

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Calvin Broadus v. Evgeniy Pahlov, NC  
Case No. D2025-0762

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is Evgeniy Pahlov, NC, Thailand.

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

The disputed domain names <snoopdogg-dollars.website>, <snoopdoggdollars.website>, <snoopdoggdollars.xyz> and <snoopdogg.sbs> 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 24, 2025. On February 25, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On February 26, 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 Complainant filed an amended Complaint on February 26, 2025, amending the mutual jurisdiction.

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 27, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 19, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 25, 2025.

The Center appointed Mireille Buydens as the sole panelist in this matter on March 28, 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, also known as “Snoop Dogg”. He conducts business on the Internet, including a website at “www.snoopdogg.com” featuring news, music, and appearances, as well as links to social media accounts, and a link to the Complainant’s online store at “www.snoopermarket.com” for purchasing authentic SNOOP DOGG products (including musical recordings and apparel). The Complainant has millions of followers on social media, including YouTube, Spotify, and Instagram. Over some 30 years since 1994, the Complainant has won a wide variety of music industry and related awards.

The Complainant is the owner of various trademark registrations for the SNOOP DOGG trademark (hereafter “the Trademark”), including:

- European Union trademark registration No. 1296177 for SNOOP DOGG (word mark) registered on October 3, 2000;
- United States trademark registration No. 2697128 SNOOP DOGG (word mark) registered on March 18, 2003;
- Malaysia trademark registration No. TM2024004690 for SNOOP DOGG (word mark) registered on August 28, 2024;
- Philippines trademark registration No. 4/2023/00532986 for SNOOP DOGG (word mark) registered on July 22, 2024.

The Complainant has spent millions of dollars for advertising, promoting, developing, and protecting the Trademarks.

The disputed domain names were registered on November 19, 2024 (<snoopdogg.sbs>) and on December 22, 2024 (<snoopdoggdollars.website>, <snoopdogg-dollars.website>, <snoopdoggdollars.xyz>).

The disputed domain name <snoopdogg.sbs> directs to a webpage proposing to install a “Snoop Dogg Dollars” application, which allows to play casino games and gamble online. The website incorporates a cartoon depiction of the Complainant’s likeness and image. The website reproduces gamer’s reviews, which show that they are of the opinion that the website and application have been developed by the Complainant.

The disputed domain names <snoopdoggdollars.website>, <snoopdogg-dollars.website>, and <snoopdoggdollars.xyz> direct to websites proposing to download online casino games. These three websites refer to a contact address in the United Arab Emirates.

#### 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 names.

First, the Complainant asserts that it owns registrations for the Trademark, which is a well-known trademark. The disputed domain name <snoopdogg.sbs> entirely incorporates the Trademark (with no addition) and the disputed domain names <snoopdoggdollars.website>, <snoopdogg-dollars.website>, and <snoopdoggdollars.xyz> also incorporate the Trademark with only the addition of the non-distinctive term “dollars”. The generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.sbs”, “.website”, and “.xyz” in the disputed domain names should be disregarded. As a result, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar with the Trademark.

Second, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Respondent has no connection or affiliation with the Complainant and has not received any authorization, license, or consent, whether express or implied, to use the Trademark in the disputed domain names. There is no evidence that the Respondent uses the disputed domain names in connection with the bona fide offering of goods or services, and there is no evidence of non-commercial fair use, either. The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain names direct to websites that are intended to deceive Internet users into believing they are authentic websites when they are not. The Complainant further contends that these websites contain a “Download” or “Install” button, which could deceive Internet users into downloading potentially harmful content or software. The Complainant further explains that the Trademark was well-known decades before the Respondent registered the disputed domain names. The registration and use of a domain name that incorporates a well-known trademark to direct visitors to a website unconnected with the trademark owner (which is the case here) cannot constitute use in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services or otherwise be considered a legitimate interest in a domain name.

