

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Riflepermits (Pty) Limited v. Paul Kruger
Case No. D2025-3363

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Riflepermits (Pty) Limited, South Africa, represented by WF Bouwer Attorneys Inc., South Africa.

The Respondent is Paul Kruger, South Africa.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <proriflepermits.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 21, 2025. On August 21, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 21, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC, DomainsByProxy.com) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 27, 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 28, 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 September 4, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 24, 2025. The Responses were filed with the Center on September 17, 2025, and September 19, 2025, respectively. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on September 19, 2025.

The Center appointed Jeremy Speres as the sole panelist in this matter on September 29, 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 has, since 2006, offered rifle permit facilitation, and storage and transport of hunting equipment and rifles, to international hunters in South Africa under its RIFLEPERMITS mark. Its primary website is hosted at its domain name <riflepermits.com>, which it has owned since 2005.

The Complainant owns South African Trademark Registration No.s 2014/17619 and 2014/17620 RIFLEPERMITS (logo) in classes 39, and 45, respectively, having a registration date of July 8, 2014.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 3, 2024, and currently redirects to a website entitled "PRE PERMITS" hosted at the domain name <prepermits.com>, offering firearm permit services to hunters. The Complainant's evidence establishes that the disputed domain name previously resolved to a nearly identical website offering the same services, entitled "PRO RIFLE PERMITS".

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 disputed domain name was registered and has been used in bad faith in order to take advantage of confusion with the Complainant's mark for the Respondent's commercial gain, and to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant for valuable consideration in excess of the Respondent's out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

The Responses do not address the Complainant's contentions directly, other than to state that the Respondent has agreed to change its trading name to "Pre Permits", that it will in future trade from "www.prepermits.com", has offered to sell the disputed domain name as well as <proriflepermits.co.za> to the Complainant, and has asked the Complainant to compensate it for "loss of marketing material".

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, minus the design elements, is reproduced within the disputed domain name. To the extent that the design elements of the Complainant's mark are incapable of representation in domain names,

these elements are generally disregarded for purposes of assessing identity or confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.10. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is 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 “pro”, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term 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

Given the Panel’s findings in relation to the third element below, there is no need to consider the second element.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The verbal part of the Complainant’s registered mark, RIFLEPERMITS, is descriptive of the Complainant’s and the Respondent’s services, noting that the Complainant uses the mark in the form of “RIFLE PERMITS”, with a space, on its website. This is borne out, in part, by the disclaimer applied to the Complainant’s trademark registrations in respect of the word “permits”.

The Complainant has not presented any evidence showing that the verbal part of its mark has acquired any secondary meaning, or any reputation, that would, on its own and without more, justify an inference of bad faith targeting whenever “rifle permits” is used by a third party. Internet searches for this term reveal many results relating to third parties unrelated to the Complainant. ¹

Apart from using the term “rifle permits” within the disputed domain name and on its website, there is no evidence suggesting that the Respondent had the Complainant in mind when it registered and used the disputed domain name. The Respondent’s website is very different to that of the Complainant, including its logo, imagery, text, and general look and feel. While there have been exchanges between the Parties as described above, there is no evidence of a history of cybersquatting by the Respondent.

In *Sociedad Puerto Industrial Aguadulce S.A. v. AbdulBasit Makrani*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-1378](#), the three-member panel stated as follows:

“As a general rule, anyone can register such [dictionary] words in a domain name without transgressing the Policy and one cannot infer without evidence, which is lacking in this case, that one user of such words is necessarily being targeted. Some dictionary words may be so well-known in connection with a particular business or trademark (for example, DELTA, UNITED or APPLE) that the general rule would be displaced but that is not the case here. Similarly, a very specific combination of dictionary words might lead to an inference of targeting, for example, if the disputed domain name had contained the dictionary word ‘puerto’ along with ‘aguadulce’. However, this is not the case with the Spanish translation of “fresh water” which could be of value to multiple organizations.”

There is no evidence in the present case justifying a departure from the general concept enunciated in the quote above. The evidence in the record is such that it is more likely than not, on balance of probabilities, that the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name for its semantic value, being descriptive of its business, rather than for any brand value or goodwill that may or may not be associated with the Complainant.

¹In accordance with its powers articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, the Panel is entitled to conduct limited independent research into matters of public record. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.8.

The Complainant makes much of the fact that the Respondent, in pre-Complaint correspondence, offered to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant. However, this was done almost a year after the Respondent registered the disputed domain name, well after the Respondent began using the disputed domain name for what appears to have been a legitimate business, and after the Respondent had agreed to change its trading name in response to the Complainant's pre-Complaint demand letters. If it was the Respondent's intention to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant all along then one would have expected this offer to have been made earlier, soon after registration of the disputed domain name. It seems more likely that the Respondent's offer was made in order to recoup its costs spent on the disputed domain name (which costs the Respondent expressly references in its Responses), after the Respondent had agreed to change its trading name away from the name embodied in the disputed domain name, rather than the Respondent having targeted the Complainant from the date of registration of the disputed domain name, noting the conjunctive nature of the third element, requiring both bad faith registration and use.

The Panel finds the third element of the Policy has not been established.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Jeremy Speres/

Jeremy Speres

Sole Panelist

Date: October 13, 2025