

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

M.S.E.O. Holdings LLC v. Jason Harriss, NameSilo, LLC  
Case No. D2025-3010

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is M.S.E.O. Holdings LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Wood, Herron & Evans, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Jason Harriss, NameSilo, LLC, United States. <sup>1</sup>

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <rarebreedtrigger.net> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 28, 2025. On July 29, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 29, 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 (Domain Administrator, See PrivacyGuardian.org) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 30, 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 July 31, 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 6, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5,

---

<sup>1</sup>Regarding the information “NameSilo, LLC” in the Respondent’s name, the Registrar clarified that “[t]he registrant left that as placeholder information, they never updated that part of their contact address.”

the due date for Response was August 26, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 27, 2025.

The Center appointed Martin Schwimmer as the sole panelist in this matter on September 1, 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 M.S.E.O. Holdings LLC, a limited liability company organized under the laws of Wyoming, United States. The Complainant conducts its business through two exclusive licensees: Rare Breed Firearms, LLC, and Rare Breed Triggers, Inc, based in Texas, United States. These entities market and sell firearms and related technology, including a forced reset trigger (a device that mechanically resets the trigger's position after each shot), under the Complainant's registered trademark RARE BREED FIREARMS and its unregistered mark RARE BREED TRIGGERS (the "Marks"). The Complainant has used the trademark RARE BREED FIREARMS since 2018.

The Complainant owns United States Registration No. 5,656,596 for the RARE BREED FIREARMS trademark, which was registered on January 15, 2019. The Complainant owns the domain names <rarebreedtriggers.com> and <rarebreedfirearms.com> and the associated websites.

Currently pending before the United States Patent and Trademark Office is the Complainant's application bearing Serial Number 99210030, dated May 30, 2025, for the registration of the trademark RARE BREED TRIGGERS. The application asserts a first use date of December 31, 2020.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 22, 2024. The disputed domain name did not resolve to an active website at the time of the filing of the Complaint. However, the Complainant has provided evidence that before the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website prominently displaying a RARE BREED TRIGGERS logo which is similar to the Complainant's, and purportedly offering for sale triggers for firearms.

#### **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.

In addition to its registered rights in the RARE BREED FIREARMS trademark, the Complaint asserts unregistered trademark rights in the trademark RARE BREED TRIGGERS. The Complainant uses these trademarks in connection with firearms and forced reset trigger devices for firearms. The Complainant further asserts that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the RARE BREED TRIGGERS trademark because the trademark is wholly incorporated into the disputed domain name with the deletion of the letter "s".

The Complainant argues that the disputed domain name is also confusingly similar to the Complainant's RARE BREED FIREARMS trademark because the dominant portion of the mark "rare breed" is recognizable within the disputed domain name.

The Complainant claims that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests regarding the disputed domain name, as the Complainant did not authorize the Respondent to use its Marks, and components thereof, in the disputed domain name. The Complainant also states that the Respondent is neither

commonly recognized by the disputed domain name, nor is it engaged in legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Additionally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name has been fraudulently used to attract unsuspecting Internet users to the Respondent's website for commercial gain, namely, that the Respondent has previously used the disputed domain name to host a website offering goods identical to those offered by the Complainant, bearing the Complainant's trademark.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **6.1 Preliminary Issue: Identification of the Respondent**

The Complainant initially indicated in the Complaint that the name of the registrant of the disputed domain name had been redacted for privacy reasons. In response to the Center's inquiry for a confirmation of the contact information of the disputed domain name holder, the Registrar identified the registrant as "NameSilo, LLC, Jason Harriss." The Registrar also identified the registrant's contact email as [Name Redacted]@gmail.com. In response to the Center's invitation to amend its Complaint to reflect the underlying registrant, the Complainant requested that the Complaint be amended to reflect the Respondent as Jason Harriss and another individual whose name could be derived from the registrant's email address.

According to paragraph 1 of the Rules, respondent means the holder of a domain-name registration against which a complaint is initiated. The Panel has the discretion to determine the identity of the Respondent. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), Section 4.4.5. It is appropriate to identify the disclosed registrant as the Respondent, as the registrant accepts liability for use of the relevant domain name. See paragraph 2 of the Policy. Here, when asked to identify the registrant, the Registrar filled out a form, somewhat unclearly, identify "NameSilo, LLC, Jason Harriss" as the registrant organization and registrant. Accordingly this is the appropriate Respondent. As to the another individual whose name was identified, the Complainant has provided no additional evidence nor argument as to why the username of the contact email alone is sufficient to establish that such a person is the registrant of the disputed domain name. Accordingly, there is insufficient information in the record to identify anyone but Jason Harris, NameSilo, LLC, as the Respondent.

### **6.2 Substantive Issues**

#### **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 the RARE BREED FIREARMS trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the Complainant has established unregistered trademark rights for the RARE BREED TRIGGERS mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.3. The Panel considers that the Complainant established common law rights through (1) its pending application which contained a sworn declaration of use; (2) its website at "www.rarebreedtriggers.com"; and (3) through third-party media coverage of its legal proceedings with the United States federal government. The proceedings and the media coverage illustrate the Complainant's use of the RARE BREED TRIGGERS trademark prior to the registration date of the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds the Marks are recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. The string “rarebreedtrigger” is confusingly similar to the RARE BREED FIREARMS trademark, as the dominant feature of the RARE BREED FIREARMS trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Furthermore, it is only a letter different from the Complainant’s RARE BREED TRIGGERS unregistered mark.

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 name. 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 name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

As discussed further in Section C below, the Complainant has demonstrated that the Respondent utilized the disputed domain name to host a website where a RARE BREED TRIGGERS logo which is similar to the Complainant’s was prominently displayed, and the Respondent offered for sale goods identified with the Complainant’s trademarks.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity – here, claimed as applicable to this case: impersonation/passing off – 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 notes that the Respondent made available a website offering goods identical to those of the Complainant. The Panel notes that the legality of the Complainant’s goods, forced trigger reset devices, were the subject of massive attention in the media, and that the Complainant was the subject of a portion of that media coverage. Accordingly, it is beyond dispute that the Respondent undertook the registration and use of the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant’s reputation in its trademarks, and set out to trade off of the Complainant’s reputation

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity – here, claimed impersonation/passing off – 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 name 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 name <rarebreedtrigger.net> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Martin Schwimmer/*

**Martin Schwimmer**

Sole Panelist

Date: September 16, 2025