

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Grand Ole Opry IP, LLC v. Michiana TV, Michiana.TV Michiana.Shop
Case No. D2025-4695

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Michiana TV, Michiana.TV Michiana.Shop, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <grandoleopry.live> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 12, 2025. On November 13, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 14, 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 18, 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 19, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 9, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on December 10, 2025.

The Center appointed Lynda J. Zadra-Symes as the sole panelist in this matter on December 16, 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.

On December 16, 2025, the Respondent submitted an email to the Center. On December 17, 2025, the Complainant submitted a supplemental filing with exhibits in response to the Respondent's email.

The Panel has considered the Respondent's email and the Complainant's supplemental filing in this Decision.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is the owner and proprietor of the trademarks GRAND OLE OPRY and OPRY (the "OPRY Marks") which it uses in connection with live music concerts and other entertainment services, including facilitating online ticket sales for such events. The GRAND OLE OPRY is a weekly performance showcase featuring country music performers and also an event venue located in Nashville, Tennessee, United States.

The GRAND OLE OPRY radio show, which adopted its name in 1927, is one of the longest continuous country music radio show broadcasts in history. Hundreds of artists have entertained and still entertain as GRAND OLE OPRY members, and induction as a member to the GRAND OLE OPRY is regarded as one of the significant confirmations of a country music performer's talent. For nearly 100 years, the GRAND OLE OPRY has been home for country music's greatest talents and today remains influential as a cultural landmark and music industry phenomenon.

Since 1927, the Complainant and its predecessors have promoted the mark extensively. The Complainant spends around millions of U.S. Dollars every year promoting the OPRY Marks and the products and services sold under the marks. The Complainant advertises and sells its products and services through its <opry.com> website and related online and brick-and-mortar stores. Each year, the GRAND OLE OPRY attracts hundreds of thousands of visitors and millions of listeners from around the world via radio and Internet. The Complainant also maintains an active social media presence, with around 2.7 million Facebook followers, 1.1 million Instagram followers, over 902,000 YouTube subscribers, and over 737,000 X (formerly Twitter) followers.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for the OPRY Marks in several countries, including but not limited to the following United States registrations:

GRAND OLE OPRY	Registration No. 527589, registered July 11, 1950
GRAND OLE OPRY	Registration No. 645898, registered May 21, 1957
GRAND OLE OPRY	Registration No. 2937990, registered April 5, 2005
OPRY	Registration No. 2813274, registered February 10, 2004
OPRY	Registration No. 2843317, registered May 18, 2004

In addition, the Complainant and its licensees own many domain names incorporating the OPRY Marks, including but not limited to <opry.com>, <grandoleopry.com>, <opry.app>, and <grandoleopry.app>. The Complainant operates its principal website at <opry.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 30, 2024, and resolves to a parking page showing pay-per-click ("PPC") advertising links to websites purportedly offering services related to those of the Complainant.

On June 24, 2025, the Complainant's counsel sent the Respondent a cease and desist message informing the Respondent that the disputed domain name or content infringes the Complainant's trademark. The Respondent did not reply to that message.

Complainant also submitted with its amended Complaint a printout of the Google Maps search results showing that Respondent's address for the disputed domain name registration does not exist. (Annex 8 to the Complaint)

On December 17, 2025, the Complainant submitted a supplemental filing with a screen shot (Annex 10 to the Complaint) showing the disputed domain name available for sale at a price of USD 100,000.

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 incorporates the Complainant's registered trademarks in their entirety, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed 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 by the deadline for response to the Complaint. On December 16, 2025, the Respondent submitted an email to the Center stating:

"Hello. I am the registered owner of GrandOleOpry.live website domain. I am not sure what the complainant [sic] is accusing, but this domain has never been used to infringe on any copyrights or patents. In fact, it has never been active or used as a redirect since I registered it in 2024. I believe the complainant [sic] is trying to make false claims in order to gain ownership of the domain. If the complainant [sic] would like to purchase the domain legitimately, I would consider selling it. Otherwise, please dismiss any false and frivolous accusations being made in regards to this domain. If the complainant [sic] would have contacted me, rather than invest in a fake legal claim, they could've acquired the domain by now. Thank you."

On December 17, 2025, the Complainant submitted a supplemental filing responding to the Respondent's email of December 16, 2025. The Complainant reiterated that it had contacted the Respondent in June 2025, but received no response. The Complainant also submitted a screen shot showing that, after the filing of the Complaint, the Respondent had listed the disputed domain name for sale for USD 100,000.

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 marks are reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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. The Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name and the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name for a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. On the contrary, the record shows that the disputed domain name is being used for the purpose of PPC advertising and that the Respondent has offered the disputed domain name for sale for USD 100,000.

The disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's marks and has a Top-Level Domain that is directly linked to the Complainant's area of business. The nature of the disputed domain name carries a high risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

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 was most likely aware of the Complainant's trademarks at the time of registering the disputed domain name. In addition, the Respondent has used the disputed domain name as a parked site with links to websites related to the industry in which the Complainant operates, most likely to obtain PPC advertising revenues. In addition, the Respondent has recently offered the disputed domain name for sale for USD 100,000, far in excess of the costs of registering and maintaining the disputed domain name.

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.

Given the well-known nature of the Complainant's trademarks, and in the absence of any explanation from the Respondent for registering a domain name identical to those marks, the Panel holds that the Respondent was most likely aware of or at least should have been aware of the Complainant's trademarks at the time of registering the disputed domain name. The Respondent is using the disputed domain name to host a parking site of PPC links, which is sufficient for a finding of registration and use in bad faith in light of the circumstances of this case. By choosing a domain name identical to the Complainant's trademarks and using it to host PPC links, the Respondent is intending to make a commercial gain by taking advantage of the goodwill and reputation of the Complainant's trademarks. After receipt of the cease-and-desist letter from the Complainant and after the filing of the Complaint, the Respondent chose not to Respond to the Complaint formally, and apparently listed the disputed domain name for sale at USD 100,000, a price likely to be in excess of its out-of-pocket expense of registering the disputed domain name.

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 <grandoleopry.live> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Lynda J. Zadra-Symes/

Lynda J. Zadra-Symes

Sole Panelist

Date: December 30, 2025