

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

M.S.E.O. Holdings LLC v. WILLIAM LOOPER, Rare Breed Trigger  
Case No. D2025-3169

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is WILLIAM LOOPER, Rare Breed Trigger, U.S.

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

The disputed domain name <rarebreedtriggerus.com> is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 7, 2025. On August 8, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 8, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 11, 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 13, 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 19, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 8, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 11, 2025.

The Center appointed Dennis A. Foster as the sole panelist in this matter on September 15, 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 U.S. company with a business address in Texas that has been in business since 2017. It specializes in selling triggers that increase the speed of firing for semi-automatic rifles such as the AR-15. A New York federal district court injunction prevented the Complainant from selling its triggers from September, 2023 to May, 2025, at which time the case was settled allowing the Complainant to resume its business.

The Complainant owns a U.S. trademark for RARE BREED FIREARMS, registration no. 5,656,596, registration date January 15, 2019, in international classes 13 for firearms; 14 for collectible coins; 25 for board shorts and other clothing; and 26 for ornamental cloth patches. The Complainant's main business websites are at the domain names <rarebreedfirearms.com> and <rarebreedtriggers.com>.

The Respondent is a U.S. individual who registered the disputed domain name on October 13, 2024, using "Rare Breed Trigger" as the registrant organization name. The Respondent has copied the look and feel of the Complainant's website at the disputed domain name website, using a similar logo, and purports to sell the same firearm trigger products as the Complainant.

#### **5. Parties' Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

- The Complainant owns the U.S. registered trademark RARE BREED FIREARMS for firearms and assorted goods such as clothing and collectibles.
- The Complainant also owns common law trademark rights in "Rare Breed Triggers". The Complainant has used this mark in commerce since at least as early as December 31, 2020.
- The term "rare breed" is inherently distinctive and qualifies as arbitrary on the Abercrombie Spectrum of Distinctiveness.
- The RARE BREED FIREARMS trademark has been in use since 2017.
- The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's RARE BREED FIREARMS trademark because "triggers" and "firearms" are both generic terms for the goods, and because generic Top-Level Domains ("gTLD") are not taken into consideration for identity or confusing similarity analysis under the Policy.
- The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's "Rare Breed Triggers" common law trademark.
- The Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because it does not have permission to use the Complainant's trademark in the disputed domain name, and because it is not making a bona fide offering of goods or services.
- The Respondent is making a bad faith use of the disputed domain name because it obviously impersonated the Complainant, including through copying the distinctive stylization of Complainant's logo, to confuse the public about the origin of its purported goods for sale.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Pursuant to Policy paragraphs 4(a)(i) - (iii), the Panel may render a decision for the Complainant and grant a transfer of the disputed domain name if the Complainant establishes that:

- The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- The disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

The Complainant's first burden of proof under Policy paragraph 4(a)(i) is to show that it has trademark rights. To this end, the Complainant has annexed a copy of its U.S. trademark RARE BREED FIREARMS whose details the Panel has included in the Factual Background section above. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

As the Complainant points out, the dominant feature of its trademark, "rare breed", is included in the disputed domain name. As the Complainant also points out, the gTLD ".com" is not to be taken into account for the purpose of identity or confusing similarity analysis under the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.

Based on the above, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark, and therefore the Complainant has carried its burden of proof under Policy paragraph 4(a)(i).

The Complainant also contends it has common law trademark rights in the term "Rare Breed Triggers", but the Panel finds there is no need to adjudicate whether this has been proved because the Panel is certain the Complainant has trademark rights in the U.S. registered trademark RARE BREED FIREARMS.

### **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

The Complainant's second burden of proof, under Policy paragraph 4(a)(ii), is to show that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. It is now well-settled under the Policy that, owing to the difficulty of proving a negative, it is sufficient for the Complainant to make out a prima facie case, and then the burden of production shifts to the Respondent to come forward with evidence to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

The Complainant avers that the Respondent does not have a license or permission to use the Complainant's trademark in the disputed domain name and is using the disputed domain name for the website impersonating the Complainant. The Panel finds that this constitutes a prima facie case under the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1. The Respondent is in default in these proceedings, and thus has not come forward with evidence to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case. Nonetheless, the Panel will examine the case record to see whether the Respondent might have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name as allowed under Policy paragraph 4(c)(i), (ii) and (iii).

Under Policy paragraph 4(c)(i), the Respondent can show rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name if it can show that, before receiving notice of this dispute, it was using the disputed domain name to make a bona fide offering of goods or services. But the Respondent herein instead has used the

disputed domain name to copy the look and feel of the Complainant's website, including its stylized logo, and to purport to sell the same firearm products that the Complainant sells without disclosing its lack of relationship with the Complainant. Rather, the website states that it is operated by Rare Breed Triggers LLC, which, according to the Complainant, it a former company name of its affiliate company. This is a bad faith rather than a good faith offering of goods or services as the Panel will discuss further in the below section of this Decision. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) section 2.13.1; see *Richemont International S.A. v. brandon gill*, WIPO Case No. 2013-0037, "The Panel concludes that the Domain Name has been employed as a means of improperly diverting Internet customers. In these circumstances, it is difficult to see how Respondent's conduct could be characterized as legitimate and thus permissible."

The Panel also notes that the registrant organization identified in the registration details of the disputed domain name is "Rare Breed Trigger", but the Respondent does not appear to be commonly known by "Rare Breed Trigger" or the disputed domain name, and thus cannot claim rights or legitimate interests per Policy paragraph 4(c)(ii). And finally, the Respondent does not appear to have been making a noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, and thus cannot claim rights or legitimate interests per Policy paragraph 4(c)(iii).

The Panel finds, then, that the Complainant has carried its burden of proof under Policy paragraph 4(a)(ii) to show that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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

The Policy at paragraph 4(b) sets out four non-exhaustive circumstances under which a Respondent may be found to have registered and to be using a disputed domain name in bad faith. In the present case, the Respondent has copied the look and feel of the Complainant's website at the confusingly similar disputed domain name and purports to sell the same goods as the Complainant. In the Panel's view, the very fact that the Respondent copied the look and feel of the Complainant's website shows the Respondent was sure of who the Complainant was and the nature of its business.

The Panel thus finds that the Respondent's conduct falls within the Policy bad faith provision at paragraph 4(b)(iv): the Respondent is trying to confuse the public into thinking it is the Complainant and to purport to sell the same products as the Complainant. See *Evergreen Federal Bank v. victory victor, Admintechologies*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-4662](#), finding that the appropriation of a name, trademark, and logo to impersonate the complainant was bad faith.

The Panel therefore finds the Complainant has carried its burden of proof under Policy paragraph 4(a)(iii).

## **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 <rarebreedtriggerus.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Dennis A. Foster/

**Dennis A. Foster**

Sole Panelist

Date: September 29, 2025