

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Pup List LLC v. 熊道华 (Xiong Dao Hua)  
Case No. D2025-2782

### 1. The Parties

The Complainant is Pup List LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Evan Curdts, United States.

The Respondent is 熊道华 (Xiong Dao Hua), China.

### 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <puplist.com> is registered with Alibaba Cloud Computing Ltd. d/b/a HiChina (www.net.cn) (the “Registrar”).

### 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 11, 2025. On July 15, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 16, 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 (as per public WHOIS)) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on the following day, 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 in English on July 18, 2025.

On July 17, 2025, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. On July 18, 2025, the Complainant confirmed its request that English be the language of the proceeding. On July 19 and July 21, 2025, the Respondent requested that Chinese be the language of the proceeding and requested a translation of the Complaint into Chinese.

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 in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 21, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 10, 2025. On July 29, 2025, the Center received a copy of emails ostensibly exchanged by the Respondent with a broker earlier the same day, the contents of which were incorporated in the Response. The Response was filed in Chinese with the Center on July 29, 2025, and confirmed its submission is the complete Response on July 30, 2025.

The Center appointed Matthew Kennedy as the sole panelist in this matter on August 22, 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 United States-based start-up offering a curated e-commerce platform for premium, high-tech, and lifestyle-oriented dog and cat products. The Complainant was established in December 2023 by Jessica Karcz. The Complainant holds United States trademark registration number 7815279 for PUP LIST and paw device, registered on June 3, 2025 (application filed on August 22, 2024 with a claim of first use in commerce on June 1, 2024) in respect of online retail store services featuring pet products and pet accessories, pet gift registry services in class 35. The registration includes a disclaimer of the exclusive right to use the word “pup” apart from the mark as shown. The Complainant registered the domain name <puplist.co> and initially used it with a “launching soon” webpage that featured the PUP LIST and paw device mark, before it launched its e-commerce website in December 2024, offering a pet gift registry and pet products for sale, including an automatic feeder for pets with camera and app control. The homepage of the website displays images of puppies, kittens, and gifts. The Complainant also operates social media accounts that feature the words PUP LIST and the paw device.

The Respondent is an individual based in China. He provides evidence that on April 24, 2025 a Chinese company named “深圳市硕英数字科技有限公司” (which may be translated as “Shenzhen Shuoying Digital Technology Co., Ltd”) filed Chinese trademark application number 84908625 for PUPLIST in respect of pet feeders; automatic pet feeders; cages; drinking troughs; cages for carrying pets; feeding troughs; animal feeding troughs; household pet cages in class 21. That trademark application has been published for opposition but not registered.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 26, 2024 after a prior registration by a third party expired.

According to evidence provided by the Respondent, on November 2, 2024, Ms. Karcz sent an enquiry via an online contact form on the website at the disputed domain name offering USD 200 to purchase the disputed domain name. On January 16, 2025, another enquiry was sent from the same device via the website’s online contact form, this time offering USD 500.<sup>1</sup>

According to evidence provided by the Complainant, on November 13, 2024, the Complainant received an email from a broker offering to sell the disputed domain name. Upon receipt of the Complainant’s reply, the broker offered to sell the dispute domain name on November 14, 2024, for a price of USD 1,286 and on November 15, 2024, for a price of USD 1,080, valid for 24 hours. On December 1, 2024, the broker offered the same price of USD 1,080, valid for a week, or over USD 5,000 the following year, and compared the respective merits of the disputed domain name and the Complainant’s domain name. On January 16, 2025, the Complainant’s representative replied to the broker, indicating an ability to pay USD 1,080. On the following day, the broker indicated that that price had expired and increased to USD 3,500, valid for that

---

<sup>1</sup> Although the second enquiry showed different name and contact details, it showed Ms. Karcz’s initials and was sent from the same IP address as the first enquiry.

week, or over USD 5,000 from the following week. On January 18, 2025, the broker sent an email complimenting the Complainant on its website and noting that the Complainant had not registered its trademark "PupList". On January 21, 2025, the broker set a price of USD 3,080, valid for 48 hours, after which it would be over USD 5,000. The broker claimed to have received over 10 offers for the disputed domain name. On January 27, 2025, the broker set a price of USD 2,580 valid for one day, after which it would be USD 5,000. On February 5, 2025, the broker set a price of USD 6,180, valid for 24 hours, after which any offer under USD 20,000 would be rejected. On March 17, 2025, the broker set a "final" price of USD 3,580, indicating that it had received a message that the owner planned to use the disputed domain name for its own business. On March 31, 2025, the broker advised that the disputed domain name was now used for the owner's business.

