

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Lancaster Archery Supply, Inc. v. Shirley, Lankford, Antxexxvocxcvcdvsffbnio
Phixlcxcxdfcvbcrigvfcfbkfb

Case No. D2025-2985

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Lancaster Archery Supply, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Greenberg Traurig, LLP, United States.

The Respondents are Shirley, Lankford, and Antxexxvocxcvcdvsffbnio Phixlcxcxdfcvbcrigvfcfbkfb, United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <lancasterarchery-us.shop> and <lancasterarchery-vip.shop> are registered with Alibaba.com Singapore E-Commerce Private Limited.

The disputed domain name <lancastervip.shop> is registered with West263 International Limited.

(Collectively referred as the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 25, 2025. On July 28, 2025, the Center transmitted by emails to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On July 29, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by emails to the Center its verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names 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 August 4, 2025 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on August 9, 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 August 12, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 1, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Parties of the Respondent’s default on September 2, 2025.

The Center appointed Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa as the sole panelist in this matter on September 9, 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 an archery, hunting, and outdoor lifestyle supply retailer established in the United States in 1983. It is the proprietor of several trademark registrations, including the following:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 7639196 for LANCASTER (word mark), registered on January 7, 2025 for services in class 35, claiming a date of first use in 1983;
- United States Trademark Registration No. 2997584 for LANCASTER ARCHERY SUPPLY (device mark), registered on September 20, 2005 for services in class 35, claiming a date of first use in 1988.

The Complainant operates its primary website and e-commerce shop at the domain name <lancasterarchery.com>.

The disputed domain name <lancasterarchery-us.shop> was registered on July 8, 2025; <lancasterarchery-vip.shop> was registered on July 10, 2025; and <lancastervip.shop> was registered on July 14, 2025.

The Complaint indicates that the disputed domain names previously resolved to websites displaying the Complainant’s marks at which the Complainant’s goods were purportedly offered for sale at discounted prices. The record indicates that, subsequent to the Complainant’s notices of infringement of July 15 and 18, 2025, the respective Registrars had suspended all three websites. At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain names do not resolve to active websites.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

Consolidation of proceedings

The Complainant requests consolidation of proceedings for the following reasons. The disputed domain names are highly similar in their naming conventions by use of the terms “us”, “vip”, and the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.shop”. The disputed domain names all wholly incorporate and/or target the Complainant’s LANCASTER and LANCASTER ARCHERY SUPPLY trademarks. The disputed domain names were registered less than a few days apart and are hosted on the same IP address. The disputed domain names <lancasterarchery-us.shop> and <lancasterarchery-vip.shop> were registered through the same registrar and use the same nameservers. Finally, all disputed domain names resolve to substantially similar websites that impersonate the Complainant, misappropriate the Complainant’s standard character and design trademarks, and fraudulently purport to offer legitimate goods of the Complainant.

Substantive contentions

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 Complainant's well-known LANCASTER and LANCASTER ARCHERY SUPPLY marks. The addition of descriptive terms does not distinguish the disputed domain names. The Respondents do not have any rights in these marks and registered the disputed domain names without the Complainant's consent. The Respondents' websites display the Complainant's marks, falsely state an affiliation with the Complainant in the "About Us" text, and purport to sell the Complainant's products at prices that are so heavily discounted that they can only indicate counterfeit or nonexistent goods, and/or a fraudulent scheme to obtain Internet users' personal data.

The Complainant requests transfer of the disputed domain names.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes, in particular, the similarity of the naming conventions, the proximate timing of the three registrations and the similarity of the websites to which the disputed domain names resolve.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

6.2 Substantive issues

Paragraph 4(a) of the UDRP requires the Complainant to make out all three of the following:

- (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 Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Under paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, “[a] Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable”.

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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the Complainant’s LANCASTER and LANCASTER ARCHERY SUPPLY marks are recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. Although the addition of other terms (here, “vip” and “us”) may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

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

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 names. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant’s prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel notes the composition of the disputed domain names, which comprise the Complainant’s established LANCASTER mark together with descriptive terms “vip” and “us”, do not distinguish them from the Mark. Together with the use to which they have been put, the Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain names affirms the Respondent’s intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant as to the origin or affiliation of the website at the disputed domain names. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain names, nor that there are any circumstances or activities that would establish the Respondent's rights therein. Rather, the disputed domain names resolve to websites displaying the Complainant's marks and purporting to sell the Complainant's goods at discounted prices. Under these circumstances, such use cannot establish rights or legitimate interests. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 2.5.2 and 2.5.3.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, claimed sale of counterfeit goods, impersonation, or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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 finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's marks. The Complainant's rights in its LANCASTER mark predate the registration of the disputed domain name by approximately 20 years. The disputed domain names reflect the dominant elements of the Complainant's LANCASTER and LANCASTER ARCHERY SUPPLY marks. Noting, in addition, the use to which the disputed domain names have been put, the composition of the disputed domain names implies an intention to benefit from the reputation of the Complainant's marks. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

The disputed domain names directed Internet users to websites prominently featuring the Complainant's marks and purporting to offer for sale the Complainant's products. The websites display images of the Complainant's products and falsely claim an affiliation with the Complainant. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, claimed sale of counterfeit goods, impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 names <lancasterarchery-us.shop>, <lancasterarchery-vip.shop> and <lancastervip.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa/
Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa
Sole Panelist
Date: September 23, 2025