ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Sniffies, LLC v. Amin khan, Menu
Case No. D2026-0600

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Amin khan, Menu, Bahrain.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <sniffiesapp.pro> is registered with Name.com, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 12, 2026. On February 12, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 12, 2026, 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, Domain Protection Services, Inc.) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 16, 2026, 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 February 18, 2026.

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 February 18, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 10, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Fabrizio Bedarida as the sole panelist in this matter on March 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

The Complainant in this administrative proceeding is a limited liability company formed under the laws of Delaware, United States. The Complainant is a provider of online platforms. The Complainant claims that since at least February 2017, it has offered the SNIFFIES-branded online dating and social meetup Progressive Web App (PWA) platform, at the website under the domain name <sniffies.com>, as well as downloadable Android Package Kits (APKs) for mobile devices. The Complainant offers its social platform and online dating services under the SNIFFIES trademark in the United States and in dozens of other countries. The platform hosts 18,000,000 user sessions per month.

The Complainant owns trademark registrations in various jurisdictions for the wordmark SNIFFIES and the combined mark S SNIFFIES (the mark consists of a horizontally-oriented letter “S”, where a circle is above the right side of the letter “S” and to the right of the letter “S” is the word “SNIFFIES”), which it uses in conjunction with its PWA platform.

The Complainant is, inter alia, the owner of:

US Trademark Registration number 6820819 for SNIFFIES (word), registered on August 16, 2022.

US Trademark Registration number 7039755 for SNIFFIES (word), registered on May 2, 2023.

US Trademark Registration number 7484495 for S SNIFFIES (combined), registered on August 27, 2024.

The Complainant also owns the domain name <sniffies.com>, registered on January 31, 2015.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 11, 2024. Currently, the disputed domain name is inactive. From submissions provided by the Complainant, it appears that previously (at least on February 11, 2026), the disputed domain name directed to a webpage that advertised a “Sniffies App” with a “download APK” link and various other download links, displaying the SNIFFIES trademarks, and logo with the addition of “.app” at the end. The webpage also displayed the Complainant’s copyright-protected photographs.

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 registered and uses the disputed domain name in a deliberate attempt to deceive third parties as to the Respondent’s identity or connection with the Complainant, in order to disrupt the Complainant’s legitimate business by misdirecting its customers through deceit, by using the SNIFFIES trademark and logo on its website and by displaying the Complainant’s copyright-protected photographs, in an attempt to build an association between the Respondent and the Complainant when in fact no such association exists.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In order for the Complainant to obtain a transfer of the disputed domain name, paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that the Complainant must demonstrate to the Panel that:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
(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

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 Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the SNIFFIES mark is incorporated entirely and recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Although the addition of other term 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 3.1, 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 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 that 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 3.1, 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 Panel notes that the composition of the disputed domain name, which incorporates the Complainant's trademark together with the term "app" (for a website advertising a "Sniffies App"), indicates the Respondent's intention to take unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant as to the origin or affiliation of the website hosted at the disputed domain name, and as such, the disputed domain name cannot qualify as fair use.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed as impersonation/passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. WIPO Overview 3.1, 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.

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 3.1, section 3.2.1.

In the present case, the Panel notes that, as discussed below, it is highly likely that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademark registrations and rights to the SNIFFIES trademark when it registered the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name contains in its entirety, without any relationship, authorization or approval by the Complainant, the Complainant's registered SNIFFIES trademark combined with the term "app".

The Complainant's SNIFFIES trademark as well as the domain name <sniffies.com> were registered several years before the Respondent registered the disputed domain name.

Noting also the composition of the disputed domain name, which incorporates the Complainant's trademark along with the additional term "app", combined with the fact that the Respondent's website displays the SNIFFIES trademark and logo and the Complainant's copyrighted images, to advertise a "Sniffies App", it is more likely than not that the Respondent, when registering the disputed domain name, had knowledge of the Complainant's prior rights to the SNIFFIES trademark. The Panel is therefore satisfied that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Further, by using the disputed domain name, the Panel notes that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark. Such use constitutes bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed impersonation/passing off constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4.

Finally, the bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name are further supported by the fact that the Respondent has not denied the assertions of bad faith made by the Complainant in these proceedings.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute bad faith under 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 <sniffiesapp.pro> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Fabrizio Bedarida/
Fabrizio Bedarida
Sole Panelist
Date: March 25, 2026