Since March 2025, the disputed domain name has resolved to a website in English titled "PUPLIST", ostensibly offering pet-feeding solutions by a "leading manufacturer and supplier in China", including automatic pet feeders for cats and dogs, such as smart pet feeders. The featured products include high-tech feeders and water fountains. The website displays an image of a puppy and a kitten. The copyright notice reserves the rights of "PUP LIST". According to evidence presented by the Complainant, the website contains no actual pet products; navigation into product categories leads to pages promoting Chinese trademark registration and renewal services, and none of the pet feeder product listings is functional; rather they redirect to pages promoting Chinese trademark services. The "About PUPLIST" section indicates that the operator "specializes in providing China intellectual property services."

On April 23, 2025, the Complainant received further communications from an email address used by the broker. The first set a price of USD 2,280 and a second increased the price to USD 3,080.

## **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 in advance of launching its website and public-facing brand presence, the Complainant had investigated the availability of the disputed domain name and discovered that it was already registered and unavailable for purchase, despite it being dormant and lacking any active website or visible business presence. In April 2024, the Complainant launched a publicly viewable homepage associated with its domain name, which included a professionally produced promotional video, a description of its forthcoming business model, and links to its newly created social media profiles. By July 2025, the Complainant's website was attracting more than 9,000 users per month and had entered into partnerships with over 80 well-known pet brands. Shortly after the disputed domain name was acquired by the Respondent, it began attempting to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant at inflated prices and later launched a deceptive imitation website, prompting the Complaint.

The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's PUP LIST mark. The Complainant has also used and promoted the PUP LIST mark extensively and publicly in commerce since April 2024, in connection with its curated e-commerce platform for pet-related products. The disputed domain name fully incorporates the Complainant's mark, is visually and phonetically identical, and creates a significant likelihood of confusion. The confusion is further compounded by the Respondent's ongoing deliberate mimicry of the Complainant's site.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent has no affiliation with, license from, or authorization by the Complainant to use the PUP LIST trademark. Within weeks of acquiring the disputed domain name, the Respondent initiated a sustained and coercive campaign to pressure the Complainant into purchasing it. Beginning in November 2024, the

Respondent, under the alias “Stone”, sent repeated emails offering to sell the disputed domain name at escalating prices with short, arbitrary expiration windows. These communications grew increasingly aggressive, falsely claiming the Complainant lacked trademark protection, and warning that failing to acquire the disputed domain name would harm the Complainant’s business. These coercive communications demonstrate opportunistic and manipulative behavior, not legitimate interest in the disputed domain name. When the Respondent’s initial coercive sales efforts failed, the Respondent escalated its conduct by launching a live website in or around March 2025. This site presents a deliberate imitation of the Complainant’s brand, including a prominent PUPLIST heading, imagery of a dog and cat that strikingly resembles the photographic style and animals used across Complainant’s branding and website, and a layout that mimics the Complainant’s e-commerce structure. The homepage claims the site is a supplier of “pet feeding solutions,” features listings and photos of high-tech automatic pet feeders closely resembling those sold by the Complainant and lists categories for dog and cat products - each element drawn directly from the Complainant’s well-established e-commerce model. This mimicry was not accidental: in January 2025, the Respondent sent the Complainant an unsolicited email complimenting how “nice” the Complainant’s website looked - demonstrating direct familiarity with the Complainant’s brand prior to launching the lookalike site. Even a brief review of the Respondent’s site’s functionality exposes the entire pet-focused identity as a façade. The site contains no actual pet products, and navigation into supposed product categories such as “dog” leads to pages promoting Chinese trademark registration services. None of the pet feeder product listings are functional; each link deceptively redirects users to pages promoting unrelated Chinese trademark services. The Respondent’s website and pet branding exist only to create confusion and deceive users, not to offer legitimate pet-related goods or services.

The disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. The disputed domain name was registered over two months after the Complainant filed its United States trademark application and six months after the Pup List brand had been publicly promoted via a visible homepage, social media marketing, and online community-building. By this time, the Complainant’s mark had acquired significant visibility in the pet e-commerce space, strongly indicating the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant’s brand and for the purpose of exploiting it. Immediately following registration, the Respondent engaged in a pattern of coercive and misleading behavior, including (i) sending unsolicited emails offering to sell the disputed domain name at inflated prices; (ii) making false legal representations (e.g., that the Complainant had no trademark protection); (iii) using short deadlines and threats to raise the price; and (iv) fabricating competitive offers and falsely claiming increasing popularity of the disputed domain name. When its sales attempts failed, the Respondent launched a sham website mimicking and misappropriating the Complainant’s branding. While the site superficially appears to sell pet products, it contains no actual pet-related offerings and instead redirects users to pages promoting Chinese intellectual property services. In particular, the site includes listings of products strongly associated with the Complainant’s offerings but the listings are non-functional and serve only to mislead and redirect visitors to unrelated services. The Respondent falsely claims ownership of the “Pup List” name through a fabricated copyright notice and leverages the Complainant’s name and reputation to attract users under false pretenses. Taken together, the Respondent’s conduct reflects a deliberate attempt to (i) capitalize on the Complainant’s brand equity; (ii) confuse or deceive consumers; (iii) pressure the Complainant into an inflated purchase of the disputed domain name; and (iv) funnel users to an unrelated commercial service.

## **B. Respondent**

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied any of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Respondent contends that the disputed domain name is not confusingly similar to the Complainant’s mark. The paw device is a dominant feature of the Complainant’s mark and its distinctive characteristic. “Pup list” is a common phrase composed of two words and a space whereas the operative element of the disputed domain name consists of the string “puplist” without a space. Given that the mark contains not only a device but also a space, it is even less likely to be confused with “puplist”.

The Respondent has rights and legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name. His company holds a Chinese trademark registration for PUPLIST. The disputed domain name is legally and properly used in connection with its website to present its pet-related products. The disputed domain name registration is legal and has nothing to do with the Complainant's trademark. The Respondent's company registered the disputed domain name for its own use and already has a trademark and a dedicated website. At the time of registration of the disputed domain name, the Complainant's trademark had no reputation. The disputed domain name was registered only two months after the Complainant filed its trademark application. It cannot be assumed that the Complainant's trademark became well known in just two months. The disputed domain name was registered only three months after the Complainant began promoting its brand on social media in July 2024. It is impossible for a new company with a new trademark that has not yet obtained registration to gain recognition in such a short period of time.

The use of the Respondent's trademark and the sales of its products will not cause confusion with the Complainant's trademark and services. The Respondent supplies goods in class 21 and engages in research and development, production, and sales, while the Complainant provides e-commerce services in class 35. The Parties' respective trademarks are protected, and their respective business operations are located, in different jurisdictions (i.e., China and the United States). Given that both Parties hold trademark rights, if the Complainant believes there is a conflict the dispute falls outside the scope of the Policy. PUP LIST is a commonly used phrase and cannot function as a trademark. Further, the Respondent's trademark is PUPLIST (without a space).

