

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Stonemaier LLC v. Sanchez Morgan
Case No. D2026-0738

1. The Parties

Complainant is Stonemaier LLC, United States of America (“U.S.” or “United States”), represented by Stites & Harbison PLLC, United States.

Respondent is Sanchez Morgan, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <prostonemaiergamesstore.shop> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 20, 2026. On February 23, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On February 23, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name, which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy Purposes) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on February 24, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on February 25, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on February 26, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for the Response was March 18, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on March 25, 2026.

The Center appointed John C. McElwaine as the sole panelist in this matter on April 7, 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 United States-based company in the board game publishing and distribution industry, founded in 2012 and headquartered in St. Louis, Missouri. Complainant develops and sells board games and related products worldwide and has operated an official website at “www.stonemaiergames.com” since 2012.

Relevant to this matter, Complainant owns the following trademark registrations incorporating the term STONEMAIER:

- STONEMAIER GAMES, U.S. Registration No. 5,647,458, registered January 8, 2019, for, inter alia, board games in International Class 28; and
- STONEMAIER, U.S. Registration No. 7,975,425, registered October 7, 2025, for, inter alia, online retail store services featuring board games in International Class 35.

These registered trademark rights are referred to herein as the “STONEMAIER Marks”.

The Domain Name was registered on July 19, 2025. It is now non-resolving but formerly resolved to an active commercial website that prominently used Complainant’s trademarks and branding, including the STONEMAIER GAMES name and Complainant’s distinctive “SM” logo. The website at the disputed domain name closely replicated the look and feel of Complainant’s official site, reproduced product images copied from Complainant’s website, and offered for sale products identified by Complainant’s trademarks.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

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

With respect to the first element of the Policy, Complainant contends that the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to trademarks in which Complainant has rights. Complainant asserts that it has longstanding trademark rights in the STONEMAIER and STONEMAIER GAMES through use and registration, and it argues that the Domain Name effectively captures these marks in their entirety. According to Complainant, the addition of the prefix “pro”, the descriptive term “store”, and the generic Top-Level Domain “.shop” does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity with Complainant’s STONEMAIER Marks. Complainant asserts that incorporating a trademark in its entirety within a domain name, even with additional terms or suffixes, does not avoid a finding of confusing similarity.

Complainant further asserts that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name. Complainant states that it has never authorized or licensed Respondent to use the STONEMAIER Marks in any manner, nor is Respondent otherwise affiliated with Complainant. Complainant notes that Respondent is not commonly known by the Domain Name; indeed, the Whois information initially listed a privacy service, and the underlying registrant name “Sanchez Morgan” has no evident connection to the term “Prostonemaiergamesstore” or the name “Stonemaier”. According to Complainant, Respondent’s only reason for choosing the Domain Name was to trade on Complainant’s well-known brand and deceive customers. In support of this, Complainant provides evidence that Respondent’s website is a copycat storefront designed to impersonate Complainant. Specifically, Respondent’s website is said to closely

replicate Complainant's official site in appearance and layout, and that it prominently features Complainant's STONEMAIER Marks and SM logo; it displays numerous photographs and product images copied directly from Complainant's website; and it offers for sale a range of board games and related products identical to those sold by Complainant, using Complainant's own trademarks (such as SCYTHE, WINGSPAN, APIARY, TAPESTRY, and others) to identify those products. Complainant argues that this conduct constitutes impersonation or passing off, and that such brazen misuse of its identity can never be considered a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name.

Lastly, with respect to the third element of the Policy, Complainant contends that the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Complainant's STONEMAIER Marks are distinctive, coined terms that have been used in commerce for many years prior to Respondent's registration of the Domain Name in July 2025. Complainant argues that the only plausible explanation for Respondent's choice of this Domain Name is that Respondent was well aware of Complainant and its marks and deliberately registered the Domain Name to exploit Complainant's reputation. Complainant maintains that Respondent's conduct falls squarely within several of the indicia of bad faith listed in paragraph 4(b) of the Policy. In particular, Respondent's website purports to offer the very same category of goods that Complainant sells (board games and related products) under Complainant's trademarks, thereby unfairly diverting potential customers away from Complainant's official channels. Complainant emphasizes that Respondent's website is a sham operation engaged in passing itself off as Complainant, by using Complainant's trademarks and logo and displaying identical product images.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Even though Respondent has defaulted, paragraph 4 of the Policy requires that, in order to succeed in this UDRP proceeding, Complainant must still prove its assertions with evidence demonstrating:

- (i) the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights;
- (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Because of Respondent's default, the Panel may accept as true the reasonable factual allegations stated within the Complaint and may draw appropriate inferences therefrom. See *St. Tropez Acquisition Co. Limited v. AnonymousSpeech LLC and Global House Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1779](#); *Bjorn Kassoe Andersen v. Direction International*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-0605](#); see also paragraph 5(f) of the Rules ("If a Respondent does not submit a response, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel shall decide the dispute based upon the complaint"). Having considered the Complaint, the Policy, the Rules, the Supplemental Rules, and applicable principles of law, the Panel's findings on each of the above-cited elements are as follows.

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 Complainant's trademark and the Domain Name. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

Complainant has established its rights in the STONEMAIER and STONEMAIER GAMES trademarks through its U.S. trademark registrations (U.S. Reg. No. 5,647,458 for STONEMAIER GAMES and U.S. Reg. No. 7,975,425 for STONEMAIER). Ownership of a nationally registered trademark is generally sufficient to establish a complainant's rights in the mark under the Policy, irrespective of the jurisdiction of registration or the extent of the complainant's geographic business. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

Here, the Domain Name consists of Complainant's distinctive mark STONEMAIER GAMES with the additional prefix "pro" and the descriptive word "store" at the end. Complainant's STONEMAIER and STONEMAIER GAMES trademarks are clearly recognizable within the Domain Name, and the inclusion of other descriptive or laudatory terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity for the purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

Consequently, the Panel finds that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to Complainant's STONEMAIER Marks for which Complainant owns valid trademark rights. Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Under the Policy's second element, paragraph 4(a)(ii), Complainant has the burden of establishing that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Complainant needs to make a prima facie showing on this element, at which point the burden of production shifts to Respondent to present evidence that it has rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. If Respondent has failed to do so, Complainant is deemed to have satisfied its burden under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy. See *Vicar Operating, Inc. v. Domains by Proxy, Inc. / Eklin Bot Systems, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2010-1141](#).

In this case, Complainant has put forward a compelling prima facie case that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Complainant states that it has never authorized or permitted Respondent to use the STONEMAIER Marks, and there is no evidence of any relationship between the Parties that would give rise to any license or permission for Respondent to use these trademarks. Respondent is not commonly known by the Domain Name or by any name corresponding to "Stonemaier" or "prostonemaiergamesstore". Indeed, the only name associated with Respondent is "Sanchez Morgan", which has no connection to the term "Stonemaier" or the Domain Name. There is likewise no evidence that Respondent has acquired any trademark or service mark rights in "Prostonemaiergamesstore" or any similar term.

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 Domain Name, such as those enumerated in the Policy¹ or otherwise. Instead, the record demonstrates that Respondent has engaged in conduct that negates any claim to legitimate interests. Specifically, Respondent has operated a website that impersonates Complainant by adopting similar branding and using copied images of Complainant's products to sell such products without authorization, thereby misleading Internet users into believing there is an affiliation or authorization by Complainant. Such impersonation is inconsistent with bona fide use and constitutes clear evidence of an intent to capitalize on Complainant's reputation. Panels have consistently held that impersonation of a complainant or its business through a domain name and associated website negates any claim to rights or legitimate interests. See *On AG, On Clouds GmbH v. Nguyen Luu, Withheld for Privacy Purposes, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf, Vuong Hoang, AN NGUYEN, NEO CORP., and Ngoc Tam Nguyen*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-1714](#) ("a [disputed domain name's] use cannot be deemed bona fide if the disputed domain names constitute trademark infringement"), citing *Sai*

¹ The Policy, paragraph 4(c), provides a non-exhaustive list of circumstances in which a respondent could demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name: "(i) before any notice to you of the dispute, your use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the domain name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or (ii) you (as an individual, business, or other organization) have been commonly known by the domain name, even if you have acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or (iii) you are making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue".

