

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Grand Ole Opry IP, LLC v. Matt Cook, National Tourism Association
Case No. D2025-4370

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Grand Ole Opry IP, LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Adams and Reese LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Matt Cook, National Tourism Association, United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <grandoleopry.net>, <grandoleopry.org>, and <scheduleforgrandolopry.com> are registered with DNC Holdings, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 23, 2025, in relation to the disputed domain name <scheduleforgrandolopry.com>. On October 24, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 28, 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 October 30, 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 31, 2025, adding two additional disputed domain names.

On November 5, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the additional disputed domain names. On November 7, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names 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 November 10, 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 November 12, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaints 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 13, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 3, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Parties of the Respondent’s default on December 11, 2025.

The Center appointed Ingrida Karina-Berzina as the sole panelist in this matter on December 17, 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 organizes live music concerts featuring country music performers at the Grand Ole Opry venue in Nashville, Tennessee, United States, which has its roots in a radio show called by that name since 1927. It operates its primary business website, including online ticket sales, at the domain name <opry.com>.

It is the proprietor of numerous trademark registrations internationally, including United States Trademark Registration No. 527589 for GRAND OLE OPRY (word mark), registered on July 11, 1950, for services in class 38, claiming first use in 1927.

The disputed domain names were registered on the following dates: <grandoleopry.net> and <grandoleopry.org> on December 18, 2003, and <scheduleforgrandolopry.com> on June 24, 2007.

At the time of filing the Complaint and of this Decision, they resolved to websites displaying pay-per-click (PPC) links to third-party sites including those purportedly selling tickets to the Complainant’s productions. The record indicates that all three disputed domain names are being offered for sale through a third-party website.

The record reflects that, on September 11, 2025, the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent. The record does not reflect a response thereto.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant states that the “Grand Ole Opry” is both a weekly performance showcase featuring country music performers and a widely renowned event venue located in Nashville, Tennessee, United States. The Grand Ole Opry radio show, which adopted its name in 1927, is the longest continuous country music radio show broadcast in history. Hundreds of artists have entertained, and still entertain, as Grand Ole Opry members. The Complainant spends millions of dollars every year promoting the OPRY Marks and the products and services sold under the marks. Over nearly 100 years of extensive marketing, sales, and enforcement, the distinctive OPRY Marks have become famous as source identifiers for Complainant’s products and services. The disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant’s mark. The disputed domain name <scheduleforgrandolopry.com> contains a deliberate misspelling of the

Complainant's mark. The added words do not distinguish the marks. The Respondent is not known by the disputed domain names and is not authorized by the Complainant to use its mark. The Respondent registered the disputed domain names with knowledge of the Complainant's world-famous marks. The additional word "schedule" is intended to convey the impression that it redirects to the Complainant's concert and event schedule. The Respondent is using the disputed domain names in bad faith to divert Internet users to commercial parking pages with links advertising the Complainant's identical services, generating revenue for the Respondent. All three disputed domain names are also currently being offered for sale on a third-party website. The Respondent is the registrant of over 2,700 domain names, many of them incorporating the names of established businesses.

The Complainant requests transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the UDRP requires the Complainant to make out all three of the following:

- (i) the disputed domain names are 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 names; and
- (iii) the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain names in bad faith.

Under paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, "[a] Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable".

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 is reproduced within the disputed domain names <grandoleopy.net> and <grandoleopy.org>. Accordingly, these disputed domain names are identical to the Complainant's mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name <scheduleforgrandoleopy.com>. 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 that the missing letter "e" is a misspelling of the Complainant's mark and 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 1.9.

Although the addition of other terms (here, "schedule for") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms 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 names. 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.

The Panel notes that the composition of the disputed domain names and finds the following. Two of the disputed domain names reflect the GRAND OLE OPRY mark in their entirety. Therefore, the Panel finds that the nature of the disputed domain names carries a high risk of implied affiliation to the Complainant that cannot constitute fair use. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1. The third contains a deliberate misspelling of the Complainant’s mark preceded by adding the descriptive terms “schedule for”. There is a risk that Internet users will not notice the subtle misspelling of the Complainant’s mark.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain names resolve to websites featuring PPC links directly related to the Complainant. Under these circumstances, the Panel finds that such use does not establish rights or legitimate interests. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.9.

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 intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark. The disputed domain names were registered more than 50 years after the Complainant registered its GRAND OLE OPRY trademark. Two of the disputed domain names are identical to the Complainant’s mark. Such composition implies a connection to the Complainant. The third disputed domain name is a deliberate misspelling of the Complainant’s mark together with descriptive terms, which creates a risk of confusion. Under these circumstances, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names were registered in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.

The Panel finds that the use of the disputed domain names to resolve to websites featuring PPC links related to the Complainant’s business is an indication of bad faith use of the disputed domain names.

[WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.5. The Panel further finds that evidence of the Respondent’s pattern of registering domain names reflecting third-party marks additionally supports a finding of bad faith.

[WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

The Respondent has provided no evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use of the disputed domain name, nor does the Panel find any such use plausible.

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 names <grandoleopy.net>, <grandoleopy.org>, and <scheduleforgrandolopy.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa/
Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa
Sole Panelist
Date: December 27, 2025*