

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Snowflake Inc. v. Marquis Peterson, Boardroom Bully
Case No. D2025-4058

1. The Parties

Complainant is Snowflake Inc., United States of America, represented by Schwegman Lundberg & Woessner, P.A., United States of America (the “United States”).

Respondent is Marquis Peterson, Boardroom Bully, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <snwflke.com> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 3, 2025. On October 6, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On October 6, 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 Complainant on October 7, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on October 7, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on October 9, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 29, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on October 31, 2025.

The Center appointed Douglas M. Isenberg as the sole panelist in this matter on November 5, 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

Complainant states that it is “a global cloud computing-based data cloud company” with more than 12,000 customers that “delivers near-unlimited storage and computing in real-time to virtually any number of concurrent users in the data cloud”. Complainant further states that its “unique architecture delivers near-unlimited storage and computing in real-time to virtually any number of concurrent users in the data cloud” and that “within the realm of AI (artificial intelligence), [Complainant] applies AI to data enabling users to run analytical workflows on unstructured data, develop agentic apps and train models using both unstructured and structured data, all with minimal operational overhead and end-to-end governance”.

Complainant states that it is the registrant of the domain name <snowflake.com>, “which was registered on July 8, 1995, and for which Complainant has acquired rights through its predecessor in interest”, which it uses in connection with its website.

Complainant states, and provides documentation to support, that it is the owner of “numerous trademark registrations worldwide for marks containing or consisting of SNOWFLAKE in association with its software as a service and platform as a service services for use in connection with facilitating the customization of a cloud data platform, data processing, data storage, data capture, data collection, data warehousing, data management, data migration, data mining and database analytics, and more”. In support thereof, Complainant provided a 7-page schedule of trademark registrations that consist of or include the mark SNOWFLAKE, from Algeria to the United States. Complainant states, and provides documentation in support thereof, that the oldest of these registrations is U.S. Reg. No. 5,610,829 for SNOWFLAKE (registered November 20, 2018) for use in connection with “computer services, namely, cloud hosting provider services; software as a service (SAAS) services, namely, hosting software for use by others for use in connection with data warehousing, data management, data mining and database analytics; platform as a service (PAAS) featuring computer software platforms for use in connection with data warehousing, data management, data mining, and database analytics”. These registrations are referred to herein as the “SNOWFLAKE Trademark”.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on October 18, 2023, and, as described by Complainant (and as confirmed by a screenshot provided in the Complaint), resolves to a website that displays the word SNOWFLAKE in conjunction with a snowflake icon and purports to offer AI services, leading the public to believe that there is an association between the Disputed Domain Name and the Complainant.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Disputed Domain Name. Notably, Complainant contends that:

- The Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the SNOWFLAKE Trademark because, inter alia, the domain name “embodies an identical consonant structure and an identical pronunciation to” the SNOWFLAKE Trademark; “[a] domain name which consists of an intentional misspelling of a trademark is considered to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for the purposes of the first element”; “[t]he only difference between the disputed domain name and the [SNOWFLAKE Trademark] is the omission of the ‘o’ and ‘a’ vowels in the disputed domain name, which is an instance of typo squatting”; and “[t]he deletions in

the disputed domain name take advantage of users' misspellings and typographical errors and is likely to result in confusion".

- Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name because, inter alia, "Complainant has given the Respondent no authorization or license to use its registered or common law marks, and there exists no connection between the parties"; "[t]here is also no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name or has any trademark or service mark rights to it"; and "the disputed domain name resolves to a website that displays the contracted SNWFLKE mark in connection with the offering of identical AI services to those offered by the Complainant, which is likely to result in user confusion and as such does not confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent".

- The Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith because, inter alia, "typo-squatting itself is evidence of bad faith registration and use"; "Respondent registered the disputed domain name and linked it to a website offering AI services in competition with the Complainant"; and "Respondent's registration and use of the confusingly similar disputed domain name long after the Complainant registered its well-known [SNOWFLAKE Trademark] in order to deliberately take advantage of the Complainant's reputation and profit from the resulting confusion, clearly shows bad faith on the part of the Respondent".

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Based upon the trademark registrations cited by Complainant, it is apparent that Complainant has rights in and to the SNOWFLAKE Trademark.

As to whether the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to the SNOWFLAKE Trademark, the relevant comparison to be made is with the second-level portion of the Disputed Domain Name only (i.e., "snwflke") because "[t]he applicable Top-Level Domain ('TLD') in a domain name (e.g., '.com', '.club', '.nyc') is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test". WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.11.1.

As set forth in section 1.7 of [WIPO Overview 3.0](#): "in cases where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark, or where at least a dominant feature of the relevant mark is recognizable in the domain name, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark for purposes of UDRP standing." Further, as set forth in section 1.9 of [WIPO Overview 3.0](#): "A domain name which consists of a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of a trademark is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element."