Third, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. The Complainant submits that the registration of domain names that are identical or confusingly similar to a widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity creates in itself a presumption of bad faith. At the time of registration of the disputed domain names, the Respondent knew, or at least should have known, of the existence of the Complainant’s Trademark. Besides, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain names are used by the Respondent in an attempt to deceive consumers into believing that the websites they are directing to are authentic websites as well as in an attempt to induce consumers to “Download” or “Install” potentially harmful content or software. By doing so, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract for commercial gain Internet users to the Respondent’s websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the Respondent’s websites.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Dealing with the Respondent’s failure to file a response to the Complaint, paragraph 14(b) of the Rules provides that if a party, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, does not comply with a provision of, or requirement under these Rules, the panel shall be entitled to draw such inferences from this omission, as it considers appropriate.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that the Complainant proves each of the following three elements in order to succeed in its Complaint:

- (i) the disputed 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 disputed domain names; and
- (iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and are 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 of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ([“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 for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the entirety of the SNOOP DOGG Trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain names. Concerning the disputed domain names <snoopdoggdollars.website>, <snoopdogg-dollars.website>, <snoopdoggdollars.xyz>, the Trademark is reproduced with the addition of the term “dollars”. Although the addition of this term may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Further, the gTLDs “.xyz”, “.sbs”, and “.website” are a standard registration requirement and do not prevent the disputed domain names from being identical or confusingly similar to the Trademark.

Accordingly, the disputed domain name <snoopdogg.sbs> is identical to the Trademark and the disputed domain names <snoopdoggdollars.website>, <snoopdogg-dollars.website>, and <snoopdoggdollars.xyz> are confusingly similar to the Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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 disputed 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 disputed domain names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Respondent is not licensed by, nor affiliated with, the Complainant in any way. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain names, nor is there any evidence of use or demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain names for a bona fide offering of goods or services. There is no evidence of legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names, either. On the contrary, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name <snoopdogg.sbs> is identical to the well-known Trademark, which is a well-known trademark registered decades prior to the disputed domain name <snoopdogg.sbs>. Besides, the website to which this disputed domain name directs incorporates a cartoon depiction of Complainant’s likeness and image as well as gamers’ reviews clearly showing that Internet users are deceived about the sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. This affirms the Respondent’s clear intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name <snoopdogg.sbs> and the Complainant’s Trademark. Concerning the disputed domain names <snoopdoggdollars.website>, <snoopdogg-dollars.website>, and <snoopdoggdollars.xyz>, the Panel notes that they reproduce the Trademark in its entirety with the mere addition of the term “dollars” (referring to the fact that the websites are offering online gambling games), and as such also carry a risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

Based on the available record, the Panel considers that the registration and use of the disputed domain names, reproducing the well-known Trademark of the Complainant (along with the non-distinctive term “dollars” as far as <snoopdoggdollars.website>, <snoopdogg-dollars.website>, and <snoopdoggdollars.xyz> are concerned) for online gambling websites, confirm the Respondent’s intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain names and the Complainant’s Trademark.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the disputed domain names contain the Complainant’s well-known Trademark either with no addition or with the mere addition of the term “dollars”. The composition of the disputed domain names is well-suited to mislead Internet users, which will unduly believe that these disputed domain names resolve to the websites operated by the Complainant or endorsed by the Complainant (and actually, on the website to which the disputed domain name <snoopdogg.sbs> directs, the gamers’ reviews show that they are actually unduly believing that there is such endorsement). The Respondent was obviously aware of the Complainant’s Trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain names as one of the websites reproduces a cartoon version of the Complainant’s image. The registration and use of the disputed domain names create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant and its Trademark. Therefore, the Panel finds that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain names in bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of 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 disputed domain names <snoopdogg-dollars.website>, <snoopdoggdollars.website>, <snoopdoggdollars.xyz>, and <snoopdogg.sbs> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Mireille Buydens/*

**Mireille Buydens**

Sole Panelist

Date: April 11, 2025