

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Washpoppin, Inc. v. jp curtis
Case No. D2025-2381

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Washpoppin, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Russ August & Kabat, United States.

The Respondent is jp curtis, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

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

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 16, 2025. On June 17, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 17, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 18, 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 amendment to the Complaint on June 18, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 23, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 13, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any formal response but did send a series of emails to the Center as described more fully below. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 15, 2025.

The Center appointed Evan D. Brown as the sole panelist in this matter on July 18, 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 in the business of managing and commercializing the intellectual property rights and brand of the rapper professionally known as Cardi B. It owns the trademark CARDI B, for which it enjoys the benefits of registration, including United States Reg. No. 5624993, registered on December 11, 2018.

According to the Whois records, the disputed domain name was registered on April 6, 2025. The Respondent has passively held the disputed domain name without any active use.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark; that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

No formal response was submitted to the Complainant's assertions, but the Respondent sent a series of emails sent to the Center on June 25 and July 17 and 22, 2025, expressing frustration and distress over the proceedings. The sender emphasized being an elderly individual and claimed to have done nothing wrong, stating that the disputed domain name was purchased legally through a domain registrar and had not been used, promoted, or offered for sale. It was asserted that the disputed domain name is passively held in an account, with no outreach or solicitation ever made regarding it. The emails portrayed the Complaint as an unjust action by the wealthy against the poor, describing it as a burdensome "money grab" that was harmful to the sender's health. The sender urged that any complaints be directed to the domain registrar rather than to them.

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied: (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 has been registered and is being used in bad faith. The Panel finds that all three of these elements have been met in this case.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

This first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7. 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. *Id.* This element requires the Panel to consider two issues: first, whether the Complainant has rights in a relevant mark; and second, whether the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to that mark.

A registered trademark provides a clear indication that the rights in the mark shown on the trademark certificate belong to its respective owner. See *Advance Magazine Publishers Inc., Les Publications Conde Nast S.A. v. Voguechen*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-0657](#). The Complainant has demonstrated its rights in the CARDI B mark by providing evidence of its trademark registrations. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1. The disputed domain name incorporates the CARDI B mark in its entirety with the term “beauty”, which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant’s CARDI B mark. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8. The CARDI B mark remains recognizable for a showing of confusing similarity under the Policy.

It is standard practice when comparing a disputed domain name to a complainant’s trademarks, to not take the extension into account. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) at 1.11.1 (“The applicable Top-Level Domain (“TLD”) in a domain name (e.g., “.com”, “.club”, “.nyc”) is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test.”).

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established this first element under the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Panel evaluates this element of the Policy by first looking to see whether the Complainant has made a prima facie showing that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. If the Complainant makes that showing, the burden of production of demonstrating rights or legitimate interests shifts to the Respondent (with the burden of proof always remaining with the Complainant). See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1; *AXA SA v. Huade Wang*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-1289](#).

On this point, the Complainant asserts, among other things, that: (1) the Respondent is not using or making demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; indeed, it appears that the domain is not in use at all; (2) the Respondent is not commonly known or referred to by the disputed domain name, regardless of whether Respondent has acquired trademark or service mark rights, which it has not; and (3) the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, but rather registered the disputed domain name with the specific intent to exploit Cardi B’s fame and goodwill for the Respondent’s own commercial gain, to misleadingly divert users to its website, and/or to tarnish the CARDI B mark at issue.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has made the required prima facie showing. The Respondent has not presented evidence to overcome this prima facie showing. Nothing in the record otherwise tilts the balance in the Respondent’s favor.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established this second element under the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Policy requires a complainant to establish that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name was registered nearly two months prior to the filing of the Complaint but appears not to be in active use. Therefore, according to the Complainant, the circumstances indicate that the disputed domain name was registered or acquired primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring it to the Complainant or to a competitor of the Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the Respondent’s out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name.

Further, the Complainant argues that the disputed domain name was registered in order to prevent the legitimate owner of the CARDI B mark from reflecting the dominant portion of the mark in a corresponding domain name.

Finally, the Complainant claims that the Respondent intends for its own commercial gain to attract users and/or consumers to the Respondent's website by creating confusion, deception, and/or mistake with the CARDI B mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website, or of a product or service the Respondent provides or intends to provide on its website.

The Respondent contends that it regularly registers domain names and holds them until approached for sale, and it appears from the Respondent's communications that it registered the disputed domain name (which clearly incorporates the Complainant's name and trademark) in anticipation that the Complaint or a third party would seek to purchase the disputed domain name.

Moreover, the Panel notes that Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name 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 trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the circumstances in the record are sufficient to establish registration and use in bad faith under paragraph 4(b) of the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established this third element under 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 <cardibbeauty.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Evan D. Brown/

Evan D. Brown

Sole Panelist

Date: August 1, 2025