

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Aaron Bishop, TLC Ops v. Grigoriy Anoshenko
Case No. D2025-2402

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Aaron Bishop, TLC Ops, United States of America ("United States"), represented by IntegriShield, United States.

The Respondent is Grigoriy Anoshenko, the Russian Federation.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <bisongreencash.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 17, 2025. On June 18, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 18, 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 and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 19, 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 23, 2025.

The Center verified that 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 25, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 15, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 16, 2025.

The Center appointed Assen Alexiev 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 refers to itself as Aaron Bishop, CEO of TLC Ops, and describes itself as being active in the financial/lending industry since 2017. For the purposes of this decision, the Panel will consider Mr. Bishop and the entity TLC Ops jointly as the Complainant.

The Complainant has provided evidence that Yatta Outsourced Processing Solutions, Inc., doing business as TLC Ops has filed the United States trademark application No. 99117415 for BISON GREEN (word), filed on April 2, 2025, for services in International Class 36. The Panel will consider the Complainant as the entity that has filed this trademark application, which has not proceeded to registration yet.

The Complainant submits that it has been operating the BISON GREEN lending financial services business, whose official website is located at the domain name <bisongreen.com>, since 2017.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 20, 2024. It resolves to an English language website with the tab page title "Bison Green Cash | Direct Lender Tribal Installment Loans". The website offers installment loans with the text *"Apply For Fast Loan - It's EASY! The smart choice for finding the perfect tribal loan from Bison Green Cash tailored to your needs"*, placed above a button with the text *"\$ Get Your Cash Now!"*.

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.

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its BISON GREEN trademark application and common law trademark and to the business lending website "www.bisongreen.com", and attempts to profit off potential clients seeking Bison Green financial lending services.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered in 2024, after the Complainant had built its business using the brand "Bison Green" and the financial ecommerce website at the domain name <bisongreen.com>, and the disputed domain name causes confusion in consumers seeking a legitimate financial lending source.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. According to it, the disputed domain name was registered primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor and is being used to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the website at the disputed domain name by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark and domain name as to the source, affiliation, or endorsement of the website at the disputed domain name or of the services offered on it. The Complainant adds that the website at the disputed domain name requests sensitive banking information from website users for their lending review submission process.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

As discussed in sections 1.1.3 and 1.1.4 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), while the Policy makes no specific reference to the date on which the holder of the trademark or service mark acquired its rights, such rights must be in existence at the time the complaint is filed. A pending trademark application would not by itself establish trademark rights within the meaning of UDRP, paragraph 4(a)(i).

Here, the Complainant has filed a trademark application for BISON GREEN in the United States, and this application has not yet proceeded to registration. Therefore, the existence of this trademark application does not by itself establish that the Complainant has trademark rights and standing to file a Complaint under the Policy.

The Complainant also submits that it has common law trademark rights based on its business activities carried out under the brand BISON GREEN through the website at the domain name <bisongreen.com> since 2017.

As discussed in section 1.3 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), to establish unregistered or common law trademark rights for purposes of the UDRP, the complainant must show that its mark has become a distinctive identifier which consumers associate with the complainant's goods and/or services. Relevant evidence demonstrating such acquired distinctiveness (also referred to as secondary meaning) includes a range of factors such as (i) the duration and nature of use of the mark, (ii) the amount of sales under the mark, (iii) the nature and extent of advertising using the mark, (iv) the degree of actual public (e.g., consumer, industry, media) recognition, and (v) consumer surveys. Specific evidence supporting assertions of acquired distinctiveness should be included in the complaint; conclusory allegations of unregistered or common law rights, even if undisputed in the particular UDRP case, would not normally suffice to show secondary meaning.

The only evidence provided by the Complainant in support of its claimed common law trademark rights is a printout of the website at the domain name <bisongreen.com>. This printout reflects the current content of the website, which is evident from the copyright notice on it, which is "© 2017 - 2025 WLCC Lending BGL dba Bison Green Lending. All Rights Reserved". The Complainant has not submitted any evidence about the content of this website at any earlier point in time.

The printout submitted by the Complainant of the website at the domain name <bisongreen.com> contains the statement *"All installment loans are underwritten by WLCC Lending BGL doing business as Bison Green Lending. Bison Green Lending is a Native American owned business operating within the interior boundaries of the Pine Ridge Reservation of the Oglala Sioux Tribe, a sovereign nation located in the United States. WLCC Lending BGA dba Bison Green Lending is an instrumentality and limited liability company which abides by all applicable federal laws, and by all regulations as established by the Oglala Sioux Tribe of South Dakota"*.

This printout contains no mention of Mr. Aaron Bishop, TLC Ops, or Yatta Outsourced Processing Solutions, Inc. (the entity listed as applicant of the Complainant's trademark application), and the Complainant has not explicitly claimed or provided evidence that it has any relationship with WLCC Lending BGL doing business as Bison Green Lending. The Panel consulted the website at the domain name <bisongreen.com> contains other references to WLCC Lending BGL doing business as Bison Green Lending as well, but no mention of Mr. Aaron Bishop, TLC Ops, or Yatta Outsourced Processing Solutions, Inc. However, the address of WLCC Lending BGL, indicated on this website, coincides with the address of the Complainant indicated in the

Complaint. It is therefore likely that there is some relationship between the Complainant and WLCC Lending BGL, although the address of the applicant, indicated in the Complainant's trademark application, is different.

Even if it is accepted that the Complainant is related to WLCC Lending BGL and to the lending services provided by the latter, the Complainant has not submitted any evidence about the duration of its alleged use of the BISON GREEN trademark. There is also no evidence about the amount of any sales made by the Complainant under this trademark, the nature and extent of any advertising made by the Complainant using the trademark and the degree of its actual public recognition, and no consumer surveys about it.

Considering the above, the Panel finds that there is no evidence to support a conclusion that "BISON GREEN" has become a distinctive identifier which consumers associate with financial lending services provided by the Complainant under this brand. For this reason, the Panel finds that the Complainant has not established that it has common law trademark rights for the purposes of the Policy.

The Panel also notes that in their correspondence prior to the submission of the Complainant, the Center had explicitly advised to the Complainant to get acquainted with the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) and had pointed out the particular importance of its sections 1.1.4 and 1.3.

The Panel therefore finds that the first element of the Policy has not been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Since the Complainant has failed to establish the first element of the Policy, there is no need to address this Section.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Since the Complainant has failed to establish the first element of the Policy, there is no need to address this Section.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Assen Alexiev/

Assen Alexiev

Sole Panelist

Date: August 8, 2025