

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Dansko, LLC v. Rich Alexander
Case No. D2025-3118

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Dansko, LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Cozen O’Connor, United States.

The Respondent is Rich Alexander, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <danskosshoesstore.com> is registered with Gname.com Pte. Ltd. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 5, 2025. On August 6, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 7, 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 (Unknown Registrant) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 7, 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 August 11, 2025.

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 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 Respondent’s default on September 5, 2025.

The Center appointed Lynda J. Zadra-Symes as the sole panelist in this matter on September 12, 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 uses its DANSKO mark in connection with comfort footwear provided to customers around the world. Beginning in 1990 with clog sales, the Complainant now offers other footwear, including boots, sandals, flats and sneakers, all designed for long-wear and comfort. The Complainant owns the following trademark registrations, among others, in the United States:

DANSKO	Registration No. 3854991	registered September 28, 2010
DANSKO	Registration No. 4229847	registered October 23, 2012
DANSKO	Registration No. 3265194	registered July 17, 2007
DANSKO	Registration No. 2712957	registered May 6, 2003.

The Complainant also owns many other United States trademark registrations incorporating the mark DANSKO with a design or additional word elements.

The Complainant also owns and operates the domain name <dansko.com>, providing information about the company and its products, from which customers can purchase the Complainant's DANSKO-branded footwear.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 2, 2025 and resolves to a website that displays the Complainant's footwear products and purports to offer them for sale.

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 the Complainant's DANSKO mark is incorporated in the disputed domain name in its entirety, that the additional words "shoe store" do not distinguish the disputed domain name from the Complainant's mark, and that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, (["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 entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The addition of the terms “shoes” and “store” does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name 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 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.

According to the Registrar-provided information, the Respondent’s name is “Rich Alexander.” There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known as “Dansko.” The Complainant has not authorized, licensed or endorsed the Respondent’s use of its DANSKO marks in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Instead, the disputed domain name resolves to a website, purporting to offer the Complainant’s own footwear goods without disclosing its lack of relationship with the Complainant.

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 is using the disputed domain name in connection with a website that is offering the Complainant’s own footwear goods for sale without disclosing its lack of relationship with the Complainant.

The record indicates that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant’s mark when registering the disputed domain name and that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

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 <danskosshoesstore.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Lynda J. Zadra-Symes/

Lynda J. Zadra-Symes

Sole Panelist

Date: September 26, 2025