

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Calvin Broadus v. Kieran Holmes
Case No. D2025-0510

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Kieran Holmes, Afghanistan.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <nz-snoopdogg.buzz>, <snoopdoggdollars-au.one>, <snoopdoggdollars.cloud>, <snoopdoggdollars.club>, and <snoopdoggold.com> (the "Domain Names") are registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 7, 2025. On February 10, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Names. On February 10, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Names which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 12, 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 February 19, 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 February 20, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 12, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 13, 2025.

The Center appointed Gregor Vos as the sole panelist in this matter on March 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 is a world-renowned musician and celebrity. The Complainant won many awards and received a star on the Hollywood Walk of Fame.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademarks in jurisdictions around the world. The Complainant is the owner of inter alia the following trademark registrations (hereinafter referred to as: the "Trademarks"):

- European Union trademark registration No. 001296177 for SNOOP DOGG registered on October 3, 2000;
- United States trademark registration No. 2697128 for SNOOP DOGG registered on March 18, 2003;
- Australia trademark registration No. 2343651 for SNOOP DOGG registered on October 30, 2023.

The Complainant is inter alia the owner of the domain name <snoopdogg.com> that resolves to a website on which inter alia news and music articles are published and a link to the Complainant's website on the domain name <snoopermarket.com>, which resolves to the Complainant's online merchandise store.

The Respondent registered on December 9, 2024 the Domain Name <nz-snoopdogg.buzz>, on December 15, 2024 the Domain Name <snoopdoggdollars-au.one>, and on December 23, 2024 the Domain Names <snoopdoggdollars.cloud>, <snoopdoggdollars.club>, and <snoopdoggold.com>. At the time of the filing of the Complaint, the Domain Names <nz-snoopdogg.buzz>, <snoopdoggdollars.club>, and <snoopdoggold.com> resolved to websites on which casino games were offered and for the latter two Domain Names on which the Complainant's likeness was displayed. The Domain Name <snoopdoggdollars.cloud> did not resolve to an active website and the Domain Name <snoopdoggdollars-au.one> resolved to a website on which pay-per-click ("PPC") links are displayed.

Currently, the Domain Names <nz-snoopdogg.buzz>, <snoopdoggdollars.cloud>, <snoopdoggdollars.club> and <snoopdoggold.com> do not resolve to an active website. The Domain Name <snoopdoggdollars-au.one> still resolves to a website on which PPC links are displayed.

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 Domain Names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the Domain Names are identical or confusingly similar to the Trademarks of the Complainant, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names, and the Domain Names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

Firstly, according to the Complainant, the Domain Names are confusingly similar to its Trademarks. The Domain Names incorporate the Trademarks in their entirety, each with minor additions such as the terms "dollars", "old", the geographical indications "nz", and "au", as well as the addition of the generic Top-Level Domains ("gTLD") ".buzz", ".one", ".cloud", ".club" and ".com". The mere additions of gTLDs, non-distinctive terms and geographical indications does not prevent a likelihood of confusion. The confusing similarity between the Domain Names and the Trademarks is reinforced by the fact that the Trademarks are well-known to consumers so that consumers will think that the Domain Names are owned by, or associated with, the Complainant.

Secondly, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names. The Respondent has never been granted a license or authorization from the Complainant to use the Trademarks or to suggest any affiliation with the Complainant. Furthermore, there is no evidence that the Respondent uses the Domain Names in connection with the bona fide offering of goods and services, nor is there any indication of noncommercial fair use. In addition, it can be inferred that the Domain Names would not have been registered but for the reputations of the Trademarks. This gives rise to the presumption that the Respondent does not have any legitimate right or interest in the Domain Names.

Finally, according to the Complainant, the Respondent has registered and is using the Domain Names in bad faith. The Domain Names <nz-snoopdogg.buzz>, <snoopdoggdollars.club> and <snoopdoggold.com> are used for websites on which content is displayed that, according to the Complainant, could be potentially harmful, and which content would be used to deceive Internet users into believing they are authentic websites. The fact that the Domain Name <snoopdoggdollars.cloud> and the Domain Name <snoopdoggdollars-au.one> do not resolve to an active webpage or to a website on which PPC links are displayed respectively does not prevent a finding of bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

For the Complainant to succeed, it must prove, within the meaning of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy and on the balance of probabilities that:

- i. the Domain Names are 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 Names; and
- iii. the Domain Names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

Only if all three elements have been fulfilled, the Panel is able to grant the remedies requested by the Complainant. The Panel will deal with each of the requirements in turn.

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 Trademarks and the Domain Names. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

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 Trademarks is reproduced within the Domain Names. Accordingly, the Domain Names are confusingly similar to the Trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Panel will discuss whether the Domain Names are confusing similar to the Trademarks for each of the Domain Names separately. In general, the addition of gTLDs is generally disregarded for the assessment of the first element.

The Domain Name <nz-snoopdogg.buzz> contains the addition of "nz" and a hyphen. Although the addition of other terms may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term here does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the Trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The Domain Name <snoopdoggdollars-au.one> contains the addition of the term “dollars”, the term “au”, and a hyphen. Although the addition of other terms may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms here does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the Trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The Domain Name <snoopdoggdollars.cloud> contains the addition of the term “dollars”. Although the addition of other terms may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term here does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The Domain Name <snoopdoggdollars.club> contains the addition of the term “dollars”. Although the addition of other terms may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term here does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The Domain Name <snoopdoggold.com> contains the addition of the term “old”. Although the addition of other terms may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term here does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

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.

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 3.0](#), section 2.1.

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

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.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent’s registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

Regarding all of the Domain Names, the Panel notes that the Trademarks are registered by the Complainant and have been used for many years. The Complainant's rights to the Trademarks predate the registration date of the Domain Names. In light of the well-known character and the strong worldwide reputation of the Trademarks, and the fact that the Trademarks are included in their entirety in the Domain Names, the Panel agrees with the Complainant that it is not conceivable that the Respondent chose the Domain Names without knowledge of the Complainant's activities and its Trademarks under which the Complainant is doing business. The well-known character of the Trademarks has been confirmed by earlier panels (see e.g. *Calvin Broadus v. Lasgaa Mohamed, acorm*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-4499](#)).

Regarding the Domain Names <nz-snoopdogg.buzz>, <snoopdoggdollars.club>, <snoopdoggdollars-au.one>, and <snoopdoggold.com>, the Panel finds that in the present case the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites on which commercial content was displayed, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's famous Trademarks.

Regarding the Domain Name <snoopdoggdollars.cloud>, Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's Trademarks, and the composition of the Domain Name <snoopdoggdollars.cloud>, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of this Domain Name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

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 Names <nz-snoopdogg.buzz>, <snoopdoggdollars-au.one>, <snoopdoggdollars.cloud>, <snoopdoggdollars.club>, and <snoopdoggold.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Gregor Vos/

Gregor Vos

Sole Panelist

Date: April 7, 2025