

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Sniffies, LLC v. luke harper, sniffieblog, Amin khan, Menu, and sniffies fun
Case No. D2025-5149

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Sniffies, LLC, United States of America ("US"), represented by Hanson Bridgett LLP, US.

The Respondents are luke harper, sniffieblog, Amin khan, Menu, and sniffies fun, US.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <sniffieapp.fun> and <sniffie.blog> are registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "First Registrar").

The disputed domain name <sniffiesapp.pro> is registered with Name.com, Inc. (the "Second Registrar") (collectively referred to as "the Registrars").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on December 10, 2025. On December 11, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On December 11, 12, and 16, 2025, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondents (Redacted for Privacy, Domain Protection Services, Inc. / 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 16, 2025, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar(s), requesting the Complainant either to file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on December 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on December 22, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 11, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents' default on January 12, 2026.

The Center appointed David Stone as the sole panelist in this matter on January 19, 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

Since 2017, the Complainant has provided a social platform and online dating service called "Sniffies" via a progressive web app platform and via downloadable apps for mobile devices. As of 2025, Sniffies was available in many jurisdictions around the world, and it had 18 million user sessions per month with an average session duration of 20 minutes and an average of 40 page-views per session.

The Complainant owns, among others, the following trademarks for SNIFFIES (the "Mark"):

- Australian trademark registration no. 2184028, registered on June 3, 2021, in international classes 9, 25, 42 and 45;
- US trademark registration no. 6820819, registered on August 16, 2022, in international classes 38, 42 and 45; and
- European Union trademark registration no. 018596060, registered on November 15, 2022, in international classes 9, 38, 42 and 45.

The Complainant's official domain name is <sniffies.com>, which was registered on January 31, 2015. The Complainant uses  as its logo (the "Logo").

The disputed domain names <sniffiesapp.pro>, <sniffieapp.fun> and <sniffie.blog> were registered on August 11, 2024, October 31, 2024, and April 17, 2025, respectively. The Complainant has provided evidence of the websites hosted at the disputed domain names as using the Mark and/or the Logo of the Complainant prominently and repeatedly, displaying download links to what appears to be potential malware and in two of the three cases offering an app for download under the Mark.

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.

Under the first element, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names <sniffie.blog> and <sniffieapp.fun> have just one letter removed from the Mark, while the disputed domain name <sniffiesapp.pro> contains the entire Mark. The disputed domain names <sniffieapp.fun> and <sniffiesapp.pro> contain the additional term "app" which is descriptive. It is contended that these differences are insufficient to avoid confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the Mark in each case.

Under the second element, the Complainant contends that the Respondents are (i) not known by "Sniffies", "Sniffie" or any other names incorporating those terms and (ii) could not have developed any common law trademark rights in the Complainant's senior and well-known marks. The Respondents are not affiliated with the Complainant, and the Complainant has not licensed or authorized the Respondents to use the Mark. It is contended that the Respondents have instead used the disputed domain names as part of a fraudulent

scheme to pass off their websites as those of the Complainant or to impersonate the Complainant and deceive the Complainant's users into visiting the disputed domain names. Specifically, it is contended that (i) the Respondents use the Mark, the Logo, and the Complainant's copyright-protected photographs on websites hosted at the disputed domain names; and (ii) the websites provide "download" links redirecting users to pages where the user's computer may be distributed malware or infected by a virus.

Under the third element, the Complainant contends that the Respondents registered and use the disputed domain names in a deliberate attempt to deceive third parties and to disrupt the Complainant's legitimate business by misdirecting its consumers through deceit. It is contended that this is particularly clear from the reproduction of the Mark and the Logo on the websites hosted at the disputed domain names, as well as the use of the Complainant's copyright-protected photographs. The Complainant also says it is aware of no evidence that the Respondents have used the disputed domain names for any other purpose than deceiving third parties with spurious websites imitating the Complainant's website for the purposes of diverting customers to potentially malicious downloads, potentially for the fraudulent purposes of infecting user machines with malware.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The Respondents did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See [WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition \("WIPO Overview 3.0"\)](#), section 4.11.2.

