

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Snowflake Inc. v. Snowflake Snowflake, Snowflake Case No. D2026-0468

1. The Parties

Complainant is Snowflake Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Schwegman Lundberg & Woessner, P.A., United States.

Respondent is Snowflake Snowflake, Snowflake, United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <apps-snowflake.com>, <snowflake-app.com>, <snowflakeapp-global.com>, and <snowflakeappglobal.com> (the “Disputed Domain Names”) are registered with Web Commerce Communications Limited dba WebNic.cc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 5, 2026. On February 6, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Names. On February 7, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response, disclosing registrant and contact information for the Disputed Domain Names which partly differed from the named Respondent (Unknown Registrant / Snowflake Snowflake) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on February 9, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on February 9, 2026.

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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on February 11, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 3, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on March 4, 2026.

The Center appointed Richard W. Page as the sole panelist in this matter on March 23, 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

Complainant is a global cloud computing-based data cloud company. According to the Complaint, thousands of organizations around the world rely on Complainant to unite siloed data, to discover and securely share data, and to execute diverse workloads. Complainant processes an average of 6.3 billion daily queries on the data cloud from their over 11,000 global customers. Specifically, within the realm of AI, Complainant applies AI to data enabling users to run analytical workflows on unstructured data, to develop agentic apps, and to train models using both unstructured and structured data, all with minimal operational overhead and end-to-end governance.

Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations worldwide for marks containing or consisting of SNOWFLAKE in association with its software as a service, for use in connection with facilitating the customization of a cloud data platform, together with its data processing, data storage, data capture, data collection, data warehousing, data management, data migration, data mining, and database analytics.

Complainant operates the website at the domain name <snowflake.com> and owns the domain name <app-snowflake.com>.

Complainant owns the SNOWFLAKE mark which was first adopted and first used in 2014 and registered on November 20, 2018, in class 42. Complainant owns the following registrations, without limitation (collectively, the “SNOWFLAKE Mark”):

- United States Registration No. 5,610,829 for SNOWFLAKE registered November 20, 2018, in class 42;
- Canada Registration No. TMA1106880 for SNOWFLAKE registered August 16, 2021, in class 42; and
- International Registration No. 1434694 for SNOWFLAKE registered September 20, 2018, in class 42.

The Disputed Domain Names were registered on January 15, 2025, and currently do not resolve to an active website.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has expended significant time, money, and effort to establish substantial customer recognition of the SNOWFLAKE Mark as identifying Complainant as the source of its computer services. Complainant further contends that it has built up and now owns valuable goodwill in the SNOWFLAKE Mark, symbolized by its above-mentioned trademark registrations. Complainant further contends that the SNOWFLAKE Mark has been used extensively and continuously in connection with identifying Complainant's goods and services, in the advertising and promotion of Complainant's goods and services, and in other ways customary in the trade, to promote its goods and services throughout the United States and internationally. As a result of such advertising, promotion and widespread use, the consuming public recognizes the SNOWFLAKE Mark and associates it with Complainant and its goods and services.

Complainant further contends that each of the Disputed Domain Names includes the SNOWFLAKE Mark in its entirety. Complainant further contends that the addition of terms such as “app” and “global” only increases the risk for consumers to think that the Disputed Domain Names are associated with Complainant.

Complainant further contends that it has also developed a significant presence on the Internet and Complainant operates the website at the domain name <snowflake.com> which was registered on July 8, 1995, and for which Complainant has acquired rights through its predecessor in interest. Moreover, Complainant owns the domain name <app-snowflake.com> which was registered on October 2, 2023, and is virtually identical to the Disputed Domain Name <apps-snowflake.com>.

Complainant submits that it has given Respondent no authorization or license to use the SNOWFLAKE Mark, and there exists no connection between the Parties. Complainant further submits that there is no evidence that Respondent has been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Names or has any trademark or service mark rights to them. Complainant further submits that there is no reason for Respondent to have registered the Disputed Domain Names other than the motive of taking advantage of the goodwill and reputation of the SNOWFLAKE Mark. Such activities are neither bona fide nor legitimate. Additionally, there is no current website to which the Disputed Domain Names resolve. Therefore, there has been no bona fide offering of goods or services and no legitimate usage.

Complainant alleges that the Disputed Domain Names were registered on January 15, 2025, more than 10 years after Complainant's first use of the SNOWFLAKE Mark and more than seven years after Complainant's first trademark registration for the SNOWFLAKE Mark. Complainant further alleges that it is inconceivable that Respondent could have registered the Disputed Domain Names without knowledge of Complainant's rights in the SNOWFLAKE Mark and that Respondent intentionally targeted Complainant – which is in bad faith.

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Disputed Domain Names.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs the Panel as to the principles the Panel is to use in determining the dispute: "A Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, these Rules, and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable."

Even though Respondent has failed to file a Response or to contest Complainant's assertions, the Panel will review the evidence proffered by Complainant to verify that the three essential elements of the claims are met. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.3.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that Complainant must prove each of the following three elements:

- i) that the Disputed Domain Names registered by Respondent are identical or confusingly similar to the SNOWFLAKE Mark in which Complainant has rights; and,
- ii) that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Names; and
- iii) that the Disputed Domain Names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

[WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1 states that registration of the SNOWFLAKE Mark is prima facie evidence of Complainant having trademark rights in the SNOWFLAKE Mark for purposes of standing to file the Complaint.

Complainant has shown rights in respect of SNOWFLAKE Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

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 SNOWFLAKE Mark and the Disputed Domain Names. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Panel finds the SNOWFLAKE Mark is recognizable within the Disputed Domain Names. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Names are confusingly similar to the SNOWFLAKE Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here “app” and “global,” 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 Names and the SNOWFLAKE Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 allows three nonexclusive methods for the Panel to conclude that Respondent has rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Names:

(i) before any notice to you [Respondent] of the dispute, your use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Disputed Domain Names or a name corresponding to the Disputed Domain Names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or

(ii) you [Respondent] (as an individual, business, or other organization) have been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Names, even if you have acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or

(iii) you [Respondent] are making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Names, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the SNOWFLAKE Mark.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on Complainant, panels have recognized that proving that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Names may result in the difficult task of “proving a negative,” requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of Respondent. As such, where Complainant makes out a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to Respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Names (although the burden of proof always remains on Complainant). If Respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, Complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Names. Respondent has not rebutted Complainant’s prima facie showing and has 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.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets forth four nonexclusive criteria for Complainant to show bad faith registration and use of the Disputed Domain Names:

(i) circumstances indicating that you [Respondent] have registered or you have acquired the Disputed Domain Names primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the Disputed Domain Names registration to Complainant who is the owner of the SNOWFLAKE Mark or to a competitor of Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of your documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the Disputed Domain Names; or

(ii) you [Respondent] have registered the Disputed Domain Names in order to prevent the owner of the SNOWFLAKE Mark from reflecting the SNOWFLAKE Mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that you have engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) you [Respondent] have registered the Disputed Domain Names primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the Disputed Domain Names, you [Respondent] have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the SNOWFLAKE Mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your website or location or of a product on your website or location.

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 the Disputed Domain Names in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that the Disputed Domain Names were registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether Respondent's registration and use of the Disputed Domain Names was in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of the SNOWFLAKE Mark, and the composition of the Disputed Domain Names, and, absent any response, finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the Disputed Domain Names is bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that 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 <apps-snowflake.com>, <snowflake-app.com>, <snowflakeapp-global.com>, and <snowflakeappglobal.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Richard W. Page/

Richard W. Page

Sole Panelist

Date: April 6, 2026