ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

# ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Dansko, LLC v. bunal bunal
Case No. D2026-0956

## 1. The Parties

The Complainant is Dansko, LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Cozen O'Connor, United States.

The Respondent is bunal bunal, United States.

## 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <danskofeet.com> is registered with Cosmotown, Inc. (the "Registrar").

## 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on March 5, 2026. On March 6, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 8, 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 (Unknown Registrant) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 10, 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 March 11, 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 March 16, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 5, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on April 10, 2026.

The Center appointed Nicolas Ulmer as the sole panelist in this matter on April 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 privately-held company involved in the manufacture, marketing and sale of footwear and related products since 1990; it submits evidence and explanations as to the considerable goodwill and markets it has developed, including in the provision of footwear favoured by health workers.
The Complainant has a significant presence on the Internet, e.g., “www.dansko.com”.

The Complainant submits the evidence that it holds many United States Patent and Trademark Office trademarks for DANSKO, both alone and accompanied with a distinctive logo; these trademark registrations date back to at least 2003 and include the three following:

DANSKO
Registration Number: 2712957
Date: May 6, 2003
(International Class: 25) footwear, namely, casual outdoor shoes and work shoes for use in the health care, food service, equestrian, and general service industries

DANSKO and Design
Registration Number: 4229969
Date: October 23, 2012
(International Class: 03) leather and suede cleaning and protecting preparations; shoe creams; shoe cleaner;
sponges impregnated with shoe polish; shoe care cleaning kits comprised of shoe cleaners and shoe brushes

DANSKO and Design
Registration Number: 3265196;
Date; July 17, 2007
(International Class: 25) footwear; component parts of footwear, namely, tips and heel pieces; and leather shoes and imitation leather shoes

Little is known concerning the Respondent, who is apparently an individual living in the United States.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 9, 2026, and resolves to a website that prominently features the DANSKO mark and logo and sells, or purports to sell, the Complainant’s footwear products.

## 5. Parties’ Contentions

### A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the three elements required under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademarks and that the addition of the word “feet” to its trademark and company name in the disputed domain name does not distinguish the disputed domain name from the DANSKO marks but actually adds to the confusion and is evidence of bad faith intent.

Secondly, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant, and has no rights or legitimate interests in disputed domain name.

Finally, the Complainant submits that the adoption and use of the disputed domain name is in bad faith and in willful infringement of the Complainant's prior rights, and an attempt improperly to trade off the Complainant's reputation and goodwill.

The Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to it.

**B. Respondent**

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

**6. Discussion and Findings**

**A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

The disputed domain name begins with and contains the entirety of the Complainant's DANSKO trademark followed by the word "feet". The addition of the word "feet" does not prevent the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademarks. Where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. The nature of such additional term(s) may however bear on assessment of the second and third elements. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 1.8. Indeed, the addition of the word feet is here pertinent to the bad faith analysis below as the Complainant is known to be in the footwear industry.

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

**B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

The Complainant recites that the Respondent has no affiliation with it and has no rights or legitimate interests to use its trademarks in the disputed domain name or otherwise. There is no evidence or basis to believe that the Respondent is known by the name "Danskofeet"; nor is there any evidence that the disputed domain name has been used in connection with any bona fide offering of goods or services, rather it appears to have been used illicitly to create customer confusion and to trade off the Complainant's marks and goodwill for the Respondent's financial gain.

UDRP case law and jurisprudence makes clear that a complainant needs to establish at least a prima facie case that the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1. Where such a prima facie case is established by the complainant the burden of production shifts to the respondent to establish its rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Where, as here, the respondent fails to do so the complainant is generally deemed to have satisfied its burden under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy. See also, *Meizu Technology Co. Ltd v. "Osama bin laden",* WIPO Case No. DCO2014-0002.

The Complainant has here established such a prima facie case; the Respondent, having failed to answer the Complaint, has not rebutted this case. There is, furthermore, no evidence or indicia in the case file that would contradict the Complainant's assertions as to the Respondent's lack of any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Where, as here, a respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1.

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

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

The composition of the disputed domain name is here evidence of bad faith intent; as the Complainant is, and is known to be, in the footwear industry, the registration of a domain name composed of the Complainant's trademark followed by the word "feet" cannot be serendipitous. Rather, it reflects a bad faith intention to make use of the Complainant's trademarks and goodwill for unauthorised and illicit commercial purposes.

This improper intention is confirmed by the use to which the Respondent has put the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name resolves to a website that prominently and repeatedly features the Complainant's trademarked name and its distinctive trademarked logo; the site sells, or purports to sell Dansko footwear and related products. It is therefore clear that the Respondent has made bad faith use of the disputed domain name in order to attract Internet users for its commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks and brand.

The Panel accordingly finds the third element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been established.

**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 <danskofeet.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Nicolas Ulmer/*
**Nicolas Ulmer**
Sole Panelist
Date: April 29, 2026