Panels have considered a range of factors, typically present in some combination, as useful to determining whether such consolidation is appropriate, such as similarities in or relevant aspects of (i) the nature of the marks at issue (e.g., where a registrant targets a specific sector), (ii) any naming patterns in the disputed domain names, (iii) any evidence of respondent affiliation with respect to the ability to control the disputed domain name(s) or (iv) other arguments made by the complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes in relation to the disputed domain names <sniffieapp.fun> and <sniffie.blog>: (i) the Complainant has provided evidence that <sniffieapp.fun> has previously redirected to <sniffie.blog>; (ii) there are similarities in the registrant's address and telephone number provided for both disputed domain names; and (iii) both disputed domain names use "sniffie" rather than "sniffies".

The Panel notes in relation to the disputed domain names <sniffieapp.fun> and <sniffiesapp.pro>: (i) <sniffieapp.fun> is nearly identical to the disputed domain name <sniffiesapp.pro>; and (ii) the disputed domain names were registered within a three-month period. However, the registrant information for these disputed domain names is entirely different and there are no similarities in the evidence provided as to the

content of the websites hosted at the respective disputed domain names that indicate common control. While both websites purport to provide an app for download under the Mark, the stated details of those apps differ.

The Complainant has provided evidence that it is a frequent target of attempts to spoof and divert its users to confusingly similar domain names. In those circumstances, the temporal proximity of registration and the similarities between the disputed domain names <sniffieapp.fun> and <sniffiesapp.pro> are insufficient to allow the Panel safely to conclude that the disputed domain names are under common control. There are even fewer similarities between <sniffiesapp.pro> and <sniffie.blog>. However, the abovementioned redirection is a strong factor in the assessment of consolidation, and the Panel does conclude that the disputed domain names <sniffieapp.fun> and <sniffie.blog> are more likely than not under common control.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes relating to the disputed domain names <sniffieapp.fun> and <sniffie.blog> would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants of <sniffieapp.fun> and <sniffie.blog> in a single proceeding. The Panel rejects the consolidation into these proceedings of the dispute regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrant of <sniffiesapp.pro>, without prejudice to the right of the Complainant to file a new Complaint for the domain name <sniffiesapp.pro>. The remainder of this decision therefore relates only to <sniffieapp.fun> and <sniffie.blog> and the words “Respondents” and “disputed domain names” are used accordingly.

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 Panel finds the Mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are 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, “app”, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such 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 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 Respondents 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 Respondents lack rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Respondents have not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie showing and have not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Further, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed distribution of malware and impersonation/passing off can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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 website hosted at the disputed domain name <sniffie.blog> uses the Mark prominently and repeatedly. The Panel notes that the website hosted at the disputed domain name <sniffieapp.fun>: (i) uses the Mark prominently and repeatedly; (ii) uses the Logo prominently and repeatedly; and (iii) is alleged to show the Complainant's copyright-protected photographs. The Panel notes that <sniffie.blog> previously redirected to <sniffieapp.fun>.

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.

The Panel finds that the content of the websites at the disputed domain names is suggestive of bad faith because it is evidence of the Respondents seeking to cause confusion.

Further, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed distribution of malware and impersonation/passing off constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

Furthermore, the Respondents have not attempted to refute any of the Complainant's contentions, which casts additional doubt on the nature of its conduct. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel concludes that the actions of the Respondents in choosing the disputed domain names were aimed at the use of the domain names for illegitimate activity. The Panel therefore concludes that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

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 <sniffieapp.fun> and <sniffie.blog> be transferred to the Complainant. The Panel makes no order in relation to <sniffiesapp.pro>.

/David Stone/

David Stone

Sole Panelist

Date: February 2, 2026