Here, a dominant feature of the SNOWFLAKE Trademark is recognizable in the Disputed Domain Name, which consists of an intentional misspelling of the trademark. Previous decisions under the Policy have found that domain names containing a complainant's trademark without two letters are confusingly similar to the trademark. See, e.g., *Equifax Inc. v. Balticsea LLC, Balcsea LLC*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-2497](#) (in finding <equax.com> confusingly similar to the EQUIFAX Trademark, panel said, "[t]he mere deletion of two letters does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity"); *Intesa Sanpaolo S.p.A. v. Domain Admin, PrivacyProtect.org / Ma Ying Jo*, WIPO Case No. [D2013-0642](#) ("the disputed domain name... is confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark as it merely deletes two letters from the Complainant's mark"); and *Fry's Electronics, Inc v. Whois ID Theft Protection*, WIPO Case No. [D2006-1435](#) ("the disputed Domain Name is

confusingly similar to the registered trademark [...] owned by the Complainant since the Respondent has merely eliminated two letters [...] from the trademark which is certainly not sufficient to exclude the confusingly similarity”).

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

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Complainant has argued that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name because, inter alia, “Complainant has given the Respondent no authorization or license to use its registered or common law marks, and there exists no connection between the parties”; “[t]here is also no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name or has any trademark or service mark rights to it”; and “the disputed domain name resolves to a website that displays the contracted SNWFLKE mark in connection with the offering of identical AI services to those offered by the Complainant, which is likely to result in user confusion and as such does not confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent”.

[WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1, states: “[w]hile 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 often impossible 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. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element.”

The Panel finds that Complainant has established its prima facie case and without any evidence from Respondent to the contrary, the Panel is satisfied that Complainant has satisfied the second element of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Whether a domain name is registered and used in bad faith for purposes of the Policy may be determined by evaluating four (non-exhaustive) factors set forth in the Policy: (i) circumstances indicating that the registrant has registered or acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the registrant’s documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or (ii) the registrant has registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the registrant has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or (iii) the registrant has registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or (iv) by using the domain name, the registrant has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the registrant’s website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the registrant’s website or location or of a product or service on the registrant’s website or location. Policy, paragraph 4(b).

Complainant refers specifically to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy in support of its assertion that “Respondent registered the disputed domain name and linked it to a website offering AI services in competition with the Complainant”. Although Complainant briefly states that it “applies AI to data”, Complainant has not cited any of its registrations for the SNOWFLAKE Trademark that are used in connection with AI. However, a screenshot provided by Complainant of its website using the domain name <snowflake.com> makes repeated references to AI. The website associated with the Disputed Domain Name appears to offer a different type of AI services (described as the “Ultimate AI Assistant”), but, by failing to submit a response in

this proceeding, Respondent has not distinguished its services from those offered by Complainant, nor has Respondent provided any explanation for its registration of the Disputed Domain Name. Clearly, if the services offered by Respondent in connection with the Disputed Domain Name compete with those offered by Complainant in connection with the SNOWFLAKE Trademark, the Panel would have no hesitation in finding a likelihood of confusion. Indeed, numerous previous decisions under the Policy have found bad faith where, as here, a domain name under similar circumstances has been used to direct visitors to a website selling a competing product or service. See, e.g., *CWI, Inc. ("CWI") v. Craig Goldrich, Tulsa RV*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-1406](#) (finding bad faith where disputed domain name "redirects to a website... which Complainant describes as 'a website for a competitor of [Complainant] offering products and services identical and highly related to those offered by [Complainant]"); *Kabushiki Kaisha Toshiba d/b/a Toshiba Corporation v. Liu Xindong*, WIPO Case No. [D2003-0408](#) (using a disputed domain name "to sell directly competing products" constitutes bad faith); and *Ho Hoi Ming Michael, VGH Solutions ("Dr Ho") v. EHM All Things Healthy, LLC*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-1753](#) (finding bad faith where disputed domain name "wholly incorporates the Trade Mark, and ... is almost identical to the Complainant's own registered domain name and was used to sell similar goods").

Although competition is arguably less clear here than in situations involving other disputed domain names under the Policy, the Panel also takes note of the likelihood of initial interest confusion, "which occurs when a member of the public sees the disputed domain name and thinks that it may lead to a website associated with the Complainant". *CBS Broadcasting Inc., f/k/a CBS Inc v. Nabil Z. aghloul*, WIPO Case No. [D2004-0988](#). This doctrine does not excuse confusion simply because such "confusion may be dispelled, and replaced by annoyance or disgust once the nature of the site is revealed". *Ticketmaster Corporation v. Iskra Service*, WIPO Case No. [D2002-0165](#). "Under this view, members of the public should not be confused for even a moment as to the source of the website to which the domain name at issue resolves.... [A] respondent cannot make a 'legitimate noncommercial or fair use of a domain name' if any type of initial confusion is created." *CBS Broadcasting v. Nabil Z. aghloul*, WIPO Case No. [D2004-0988](#).

The Panel finds that 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 <snwflke.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Douglas M. Isenberg/

Douglas M. Isenberg

Sole Panelist

Date: November 7, 2025