Machine Tools Pvt. Ltd. v. Mr. Sudhir Jaiswal, Shree Sai Extrusion Technik Pvt. Ltd., WIPO Case No. [D2018-2560](#) (“bona fide use is predicated on honest adoption of the name” and respondent failed to show such honest adoption; rather, respondent’s use was infringing and therefore not bona fide).

Respondent, having defaulted, has not submitted any evidence to rebut Complainant’s prima facie case. There is nothing in the record to suggest that any of the circumstances enumerated in Policy paragraph 4(c) (or any other basis for rights or legitimate interests) would apply. Respondent’s use of the Domain Name is not in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, but rather in connection with a deceptive e-commerce site that infringes Complainant’s rights, and Respondent is not making any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name, but instead is seeking to mislead Internet users for commercial gain.

The Panel concludes that Complainant’s un rebutted evidence establishes that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Therefore, the second element of the Policy is satisfied.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, Complainant must show that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith. The Policy provides a non-exhaustive list of circumstances that shall be considered evidence of bad faith (Policy, paragraph 4(b)). Two of these illustrative circumstances are directly relevant here. First, paragraph 4(b)(iii) considers it evidence of bad faith if a respondent has registered a domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor. Second, paragraph 4(b)(iv) provides that bad faith is demonstrated where a respondent, by using the domain name, has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website or of a product or service on that website.

Bad faith registration can be found where a respondent “knew or should have known” of a complainant’s trademark rights and nevertheless registered a domain name in which it had no rights or legitimate interests. See *Accor v. Kristen Hoerl*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-1722](#). Here, the incorporation of Complainant’s unique and coined brand name, “Stonemaier Games”, together with the nature of Respondent’s website that mimics Complainant’s branding and product line, leaves no doubt that Respondent knew of and targeted Complainant’s mark when registering the Domain Name. Respondent’s choice of the Domain Name was not some coincidence; it was plainly intended to give Internet users the false impression that the Domain Name and corresponding website are owned by, operated by, or affiliated with Complainant. In the view of the Panel, Respondent’s deliberate impersonation of Complainant demonstrates that Respondent registered the Domain Name with Complainant’s trademark firmly in mind and with the intention of exploiting it. This supports a finding of bad faith registration. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2 (noting that panels may find bad faith where a respondent knew or should have known of a complainant’s mark and nevertheless registered a domain name incorporating that mark). There is no explanation for Respondent to have chosen to register the Domain Name other than to intentionally trade off the goodwill and reputation of Complainant’s trademark or otherwise create a false association with Complainant. With no response from Respondent, Complainant’s claim concerning Respondent’s scheme is undisputed.

Turning to the use of the Domain Name, by operating an online store that closely imitates Complainant’s official website, Respondent has shown an intent to confuse and mislead consumers for commercial gain. Respondent’s website prominently displays Complainant’s STONEMAIER Marks and its SM logo, purports to offer Complainant’s exact products, uses images from Complainant’s website, and generally creates a false impression of being an official “pro” Stonemaier Games retail outlet. Internet users are thus likely to be lured to Respondent’s site in the belief that they are visiting a genuine store associated with Complainant, when in fact they are dealing with an unrelated entity. This is bad faith use of a domain name within the meaning of Policy paragraph 4(b)(iv). In addition, such conduct also inevitably disrupts Complainant’s business (e.g., by diverting potential sales or damaging customer trust), which is evidence of bad faith under Policy paragraph 4(b)(iii). See also [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1 (evidence of mimicking the complainant’s website is

evidence that a respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark).

As detailed above, the Panel finds on the record before it that Respondent's intention in registering the Domain Name was to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the STONEMAIER Marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website or location or of a product or service on its website or location, and its use has the likely effect of disrupting Complainant's business. Thus, the Panel holds that Complainant has met its burden of providing sufficient evidence that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iii) and (iv) of the Policy.

For these reasons, the Panel holds that Complainant has met its burden of showing that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) 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 Domain Name, <prostonemaiergamesstore.shop>, be transferred to Complainant.

/John C McElwaine/
John C McElwaine
Sole Panelist
Date: April 21, 2026