

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

DRIP DROP HYDRATION INC. v. Drip Drop

Case No. D2025-4714

1. The Parties

The Complainant is DRIP DROP HYDRATION INC., United States of America (the “U.S”), represented by Venable, LLP, U.S.

The Respondent is Drip Drop, Pakistan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <drippro.com> is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 13, 2025. On November 14, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 14, 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 (Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0175629264) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 18, 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 amendment to the Complaint on November 18, 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 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 17, 2025.

The Center appointed Mladen Vukmir as the sole panelist in this matter on December 19, 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 U.S. company established in 2008 under the laws of Delaware, with an office in Walnut Creek, California. It owns a hydration supplement brand sold online and in retail stores. The Complainant offers oral rehydration solutions designed to prevent and treat dehydration.

The Complainant is the owner of many earlier registered DRIP DROP trademarks in various jurisdictions, including DRIP DROP work trademark registered in the United States on March 13, 2012, under the registration number 4110969 for goods and services in class 44 (the “DRIP DROP trademark”).

The Complainant owns numerous domain names containing the DRIP DROP trademark, primarily operating its online platform through its official website created under the domain name <dripdrop.com>, registered on April 13, 2004.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 14, 2025. The disputed domain name resolves to a parked Shopify website with the statement “Sorry, this store is currently unavailable.”

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:

(i) It is the owner of DRIP DROP trademarks in numerous international classes worldwide. Since being established in 2008, it has developed a hydration supplement brand sold nationwide online and in retail stores. As a result of extensive use and promotion of its DRIP DROP trademarks, they have developed a reputation to consumers and goodwill around the world. In addition, the Complainant has a strong online presence, developed through incorporation of DRIP DROP trademarks on its online store, numerous owned websites and social media;

(ii) The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant’s registered DRIP DROP trademarks, incorporating the entire DRIP DROP trademark, with the minor addition of the word “pro” and the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) identifier “.com”. For this reason, it may be inferred that the disputed domain name is calculated to confuse or deceive, as it falsely suggests an association with the Complainant;

(iii) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. There is no evidence that the Respondent uses the disputed domain name in connection with the bona fide offering of goods or services. At the time the Respondent registered the disputed domain name, DRIP DROP trademarks were well-known within the food and beverage supplement industry and among consumers throughout the United States and worldwide. Moreover, there is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name; and

(iv) The Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in bad faith. The disputed domain name resolves to a parked Shopify website. The fact that the disputed domain name is a parked page does not preclude a finding of bad faith. Having in mind the strength of DRIP DROP trademarks, it is clear that the

Respondent registered the disputed domain name at a time when it knew or should have known their value and distinctive quality.

B. Respondent

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

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 DRIP DROP trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Complainant's DRIP DROP trademark is reproduced 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.

Although the addition of other terms here, "pro", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of this term 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 gTLD ".com" is a standard registration requirement and as such may be disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

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 Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use the Complainant's DRIP DROP trademark. There is no evidence that the Respondent has been using the disputed domain name at all, either in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, nor is there any indication that the Respondent is commonly known under the disputed domain name.

The nature of the disputed domain name, containing the Complainant's DRIP DROP trademark and the term "pro", in tandem with the use of the disputed domain name to resolve to a Shopify page, indicates the Respondent's awareness of the Complainant and its trademark, and creates a risk of implied affiliation or association with the Complainant (as Internet users may believe the disputed domain name is an authorized website to purchase the Complainant's products). [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

The Panel notes that the Respondent is identified as "Drip Drop", which could indicate that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name but in reality seems more likely to be a ruse to give the appearance of legitimacy. And the Respondent has failed to provide a response to the Complaint and to come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the Respondent failed to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case showing that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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 has registered the disputed domain name which includes the Complainant's DRIP DROP trademark. The disputed domain name resolves to a parked Shopify website. The available evidence shows that registration and use of the Complainant's DRIP DROP trademark predates the registration of the disputed domain name. In the Panel's view, the Complainant has acquired and demonstrated goodwill related to its area of business (offering oral rehydration solutions). The Panel accepts that the DRIP DROP trademark is well-known within the food and beverage supplement industry.

The Panel is therefore of the opinion that it is more likely than not that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name being aware of the Complainant and its well-known DRIP DROP trademark. This finding is bolstered by the fact that a timeline on the Complainant's website (and corroborated by other sources as revealed by an Internet search) shows that the Complainant operated in Pakistan, where the Respondent is apparently domiciled, as early as 2010.¹

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.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

¹Although the Complainant neglected to include this evidence in the Complaint or amendment to the Complaint, noting in particular the general powers of a panel articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the UDRP Rules, it has been accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record if it would consider such information useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.8.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name incorporating the entirety of the Complainant's well-known DRIP DROP trademark without any authorization from the Complainant. Such action from the Respondent indicates an intent to exploit the Complainant's established goodwill. The Respondent is passively holding the disputed domain name and there is no evidence of any good-faith use, which reinforces the conclusion of bad faith.

The Panel further draws adverse inference from the Respondent's failure to take part in the present proceeding where an explanation is certainly called for ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.3).

These factors collectively support the finding that the disputed domain name was registered and used in bad faith, in line with the criteria outlined in paragraphs 4(a)(iii) and 4(b) of the Policy.

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 <dripdropro.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mladen Vukmir/

Mladen Vukmir

Sole Panelist

Date: January 2, 2026