuel/*

**Adam Samuel**

Sole Panelist

Date: February 27, 2025