

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Sea Pines Resort, LLC v. Sana Salman  
Case No. D2025-4118

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Sea Pines Resort, LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Wiley Rein LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Sana Salman, United States, self-represented.

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

The disputed domain name <seapinehotelandgolf.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on October 8, 2025. On October 9, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 13, 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 (SUPER PRIVACY SERVICE LTD C/O DYNADOT) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 21, 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 October 27, 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 November 3, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 23, 2025. The Respondent sent email communications to the Center on November 14, 2025. On the same day, the Center sent an email regarding possible settlement. On November 28, 2025, the Center informed the Parties of the commencement of the panel appointment process.

The Center appointed Evan D. Brown as the sole panelist in this matter on December 3, 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 owns and operates multiple properties on Hilton Head Island in South Carolina and provides services in the fields of hospitality, real estate and golf club services. It owns a number of marks that it uses in connection with its business, including the mark SEA PINES, for which it enjoys the benefits of registration in the United States (Reg. No. 2804427, registered on January 13, 2004).

According to the Whois records, the disputed domain name was registered on July 27, 2025. The Respondent has used the disputed domain name to display pay-per-click ("PPC") advertisements.

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

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

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark; that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

##### **B. Respondent**

The Respondent did not substantively respond to the Complainant's contentions. However, on November 14, 2025, the Respondent sent two email messages to the Center expressing that it did not contest the assertions in the Complaint, that it consented to the transfer of the disputed domain name, and that it would sign the Standard Settlement Form to cause the disputed domain name to be transferred to the Complainant. The Parties did not submit the Standard Settlement Form and the matter proceeded to determination by the Panel.

#### **6. Discussion and Findings**

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied: (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights, (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, and (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. The Panel finds that all three of these elements have been met in this case.

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

This first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7. 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. This element requires the Panel to consider two issues: first, whether the Complainant has rights in a relevant mark; and second, whether the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to that mark.

A registered trademark provides a clear indication that the rights in the mark shown on the trademark certificate belong to its respective owner. See *Advance Magazine Publishers Inc., Les Publications Conde Nast S.A. v. Voguechen*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-0657](#). The Complainant has demonstrated its rights in the SEA PINES mark by providing evidence of its trademark registrations. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name incorporates the SEA PINES mark in its entirety along with the descriptive terms “hotel” and “golf”, which do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant’s SEA PINES mark. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8. The SEA PINES mark remains recognizable for a showing of confusing similarity under the Policy.

It is standard practice when comparing a disputed domain name to a complainant’s trademarks, to not take the extension into account. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) at 1.11.1 (“The 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.”).

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established this first element under the Policy.

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

The Panel evaluates this element of the Policy by first looking to see whether the Complainant has made a prima facie showing that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. If the Complainant makes that showing, the burden of production of demonstrating rights or legitimate interests shifts to the Respondent (with the burden of proof always remaining with the Complainant). See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1; *AXA SA v. Huade Wang*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-1289](#).

On this point, the Complainant asserts that there is no indication that the Respondent is known by the SEA PINES mark or by the disputed domain name, and the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name for any legitimate noncommercial or fair use purposes but instead is using the disputed domain name for commercial purposes to display PPC links.

This establishes a prima facie case, and the Respondent has not provided any evidence to overcome this showing. Nothing in the record otherwise tilts the balance in the Respondent’s favor.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established this second element under the Policy.

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

The Policy requires a complainant to establish that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name, which incorporates the Complainant’s SEA PINES mark in its entirety along with generic terms closely related to the Complainant’s field of services (“hotel” and “golf”). This supports a finding that the Respondent specifically targeted the Complainant.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s SEA PINES mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the site.

Bad faith use is further shown from the Respondent’s activities of using the disputed domain name to present PPC links for commercial gain. See *Government Employees Insurance Company v. Joel Rosenzweig, RegC*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-1221](#).

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established this third element under 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 <seapinehotelandgolf.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Evan D. Brown/*

**Evan D. Brown**

Sole Panelist

Date: December 11, 2025