

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

William Grant & Sons Limited v. Web3 Privacy LLC
Case No. D2025-0478

1. The Parties

The Complainant is William Grant & Sons Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Demys Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Web3 Privacy LLC, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <glenfiddich.box> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 6, 2025. On February 7, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 12, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the 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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on February 13, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 5, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 6, 2025.

The Center appointed Edoardo Fano as the sole panelist in this matter on March 13, 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.

The Panel has not received any requests from the Complainant or the Respondent regarding further submissions, waivers, or extensions of deadlines, and the Panel has not found it necessary to request any further information from the Parties.

Having reviewed the communication records in the case file provided by the Center, the Panel finds that the Center has discharged its responsibility under the Rules, paragraph 2(a), “to employ reasonably available means calculated to achieve actual notice to [the] Respondent”. Therefore, the Panel shall issue its Decision based upon the Complaint, the Policy, the Rules, and the Supplemental Rules and without the benefit of a response from the Respondent.

The language of the proceeding is English, being the language of the Registration Agreement, as per paragraph 11(a) of the Rules.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is William Grant & Sons Limited, a United Kingdom company located in Scotland, operating in the field of distilling, marketing, and distributing Scotch whiskies and other spirits, and owning several trademark registrations for GLENFIDDICH all over the world in relation to a single malt whisky, among which:

- United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00000809941 for GLENFIDDICH, registered on August 26, 1960;
- Canadian Trademark Registration No. TMA143048 for GLENFIDDICH, registered on December 10, 1965;
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 000192575 for GLENFIDDICH, registered on October 29, 1998; and
- United States Trademark Registration No. 3980808 for GLENFIDDICH, registered on June 21, 2011.

The Complainant also operates on the Internet, the official website for its GLENFIDDICH single malt whisky being “www.glenfiddich.com”.

The Complainant provided evidence in support of the above.

According to the Whois records, the disputed domain name was registered on July 16, 2024, and it resolves to a commercial website associated with new Web3 technology products/services, namely non-fungible tokens (“NFTs”) and cryptocurrencies.

On November 4, 2024, the Complainant’s legal representatives sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent, without receiving any reply.

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 states that the disputed domain name is identical to its trademark GLENFIDDICH, as the disputed domain name wholly incorporates the Complainant’s trademark.

Moreover, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name since it has not been authorized by the Complainant to register the disputed domain name or to use its trademark within the disputed domain name, it is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and it is not making either a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in bad faith, since the Complainant’s trademark GLENFIDDICH is well known in the field of single malt whiskies. Therefore, the

Respondent targeted the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name and the Complainant contends that the Respondent is intentionally attempting to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark, which qualifies as bad faith registration and use.

B. Respondent

The Respondent has made no reply to the Complainant's contentions and is in default. In reference to paragraphs 5(f) and 14 of the Rules, no exceptional circumstances explaining the default have been put forward or are apparent from the record.

A respondent is not obliged to participate in a proceeding under the Policy, but if it fails to do so, reasonable facts asserted by a complainant may be taken as true, and appropriate inferences, in accordance with paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, may be drawn. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.3.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists three elements, which the Complainant must satisfy in order to succeed:

- (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

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 the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, 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 entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

It is also well accepted that a generic Top-Level Domain, in this case ".box", is typically ignored when assessing the confusing similarity between a trademark and a domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

While 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 often impossible 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. 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 record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed 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 disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's GLENFIDDICH trademark and nearly identical to the Complainant's domain name <glenfiddich.com>, and the Respondent uses it for a commercial website associated with NFTs. Even assuming that the disputed domain name could be derived from any potential geographic location in Scotland or a combination of ancient Scottish Gaelic words that mean "valley of the deer", the Respondent has not claimed nor produced evidence that would establish that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name based on any such meaning of the terms and not on account of its value based on the GLENFIDDICH trademark and distillery.

Based on the available record, the Panel 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.

In the present case, regarding the registration in bad faith of the disputed domain name, the reputation of the Complainant's trademark GLENFIDDICH in the field of single malt whiskies is clearly established, and the Panel finds that the Respondent more likely than not knew of the Complainant, and deliberately registered the disputed domain name based on its trademark value, in bad faith.

The Panel further notes that the effect of the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name is to attract Internet users to its website by creating likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the disputed domain name's source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement, an activity clearly detrimental to the Complainant's business.

The above suggests to the Panel that, on balance of probabilities, the Respondent intentionally registered and is using the disputed domain name in order both to disrupt the Complainant's business, and to attract Internet users to its website in accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

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, <glenfiddich.box>, be transferred to the Complainant.

/Edoardo Fano/

Edoardo Fano

Sole Panelist

Date: March 20, 2025