The Complainant has engaged in Reverse Domain Name Hijacking. It has twice enquired about a possible purchase of the disputed domain name via the online contact form, first on November 2, 2024 and later on January 16, 2025. After failing to obtain the disputed domain name at low prices, the Complainant waited to obtain registration of its trademark and then immediately filed the Complaint. The Complainant's evidence of pre-Complaint correspondence shows "[Quoted text hidden]" 11 times, which may indicate that the Complainant has concealed evidence unfavorable to its case. The Complainant deliberately misrepresents the broker in pre-Complaint correspondence as the disputed domain name holder. The Complaint distorts facts: 1) it claims that the broker's emails were aggressive and issued a "warning" that failure to acquire the disputed domain name would "harm" the Complainant's business when in fact the broker "suggested" that the Complainant register its trademark and that, to protect its business, it must register its brand in the corresponding ".com" domain; 2) it claims that the broker issued "threats" and "coercive" communications that were "opportunistic and manipulative" when these were simply part of a price negotiation; 3) it unreasonably expected discounts to remain valid indefinitely, when limited time offers are a common practice in sales. In fact, the Respondent asked the broker to explain why the broker rejected the offer for the initial asking price. The pre-Complaint price negotiation does not show bad faith on the part of the Respondent. Rather, it shows that the Complainant is using this administrative procedure as a bargaining tool and last resort (so-called "Plan B") in an attempt at Reverse Domain Name Hijacking.

The Complainant's claim that the Respondent's website imitates its own website is untrue. All websites selling pet-related products must show pictures of cats and dogs. Product names and industry terms are the same, and the Parties' product offerings have both similarities and differences. The Respondent's company was established in 2006 and if it were to imitate anybody it would choose a well-known company. The Respondent's website refers to its partner <petwant.com> and its products. The Respondent had never visited the Complainant's website before. The Respondent's website contained jumbled content during the website construction phase, including incorrect information and links. It was not intentional targeting of the Complainant's website or trademark.

The Complainant's earliest social media post was dated July 24, 2024. The screenshot of the Complainant's "launching soon" webpage indicates a date of access, but this has not been verified. The Complainant's claim that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name to exploit the Complainant's trademark is unfounded. The pre-Complaint email exchanges with the broker were part of a price negotiation and do not evidence bad faith. The Respondent never commissioned the broker to promote or sell the disputed domain name and the broker's actions are not attributable to the Respondent.

The Response incorporates the text of emails ostensibly exchanged by the Respondent with the broker, in which the broker apologizes for having promoted the disputed domain name without the Respondent's authorization. The broker states inter alia that he discovered that the disputed domain name was for sale and contacted potential buyers without ever contacting the Respondent; he noticed that the Respondent was updating the content of the website associated with the disputed domain name to include pet product information without contacting the Respondent; and he provides a unique intermediary service offering the disputed domain name for sale without the Respondent's consent.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **6.1 Preliminary Issue: Language of the Proceeding**

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the Parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the Registration Agreement.

The Complaint and amended Complaint were filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including the fact that the disputed domain name is in Latin script and consists of English language words; the content of the Respondent's website is in English; the Respondent used English in all pre-Complaint correspondence; the Complainant does not understand Chinese; and translation would impose an undue burden on it and create unwarranted delay.

The Response was filed in Chinese, incorporating numerous quotations in English. The Respondent requested that the language of the proceeding be Chinese on the ground that he does not understand English; that the content of the Respondent's website was created by a professional website developer and does not indicate that the Respondent is proficient in English; the Respondent does not recognize the pre-Complainant correspondence between the Complainant and the broker, who was unauthorized by the Respondent; the Complainant should use the language of the Registration Agreement; and the Complainant should engage a translator to translate the Complaint.

The Panel observes that the Respondent has in fact understood the Complaint and taken the opportunity to respond to it in detail.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time, and costs. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.5.1.

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English, but that the Panel will accept all submissions as filed in their original language, whether English or Chinese, without translation.

### **6.2 Substantive Issues**

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that a complainant must prove each of the following elements:

- (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. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a PUP LIST and paw device trademark for the purposes of the Policy. The jurisdiction where the trademark is valid is not considered relevant to the assessment under the first element, nor are the services in respect of which the mark is registered. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.1.2 and 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name wholly incorporates the textual elements of the mark, i.e., PUP LIST. Given that the figurative elements of the mark cannot be reproduced in a domain name for technical reasons, they may be disregarded in the assessment of identity or confusing similarity for the purposes of the Policy. The only additional element in the disputed domain name is a generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") extension (".com") which, as a standard requirement of domain name registration, may also be disregarded in the assessment of identity or confusing similarity. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7, 1.10, and 1.11.1.

