

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Dansko, LLC v. Michael Ambrus
Case No. D2026-0958

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Michael Ambrus, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <usdanskooutlet.com> is registered with Gname.com Pte. Ltd. (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 9, 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 the same day, 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 12, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 1, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on April 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Nicolas Ulmer as the sole panelist in this matter on April 10, 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, Dansko, LLC, is a private employee-owned company involved in the manufacture and sale of a variety of footwear and related goods; the Complainant has been in this business for more than three decades and asserts that it has built up sizeable goodwill, and common law trademark rights through its efforts and promotion of its DANSKO branded footwear and products. The Complainant is active on the Internet and operates websites in connection with its business, notably at “www.dansko.com”.

The Complainant has submitted evidence of numerous registrations of the trademark “DANSKO”, both alone and with related terms and designs, in the footwear class and other classes, at the United States Patent and Trademark Office. These many and various registrations are dated from 2003 through the present, including United States trademark registration number 2712957, registered on May 6, 2003.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 29, 2025.

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

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

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

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademarks, and that the addition of the letters surrounding the trademarked term, DANSKO, in that disputed domain name adds to the confusing similarity as they suggest that the disputed domain name is linked to a US discount outlet of the Complainant’s goods.

The Complainant further asserts that the Respondent has not been given, and has no, license, permission or right to use its trademarks.

Finally, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name was clearly both registered and used in bad faith, notably as the disputed domain name resolves to a website featuring the Complainant’s trademarked name and designed to make illicit commercial gain from the use of the Complainant’s goodwill, brand and trademarks.

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 contains the entirety of the Complainant's registered trademark DANSKO sandwiched between "us" and "outlet". These additional letters and word do not remove the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademarks. Indeed the additions to the trademark suggest that the disputed domain name is a United States outlet for the Complainant's products, a finding pertinent to the bad faith analysis below.

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

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant has clearly asserted that the Respondent has no affiliation with it and has no permission, license or right to use its trademarks. There is no basis to believe – and it is inherently improbable – that the Respondent is known by the disputed domain name; nor is there any evidence that the disputed domain name has been used in connection with any bona fide offering of goods or services, on the contrary it appears to have been used illicitly to create customer confusion for the Respondent's financial gain. UDRP 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 of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 2.1.

Where such a prima facie case is established by the complainant the burden 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 paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy. Id.; 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 nothing in the case file that would contradict or undermine the Complainant's assertions as to the Respondent's lack of any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

It follows that the Complainant has met its burden under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The very composition of the disputed domain name is suggestive of bad faith. As pointed out by the Complainant the disputed domain name suggests that the holder is a United States outlet for the Complainant's products. Such a registration can only be assumed to be with a motive of using the disputed domain name to attract Internet customers for commercial gain and thereby seek to profit from the Complainant's trademarks and name recognition.

The use to which the Respondent put the disputed domain name further confirms bad faith. The disputed domain name resolves to a website that features the DANSKO trademark and logo and sells, or purports to sell, the Complainant's footwear, a direct and obvious bad faith use of the disputed domain name illicitly to trade off the Complainant's trademarks, brand and goodwill.

The Respondent's anonymous registration of the disputed domain name and failure to answer the complaint are here further indicia of bad faith.

The Complainant has, consequently, met its burden under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

7. Decision

For all 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 <usdanskoooutlet.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nicolas Ulmer/

Nicolas Ulmer

Sole Panelist

Date: April 15, 2026