ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Doggett Company, LLC v. Richard Rawlings
Case No. D2025-1977

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Doggett Company, LLC, United States of America (the "United States"), represented by Chamberlain Hrdlicka White Willams Aughtry, United States.

The Respondent is Richard Rawlings, United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <doggettbuickgmc.com>, <doggettcar.com>, <doggettchrysler.com>, <doggettgmcbuick.com>, and <doggettmercedes.com> (the "Disputed Domain Names") are registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 16, 2025. On May 19, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Names. On May 19, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Disputed Domain Names which differed from the named Respondent (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 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 June 10, 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 June 18, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 8, 2025. The Respondent sent email communications to the Center on May 27, 2025, June 11, 2025, June 23, 2025, and July 23, 2025.

The Center appointed Colin T. O'Brien as the sole panelist in this matter on July 25, 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 has a multiyear history in the forklift rental, warehousing, structural automotive parts, and associated sales businesses, currently running multiple auto and equipment dealerships in Texas and nearby states under the DOGGETT brand.

The Complainant owns the following United States trademark registrations:

MARK	REGISTRATION NUMBER AND DATE	INTERNATIONAL CLASS
DOGGETT	Reg. No. 7526296, registered on October 8, 2024	12, 35, 36, 37, 39, and 42 with earliest first use date of 2012
DOGGETT and Design	Reg. No. 7526297, registered on October 8, 2024	12, 35, 36, 37, 39, and 42 with earliest first use date of 2012
DOGGETT AUTOMOTIVE GROUP	Reg. No. 7848069, registered on July 1, 2025	35 with earliest first use date of 2018.

the “DOGGETT Marks”.

The Complainant has controlled the <Doggett.com> domain since 2004.

The disputed domain names <doggettbuickgmc.com>, <doggettchrysler.com>, <doggettgmcbuick.com>, <doggettmercedes.com> were registered on February 25, 2024, and <doggettcar.com> on November 12, 2024.

All of the Disputed Domain Names resolve to parking pages provided by the Registrar.

In a prior dispute between the Parties – *Doggett Company, LLC v. Richard Rawlings*, WIPO Case No. D2024-3591, dated October 31, 2024, the Respondent was ordered to transfer over eight domain names to the Complainant all of which incorporated DOGGETT with another car company name.

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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the Disputed Domain Names are confusingly similar to the Marks in which the Complainant has superior rights in that the Disputed Domain Names include a complete reproduction of the Complainant's Marks and merely adds a motor vehicle brand (i.e., “BuickGMC”, “Chrysler”, “GMCBuick”, and “Mercedes”) or the generic term, “car”, to the end of the DOGGETT Marks.

All of the Disputed Domain Names were registered after the Complainant filed the trademark applications for its DOGGETT Marks with the United States Patent and Trademark Office and long after the Complainant began using its DOGGETT Marks. The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant nor is the Respondent otherwise authorized to use the Complainant's DOGGETT Marks for any purpose.

The Respondent registered 4 of the disputed domain names on February 25, 2024, and the remaining disputed domain name on November 12, 2024. These dates are long after the Complainant has established rights in the Marks. Because the Disputed Domain Names were registered long after the Complainant had established rights, it is highly unlikely the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's Marks. Thus, the Respondent has registered the Disputed Domain Names containing the Complainant's well-known Marks without authorization, which constitutes a pattern of cybersquatting conduct and, as such, constitutes bad faith.

Given the Complainant's use of the DOGGETT Marks in connection with automotive dealerships, it is doubtful that the Respondent was not aware of the Complainant's Marks and their use in connection with automotive dealerships. Moreover, the Disputed Domain Names include the identical DOGGETT Marks, and are thus suited to divert or mislead potential web users from the websites they are actually trying to visit (e.g., "www.doggett.com", "www.doggettautomotivegroup.com", "www.doggettford.com"). This shows bad faith on the part of the Respondent.

B. Respondent

The Respondent replied to the Complaint by writing:

"These domains are for sale if you'd like to purchase them. Otherwise they are mine."

"As previously stated, these domains are not being used in any manner to infringe on any business. If you would like to purchase these domains, please reach out and let me know? I'd be more than willing to negotiate on a fair price that would be a lot cheaper than any other alternatives.
Please advise."

"Will replying to this email thread be acceptable to dispute claim against me? If so, I purchased these and have no intention of using them to infringe upon Doggett industries rights or businesses."

"I responded and got an email saying that it would be noted."

"Thank you I just wanted to make sure that you receive them, especially because I was let go (fired) from employment with Doggett for purchasing them."[1]

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has demonstrated it owns common law and registered trademark rights in its DOGGETT Marks in the United States and throughout multiple countries around the world. The addition of the other terms (including other trademarks) "buickgmc", "chrysler", "gmcbuick", "mercedes", and "car" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity as the Complainant's DOGGETT mark is clearly recognizable in the Disputed Domain Names. See sections 1.7 and 1.8 of the WIPO Overview 3.0.

Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Names are confusingly similar to a mark in which the Complainant has rights.

[1] The Panel notes the Respondent's contention and declines to make a finding thereunder, as it is outside of the scope of a UDRP proceeding.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant has presented a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Names and has not been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Names.

After a complainant has made a prima facie case, the burden of production shifts to a respondent to present evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. See, e.g., *Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd.,* WIPO Case No. D2003-0455.

Here, the Respondent has provided no evidence of any rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Names.

Moreover, the Panel finds that the nature of the Disputed Domain Names carries a risk of an implied affiliation as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. Section 2.5.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.0.

In the absence of any evidence rebutting the Complainant's prima facie case indicating the Respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Names, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Disputed Domain Names were registered years after the Complainant first used its DOGGETT Marks. The evidence provided by the Complainant as well as the admission by the Respondent makes it clear that the Respondent knew of the Complainant's DOGGETT Marks and likely knew that it had no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Names when it registered them.

There is no benign reason for the Respondent to have registered the Disputed Domain Names other than to make a profit off of the Complainant by creating a likelihood of confusion.

There is prima facie no reason for the Respondent to have registered the Disputed Domain Names using the Complainant's DOGGETT Marks with the names of automobile brands and the term "car" other than to create an association with the Complainant's dealership services. The Disputed Domain Names are currently inactive. but the Respondent only registered and holds the Disputed Domain Names in order to make a profit. The Panel finds bad faith. See WIPO Overview 3.0, section 3.1.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(iii) 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 <doggettbuickgmc.com>, <doggettcar.com>, <doggettchrysler.com>, <doggettgmcbuick.com>, and <doggettmercedes.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Colin T. O'Brien/
Colin T. O'Brien
Sole Panelist
Date: August 8, 2025