The Respondent notes that the trademark includes a space between the words "pup" and "list" while the disputed domain name does not. However, the Panel does not consider this difference to be material. Domain names cannot include spaces as such and, in this case, the textual elements of the mark do not spell anything else when combined but remain clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Respondent notes that the trademark includes a device. However, the Panel does not take this into account in the comparison with the disputed domain name because, in this case, the paw device does not overtake the textual elements in prominence. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.10.

The Panel notes that the Complainant's trademark registration includes a disclaimer of the exclusive right to use the word "pup" apart from the mark as shown. This disclaimer does not affect standing under the first element of the Policy in this case but may be taken into account under other elements, if relevant. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.10.

Therefore, 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.

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. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

In the present case, the disputed domain name resolves to a website titled "PUPLIST" that ostensibly offers pet feeder products for sale. Although the Complainant claims that the website presents a deliberate imitation of its own, the Panel does not find that the images and layout of the Respondent's website mimic

those of the Complainant's website. It is unremarkable that two sites offering pet feeders both display images of pets. The principal similarities between them are their titles ("PUP LIST" with or without a space) and their products (pet feeders). However, according to evidence presented by the Complainant, the website is not functional as the product links direct to pages offering unrelated services. These circumstances indicate that the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; rather, the most likely explanation of this evidence is that the website is a sham. Nor is this a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Further, the Registrar has verified that the Respondent's name is "熊道华 (Xiong Dao Hua)", which does not resemble the disputed domain name. This does not indicate that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

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.

Turning to the Respondent's arguments, it presents evidence of a Chinese trademark application for PUPLIST. However, the application is currently pending and the Respondent does not clarify his relationship to the applicant company. There is no evidence of use of the claimed mark besides the Respondent's website since March 2025. The Respondent argues that the incorrect links on that website occurred during the website's construction phase, which offers no credible reason as to why the site should operate so differently from the way that it appeared. The most likely explanation of all the evidence is that the website is a sham intended to protect the Respondent's claim to the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie showing.

Based on the record, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

The Panel notes that the third element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy contains two requirements that apply conjunctively. A complainant must show both that the disputed domain name has been registered in bad faith and also that it is being used in bad faith. The former requires a demonstration that the Respondent knew, or should have known of the Complainant and/or the Complainant's trademark at the time when it registered or acquired the disputed domain name and that it registered the disputed domain name with a bad faith intention targeting the Complainant and/or its mark.

The disputed domain name was registered in October 2024 before the Complainant's PUP LIST and paw device trademark was registered in June 2025. The trademark application was merely pending at the time when the disputed domain name was registered. The Panel recalls that, where a respondent registers a domain name before the complainant's trademark rights accrue, panels will not normally find bad faith on the part of the respondent. There is an exception to that general proposition, where the facts of the case establish that the respondent's intent in registering the disputed domain name was to unfairly capitalize on the complainant's nascent (typically as yet unregistered) trademark rights. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 3.8.1 and 3.8.2.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name is identical to the textual elements of the Complainant's mark, which do not form a common phrase but do consist of two dictionary words ("pup" and "list"). The Respondent registered the disputed domain name after a prior registration expired but the prior registrant was not the Complainant.

The Complainant alleges that its mark had acquired significant visibility in the pet e-commerce space by October 2024 and that this strongly indicates that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant's brand and for the purpose of exploiting it. The Complainant's eventual trademark registration includes a claim of first use in commerce on June 1, 2024. The Complainant operates social media accounts and posted that it was "coming soon" on July 24, 2024, three months before the registration of the disputed domain name. While the Complainant claims in April 2024, it published a "Launching soon!" webpage, together with a promotional video and links to its social media profiles on the

