

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Snowflake Inc. v. Domain Admin, DomainNameNexus
Case No. D2025-1919

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Snowflake Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Schwegman, Lundberg & Woessner, P.A., United States.

The Respondent is Domain Admin, DomainNameNexus, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <snowflakecomputing.com> is registered with Sav.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 13, 2025. On May 14, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 14, 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 May 16, 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 May 20, 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 May 21, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 10, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 11, 2025.

The Center appointed William F. Hamilton as the sole panelist in this matter on June 16, 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 global cloud computing-based data company headquartered in the United States. Customers utilize the Complainant's services to unite siloed data, to discover and securely share data, and to execute diverse workloads. The Complainant processes an average of 6.3B daily queries on the data cloud from its over 11,000 global customers.

The Complainant owns hundreds of registrations for the trademark SNOWFLAKE (the "Mark") across numerous national jurisdictions, including but not limited to United States Registration No. 6,209,087, dated December 1, 2020, in Classes 35, and 42. The United States registration indicates a first use of the Mark in commerce on November 17, 2016.

The Complainant operates the website at the domain <snowflake.com>. The Complainant also owns the domain name <snowflakecomputing.com>, which was registered on July 27, 2012. The domain name <snowflakecomputing.com> redirects visitors to the Complainant's website at "www.snowflake.com".

The disputed domain name was registered on April 18, 2025, and resolves to a website that offers it for sale for USD 65,000, a price that significantly exceeds the cost of acquiring and maintaining it.

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 argues that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its Mark because the Mark is clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name. Furthermore, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name not only adopts the Mark but also incorporates a simple yet visually misleading misspelling of the word "computing," namely "computng." This misspelling, when combined with the Mark, is likely to confuse Internet users into believing they are visiting the Complainant's website at "www.snowflake.com". The Complainant maintains that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and that there is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent is commonly known by it. Additionally, the Complainant states that the Respondent is neither a licensee of the Complainant nor affiliated with the Complainant in any way. The Complainant further claims that it has not authorized the Respondent to use the Mark. Moreover, the Complainant argues that the disputed domain name was registered and used in bad faith, fully aware of the Mark, to attract Internet users to the Respondent's website, leading them to believe that the disputed domain name and the Respondent's website content are associated with or sponsored by the Complainant, and to offer the page for sale at an extraordinary price.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed the Complainant must satisfy the Panel that:

- (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 was 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 of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect to the Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the Mark is clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name. The Mark is the initial component and a prominent feature of the disputed domain name. Further, the use of the term "computlng," which replaces the "l" in computing with the similar appearing letter "l," in the disputed domain name does not prevent the Complainant's Mark from being recognizable in the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of the term "computlng" in the disputed domain name may bear on the assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of "computlng," an obvious misspelling of a dictionary term, does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Mark for the purposes of the Policy.

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 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 the composition of the disputed domain name. The Complainant offers computing services, and the Respondent's intentional addition of the misspelled word "computng" to the Mark will confuse Internet users into believing that they are visiting the Complainant's website at "www.snowflakecomputing.com", which would redirect to the Complainant's main website at "snowflake.com".

The disputed domain name resolves to a website offering it for sale at a substantial price, which demonstrates that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Under paragraph 4(b) of the Policy, bad faith may be established by any one of the following scenarios:

(i) circumstances indicating that the respondent has registered or acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or

(ii) the respondent has registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) the respondent has registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the domain name, the respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the respondent's website or location or of a product or service on the respondent's website or location.

The Panel finds that the Respondent was undoubtedly aware of the Complainant's Mark and its associated goodwill when registering the disputed domain name. By using the disputed domain name, which incorporates Complainant's Mark and directs to a webpage informing viewers that the disputed domain name is available for sale, the Respondent intentionally attempts to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website with the Complainant's Mark.

This case also presents a clear instance of typo-squatting, which itself constitutes evidence of bad faith registration and use. *Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Longo*, WIPO Case No. [D2004-0816](#) (typosquatting creates a presumption of bad faith registration). The disputed domain name is nearly identical to Complainant's domain name <snowflakecomputing.com>, differing only in that Respondent has replaced the letter "i" with the letter "l." This substitution of two visually similar letters creates a minor variation from the Complainant's domain name that is designed to capitalize on Internet users' typographical errors.

The Respondent composed and registered the disputed domain name using the Complainant's Mark and a deliberate misspelling of the Complainant's domain name to exploit the reputation of the Complainant's Mark and mislead Internet users searching for the Complainant's website to the Respondent's site, which offers the disputed domain name for sale.

The fact that the disputed domain name is being offered for sale by the Respondent for a price that significantly exceeds typical acquisition costs further evidences bad faith. Given the fame of Complainant's Mark, the wholesale adoption of the Mark in the disputed domain name, and the typo-squatting error in the disputed domain name, it is implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's existence

when registering the disputed domain name. The Panel finds the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 <snowflakecomputing.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/William F. Hamilton/

William F. Hamilton

Sole Panelist

Date: June 25, 2025