

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Crocs, Inc. v. Name Redacted
Case No. D2025-3802

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Crocs, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Lipkus Law LLP, Canada.

The Respondent is Name Redacted.¹

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <crocsargentina.com> is registered with NETIM SARL (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 18, 2025. On September 19, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 22 and September 23, 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 September 24, 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 September 25, 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").

¹ The Respondent appears to have used the name of a third party when registering the disputed domain name. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted the Respondent's name from this Decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this Decision an instruction to the Registrar regarding transfer of the disputed domain name, which includes the name of the Respondent. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in these proceedings, and has indicated Annex 1 to this Decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST-12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1788](#).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 29, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 19, 2025. On October 6, 2025 the Center received an email communication from a third party. The Center notified the Parties of commencement of panel appointment process on October 22, 2025.

The Center appointed Enrique Bardales Mendoza as the sole panelist in this matter on October 24, 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 company incorporated under the laws of Delaware, United States, engaged in the manufacture and distribution of footwear and related merchandise. With a presence in many countries, the Complainant holds multiple trademark registrations:

- United States Trademark No. 3836415 for CROCS (registered on August 24, 2010) and covering goods and services in classes 25 and 35;
- United States Trademark No. 4179863 for CROCS (registered on July 24, 2012) and covering goods in class 25; and
- United States Trademark No. 4230390 for CROCS (registered on October 23, 2012) and covering goods in class 25.

Furthermore, the Complainant claims that it owns multiple domain names, including <crocs.com>, <crocs.ca>, <crocs.eu>, and <crocs.co.jp>, among others.

The disputed domain name, registered on July 20, 2022, resolves to a website that appears to reproduce elements associated with the Complainant's brand. As shown in Annex A to the Complaint, the site offers the products bearing the Complainant's mark, features the CROCS mark in several places, including the header and product images. The webpage includes English-language content such as the phrase "Exclusive Bundle of the Week" and displays various payment methods, logos and a copyright notice in the name of "Crocsargentina" in English. The Complainant has also submitted evidence showing that at another point the disputed domain name resolved to a website featuring commercial pay-per-click ("PPC") links, some of which expressly referenced the Complainant.

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 confusingly similar to the CROCS trademark, and that the addition of the geographic term "argentina" and the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" to the Complainant's mark does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant further submits that previous UDRP decisions have consistently held that the inclusion of a geographic term alongside a well-known trademark creates a domain name that is confusingly similar to the famous mark and rather reinforces the impression of a local affiliate of the brand, especially given the Complainant's commercial presence in Argentina.

Furthermore, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The registration of the disputed domain name took place in 2022, long after the Complainant's trademarks were registered and widely used worldwide. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor has it been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted to use the Complainant's mark. The website associated with the disputed domain name displays the CROCS logo and branded footwear without authorization, imitating the Complainant's official e-commerce platforms.

Lastly, the Complainant maintains that the Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain name in bad faith. By reproducing the CROCS mark and offering what appear to be Crocs-branded products, the Respondent intentionally seeks to mislead consumers for commercial gain by creating a false impression of affiliation or endorsement.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that the following three elements are present in order to obtain the transfer or cancellation of the disputed domain name:

- a. It must be demonstrated that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights.
- b. It must be demonstrated that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.
- c. It is necessary to demonstrate that the disputed domain name has been registered and is used in bad faith.

Since in the present case there was no response from the Respondent to the Complaint filed by the Complainant, the Panel can take as true those assertions of the Complainant that it considers reasonable (see *Joseph Phelps Vineyards LLC v. NOLDC, Inc., Alternative Identity, Inc., and Kentech*, WIPO Case No. [D2006-0292](#)).

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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable 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.

In this case, the disputed domain name reproduces the CROCS mark in its entirety, followed by the term "argentina".

Although the addition of other terms (in this case, "argentina") may be relevant to the assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that such an addition does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's mark for the purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

In addition, it is well established that the gTLD (in this case “.com”) is generally not considered when considering whether a disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark in which the complainant has rights (see section 1.11.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#)).

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 non-exclusive list of circumstances that indicate the respondent's rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. These circumstances are:

- (i) before any notice of the dispute, the respondent's use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the domain name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or
- (ii) the respondent (as an individual, business, or other organization) has been commonly known by the domain name, in spite of not having acquired trademark or service mark rights; or
- (iii) the respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

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.

In the present case, the Complainant has provided evidence of its trademark rights in CROCS, as well as proof of the mark's global recognition. The Respondent has not been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted to use or register a domain name incorporating the Complainant's trademark, nor is there any indication that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Panel further observes that the disputed domain name <crocsargentina.com> wholly incorporates the Complainant's mark together with the geographic term “argentina”, creating a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant, as contemplated under [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1. The associated website reproduces the Complainant's trademarks (including in the copyright notice) and imagery, and offers the Complainant's branded products, thereby misrepresenting an affiliation with the Complainant. Moreover, the site fails to clearly disclose the Respondent's lack of relationship with the Complainant and therefore does not satisfy the conditions for legitimate use as established in *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#).

The Panel notes that the Respondent did not file any response to the Complaint. This absence of response prevents the Panel from identifying any evidence of rights or legitimate interests that might justify the registration or use of the disputed domain name. Nothing in the case record suggests otherwise.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

In the present case, the following circumstances demonstrate bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name:

(i) The disputed domain name <crocsargentina.com> was registered on July 20, 2022, long after the Complainant's founding (2002) and the registration of its CROCS trademarks, which have been in force for many years prior to the Respondent's registration.

(ii) The Respondent has not submitted any evidence to indicate a legitimate or good faith use of the disputed domain name.

(iii) The website associated with the disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's CROCS mark and logo and displays images of CROCS-branded footwear, without disclosing its lack of relationship with the Complainant, creating the misleading impression of an official or authorized online store. At another point, the website featured PPC links some of which expressly referenced the Complainant.

(iv) The Respondent was clearly aware of the Complainant and its trademarks at the time of registration, as evidenced by the intentional incorporation of the CROCS mark in its entirety and the use of the Complainant's branding elements, logo and featuring the Complainant's footwear on the corresponding website.

v) The Respondent's failure to respond to the Complaint further supports the inference of bad faith, as no evidence has been presented to refute the Complainant's allegations or to demonstrate any legitimate purpose behind the domain name's registration or use.

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 <crocsargentina.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Enrique Bardales Mendoza/

Enrique Bardales Mendoza

Sole Panelist

Date: November 7, 2025