website at its domain name <puplist.co>, the screenshot provided by the Complainant is undated. The Complainant asserts that it launched the full version of its website at the domain name <puplist.co> in December 2024, and the Panel notes that this date was after the registration of the disputed domain name. There is no evidence of the results of an Internet search for “puplist” at any time. The Panel conducted basic searches for “puplist” on the Internet, using Google and Baidu, and noticed that the term “PUP list” may also stand for the National Football League’s “Physically Unable to Perform list”, which is a roster designation for players who are injured due to a football-related activity at the start of training camp and cannot practise.<sup>2</sup> In sum, the Complainant’s evidence, without more, is insufficient to sustain an inference that the Respondent knew of the Complainant’s brand prior to the registration of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant also submits that, within weeks of acquiring the disputed domain name, the Respondent “initiated” a campaign to pressure the Complainant into purchasing the disputed domain name. In support, the Complainant provides an email that it received from a broker on November 13, 2024, a mere 18 days after the Respondent registered the disputed domain name. However, according to evidence presented by the Respondent, the Complainant’s founder, Ms. Karcz, had already approached the Respondent via an online contact form on the website at the disputed domain name and made an unsolicited offer to purchase the disputed domain name on November 2, 2024. The evidence also shows a second enquiry sent from Ms. Karcz’s device on January 16, 2025 making another unsolicited offer via the online contact form. The Complainant did not disclose to the Panel the existence of either of these unsolicited offers.

The first unsolicited offer shows that the Complainant initiated contact with a view to a sale of the disputed domain name shortly after the Respondent registered it. It also shows that Ms. Karcz shared her email address using the <puplist.co> domain name. The Panel further notes that according to the “Launching soon!” webpage provided by the Complaint, it displayed the PUP LIST and paw device mark and a contact email address, the same address that the broker used to contact the Complainant 11 days later after the Complainant’s first approach to the Respondent. If this evidence is to be believed, the broker may have never heard of the Complainant prior to the registration of the disputed domain name and it is irrelevant whether he acted on instructions from the Respondent.

Even if the Respondent’s subsequent creation of a sham website in March 2025 and his claimed filing of a trademark application in April 2025 (it is not clear from the record how the Respondent is related to the applicant company) were both carried out with full knowledge of the Complainant and its mark, in the circumstances of this case, that does not demonstrate that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant in October 2024, at the time when the disputed domain name was registered.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel has considerable misgivings about the completeness and veracity of the available evidence. The Panel recalls that it is not a general domain name court, and that the Policy is not designed to adjudicate all disputes of any kind that relate in any way to domain names. Rather, the Policy establishes a streamlined, inexpensive administrative dispute resolution procedure not intended to adjudicate a dispute such as this where the Panel does not have the benefit of witness testimony, disclosure of documents, or the other appropriate instruments that are typically available to assist a court to resolve the evidentiary issues in dispute between the Parties.

Therefore, the Panel has decided to deny the Complaint, not on the merits, but on the broader ground that the issue of bad faith in this case is part of a wider, more complex dispute between the Parties that exceeds the scope of the Policy. The wider dispute can be addressed by a court of competent jurisdiction. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.14.6.

---

<sup>2</sup> Noting in particular the general powers of a panel articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the UDRP Rules, it has been accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record if it would consider such information useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.8.

#### **D. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking**

Paragraph 15(e) of the Rules provides that, if after considering the submissions, the Panel finds that the Complaint was brought in bad faith, for example in an attempt at Reverse Domain Name Hijacking or to harass the domain-name holder, the Panel shall declare in its decision that the Complaint was brought in bad faith and constitutes an abuse of the administrative proceeding. The mere lack of success of the complaint is not, on its own, sufficient to constitute Reverse Domain Name Hijacking. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.16.

The Respondent alleges that the Complainant has engaged in Reverse Domain Name Hijacking. However, in the Panel's view, the determination of the evidentiary issues that underpin that allegation lie outside the scope of the Policy for the same reason as do the issues on the merits. Accordingly, the Panel does not make any declaration of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking.

#### **7. Decision**

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

*/Matthew Kennedy/*

**Matthew Kennedy**

Sole Panelist

Date: September 5, 2025