

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Boot Barn, Inc. v. Alex Harrison  
Case No. D2025-4944

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Boot Barn, Inc., United States of America (“US”), represented by Sisun Law, US.

The Respondent is Alex Harrison, Ireland.

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

The disputed domain name <myshyanne.com> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 26, 2025. On November 27, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 27, 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, Privacy Service Provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 1, 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 December 5, 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 December 10, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 30, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 6, 2026.

The Center appointed Adam Samuel as the sole panelist in this matter on January 17, 2026. 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 US corporation that sells work- and “western”-themed clothes. The Complainant owns a number of US trademarks for SHYANNE, including Registration no. 3615901, registered on May 5, 2009. It markets its goods through [shyanne.com](http://shyanne.com), registered on April 29, 2000, and [bootbarn.com](http://bootbarn.com), registered on March 13, 1996.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 16, 2025. Currently, it does not resolve to a website. In the past, it resolved to a website entitled “Shyanne Shoes Official Website – Boots and shoes crafted for the modern cowgirl lifestyle”.

#### **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 Respondent's use of the SHYANNE Marks within the disputed domain name is likely to cause consumer confusion. Consumers will be misled into believing that the goods shown on the website are sourced from or associated with the Complainant.

“SHYANNE” is the distinctive part of the Complainant's trademarks and constitutes the core element of the domain name whereas “my” is a non-distinctive prefix commonly found insufficient to differentiate a domain name from the underlying mark. The “.com” generic top-level domain (“gTLD”) does not alter the situation.

The Respondent does not operate any legitimate business under the name “myshyanne” and does not own any trademark rights in that name. The “Contact Us” page for [myshyanne.com](http://myshyanne.com) lists an email address, telephone number, and a physical address—2847 Prairie View Lane, Austin, TX 78704—that appear to be fabricated. A Google search confirms that the address is not a valid location in Austin or elsewhere in Texas. Additionally, neither the WHOIS database nor the registrar-provided contact information identifies any publicly verifiable contact details for Respondent, and there is no evidence that the Respondent has ever been commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Respondent has received no authorization from the Complainant to use or register the SHYANNE Marks, or a colorable imitation thereof.

Since the Respondent has never used the [myshyanne.com](http://myshyanne.com) domain name for a website prior to its notice of the Complainant's SHYANNE Marks, the Respondent must have selected the [myshyanne.com](http://myshyanne.com) domain name to exploit the Complainant's SHYANNE Marks.

Given the Respondent's purported offering of goods identical to Complainant's goods and use of the [myshyanne.com](http://myshyanne.com) domain name in connection with an active website (as of December 2025), it is inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of Complainant's SHYANNE Marks before registering the [myshyanne.com](http://myshyanne.com) domain name.

The Respondent's website is clearly designed to lure Complainant's consumers to the Respondent's website looking for goods and services identical to those of the Complainant, in order for the Respondent to sell them different items.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **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.

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

The disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's trademark SHYANNE, preceded by "my" and followed by the gTLD ".com". The gTLD is irrelevant here as it is a standard registration requirement. See section 1.11.1 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("WIPO Overview 3.0").

Section 1.8 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) says:

"Where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive ...or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element."

Here, the insertion of "my" before the Complainant's trademark does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark.

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

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

The Respondent is not called "myshyanne" or anything similar. There is no evidence that the Complainant has ever authorised the Respondent to use its trademark.

For these reasons, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has met this element. See section 2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

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

The disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's distinctive trademark preceded by "my". In November 2025, a screenshot of the website to which the disputed domain name resolved indicated that the site was being used to sell what look like and purport to be the Complainant's products.

This all indicates that the Respondent knew of the Complainant's business when it registered the disputed domain name and did this in order to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's websites or location or of a product or service there. This is all evidence of bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name: paragraph 4(b)(iii) and (iv) of the Policy. Consequently, there is no need to consider the other points made in the Complaint.

For these reasons, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith and that the third element of the Policy has been proved.

## **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 <myshyanne.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Adam Samuel/*  
**Adam Samuel**  
Sole Panelist  
Date: January 23, 2026