

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Dr Etc Holdco LLC v. niu youguo
Case No. D2025-3784

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Dr Etc Holdco LLC, United States of America, represented by Venable, LLP, United States of America ("United States").

The Respondent is niu youguo, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <snoopdogghome.shop> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 17, 2025. On September 18, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 18, 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 (Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 19, 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 September 22, 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 September 23, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 13, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 14, 2025.

The Center appointed Lynda J. Zadra-Symes as the sole panelist in this matter on October 22, 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 the intellectual property management company for the musician and celebrity Calvin Broadus a.k.a. "Snoop Dog". The Complainant is the owner of the SNOOP DOGG trademarks in numerous international classes in countries around the world, including but not limited to the following United States Trademark Registrations:

SNOOP DOGG	Registration No. 2697128	registered March 18, 2003
SNOOP DOGGY DOGG	Registration No. 2278013	registered September 14, 1999
SNOOP DOGGIE DOGGS	Registration No. 7197937	registered October 17, 2023

The Complainant operates a website at "www.snoopdogg.com" featuring news, music, campaigns, and appearances, as well as links to social media accounts and a link to the Complainant's merch store "www.shop.snoopdogg.com" for purchasing authentic SNOOP DOGG merchandise.

Millions of fans follow Snoop Dogg on social media platforms, including YouTube (10.9 million subscribers), Spotify (27 million monthly listeners), and Instagram (88.6 million followers).

The Complainant submitted evidence of numerous achievements, awards and innovations showing that Complainant's SNOOP DOGG trademarks are well-known, including but not limited to Snoop Dogg receiving a star on the Hollywood Walk of Fame in 2018, Snoop Dogg performing at The Pepsi Super Bowl LVI Halftime Show in 2022 and Snoop Dogg carrying the Olympic torch, performing and working as a correspondent for NBC and Peacock at the Paris Olympics in 2024.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on August 8, 2025. The disputed domain name resolves to a website that prominently displays the SNOOP DOGG trademark and offers for sale unauthorized products bearing the mark, including clothing, shoes, figurines and posters, among other goods.

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 is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark, that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name 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 Complainant's SNOOP DOGG mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name, with the addition of the word "home" as well as the gTLD identifier ".shop". 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 Panel finds the addition of the word "home" and the gTLD identifier ".shop" 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity as shown here, namely, the sale of counterfeit goods and impersonation/passing off using the Complainant's mark, 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 is using the disputed domain name in connection with the sale of counterfeit goods and to impersonate or pass off Respondent's website as being an authorized website of the Complainant. The record shows that Respondent was well aware of the Complainant's mark when registering the disputed domain name and is intentionally attempting to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity as shown here, namely the sale of counterfeit goods and impersonation of the Complainant using the Complainant's mark, 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 <snoopdogghome.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Lynda J. Zadra-Symes/

Lynda J. Zadra-Symes

Sole Panelist

Date: November 10, 2025