

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Skydance Productions, LLC v. Name Redacted  
Case No. D2025-1982

### 1. The Parties

The Complainant is Skydance Productions, LLC, United States of America (“United States” or “US”), represented by Hanson Bridgett LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Name Redacted. <sup>1</sup>

### 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <skydance-acquisitions.com> (“Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with Squarespace Domains LLC (the “Registrar”).

### 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 18, 2025. On May 19, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On May 19, 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 (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 20, 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 22, 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

---

<sup>1</sup>The Respondent appears to have used the name and physical address of a third party when registering the Disputed Domain Name. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted the Respondent’s name from this Decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this Decision an instruction to the Registrar regarding transfer of the Disputed Domain Name, which includes the name of the Respondent. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in these proceedings, and has indicated Annex 1 to this Decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST 12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1788](#).

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 23, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 12, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 13, 2025.

The Center appointed Peter J. Dernbach as the sole panelist in this matter on June 20, 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 US media production company headquartered in Santa Monica, California, engaged in film and television production.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations in the United States for SKYDANCE, SKYDANCE PRODUCTIONS, and SKYDANCE TELEVISION, which were first used in January 2006. Some of the Complainant’s trademarks are listed below:

Registration No.	Trademark	International Classes	Jurisdiction	Registration Date
6053525	SKYDANCE	9, 36, and 41	United States	May 12, 2020
5433657	SKYDANCE PRODUCTIONS	9	United States	March 27, 2018
3856311	SKYDANCE PRODUCTIONS	41	United States	October 5, 2010

Additionally, Complainant owns and operates a website using the domain name <skydance.com>, which was registered on April 12, 1996.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on April 30, 2025, and currently resolves to a webpage under construction, which displays <skydance-acquisitions.com> at the center of the page.

The Respondent, according to information provided by the Registrar, is an individual whose listed address corresponds to the official corporate address of a third party. The Respondent’s name is reportedly the name of an employee of the third party. However, the email address associated with the Respondent is a personal Gmail account, which differs from the official email account used by the third party.

The Respondent has used an email address associated with the Disputed Domain Name to send emails to third parties requesting them to sell their books’ film and adaptation rights, while claiming to be an executive with the Complainant. The Complainant has confirmed that none of its personnel sent or authorized the sending of these messages.

#### 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 contends that:

(i) The Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights.

The Complainant asserts that the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to its trademark because it wholly incorporates the entire SKYDANCE word mark and combines it with the descriptive term “acquisitions”. The addition of this term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, because the content of the fraudulent emails sent from the Disputed Domain Name relates to the acquisition of intellectual property for production, a principal business activity of the Complainant.

(ii) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. The Complainant confirms it has never licensed or otherwise authorized the Respondent to use the SKYDANCE mark for a domain name or any other purpose, and that the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant in any way. As such, the Respondent is not using the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Furthermore, the Complainant notes that the Respondent has never been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name. Instead, the Disputed Domain Name is being actively used to send impersonating phishing emails while the corresponding website is passively held with only an “under construction” page. This combination of phishing and passive holding does not represent a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

(iii) The Disputed Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant argues that the Disputed Domain Name is being used in bad faith. The Respondent's use of the Disputed Domain Name to conduct phishing scam—by sending emails from a “@skydance-acquisitions.com” address while impersonating the Complainant's President of Television — demonstrates a clear awareness of the Complainant's reputation, as this is instrumental to the fraudulent scheme.

This assertion of bad faith is further confirmed by the identity information provided by the Registrar. The name used to register the Disputed Domain Name is that of a development executive at a third party company. However, the associated contact email is an unverified, personal Gmail address, not the third party executive's professional email address. This discrepancy suggests an attempt to impersonate a legitimate industry figure, reinforcing the conclusion that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used with fraudulent intent from the outset.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, in order to succeed in this administrative proceeding and obtain the requested remedy (in this case, transfer of the Disputed Domain Name), the Complainant must prove that each of the three following elements are present:

(i) the Disputed Domain Name is 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 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 of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown that it is the owner of United States registered trademarks for the SKYDANCE mark and marks that contain the Skydance element. The entirety of the SKYDANCE mark is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name. The Disputed Domain Name also includes another element "acquisitions", which aligns with the Respondent's email's goal to acquire third parties' intellectual property. The Panel finds that the addition of this term in the Disputed Domain Name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Name and the SKYDANCE mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8. The Top-Level Domain ".com" is a standard registration requirement and does not impact the assessment of confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark for the purposes of the Policy.

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:

- (i) before any notice to [the respondent] of the dispute, [the respondent's] use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the [disputed] domain name or a name corresponding to the [disputed] domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or
- (ii) [the respondent] (as an individual, business, or other organization) [has] been commonly known by the [disputed] domain name, even if [the respondent has] acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or
- (iii) [the respondent is] making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the [disputed] domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

Pursuant to paragraphs 4(a)(ii) and 4(c) of the Policy, the Complainant is required to first establish a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. The burden of production then shifts to the Respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. If the Respondent fails to do so, the Complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element.

Here, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no connection or affiliation with the Complainant, nor did the Respondent receive authorization to use the Skydance marks. There is additionally no evidence to suggest that the Disputed Domain Name has any connection with the Respondent's name or that the Respondent is commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name, particularly considering that the Respondent has used the name of an executive of a third party when registering the Disputed Domain Name.

Although the Disputed Domain Name currently appears to resolve to a passively held page, the evidence shows that the Respondent is using the Disputed Domain Name to impersonate one of the Complainant's executives for phishing purposes. Panels have previously held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity — here, claimed phishing and impersonation/passing off — can never confer rights or legitimate

interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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 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.

Therefore, 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, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name several years after the Complainant registered its SKYDANCE marks and the domain name <skydance.com>. The Disputed Domain Name wholly incorporates the SKYDANCE mark, which appears to have no meaning other than the Complainant's trademark. It is implausible that the Respondent, purely by coincidence, came up with the Disputed Domain Name that reproduces the word in its entirety. In addition, the Panel finds no apparent record of use of the Complainant's SKYDANCE marks in connection with any goods or services other than in connection with the Complainant. Therefore, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith.

Currently, and at the time of the Complaint's submission, the Disputed Domain Name resolved to a webpage that appeared to be under construction. However, the Disputed Domain Name is being used to create and send fraudulent emails using the associated email address (i.e., [...]@skydance-acquisitions.com) by impersonating one of the Complainant's executives and requesting the recipients of such emails to provide personal information and gauging their interest in selling their intellectual property to the Respondent. Moreover, the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name using the name of another executive from a third party company with an unverified Gmail address. Panels have consistently held that the use of a Disputed Domain Name for per se illegitimate activity such as phishing can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent, and such behavior is manifestly considered evidence of bad faith. The Panel finds that the Respondent has used the Disputed Domain Name to engage in a bad faith conduct by impersonating the Complainant and sending fraudulent emails with the intention to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to respond to phishing emails by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith.

Therefore, 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 Name <skydance-acquisitions.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Peter J. Dernbach/*

**Peter J. Dernbach**

Sole Panelist

Date: July 4, 2025