

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

FLRT, Inc. v. James Renae

Case No. D2026-1035

### **1. The Parties**

Complainant is FLRT, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Silverstein Legal, United States.

Respondent is James Renae, United States.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <feetfinderpics.com> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with Amazon Registrar, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 10, 2026. On March 11, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On March 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 (Identity Protection Service, On behalf of feetfinderpics.com owner) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on March 13, 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 March 13, 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 March 18, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 7, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on April 9, 2026.

The Center appointed Richard W. Page as the sole panelist in this matter on April 21, 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 owns and operates the website located at the domain name <feetfinder.com> and has used its domain name for several years in connection with the provision of a social media platform that allows users to post and subscribe to online foot fetish content. Complainant has been offering its services since June 2019.

In providing its services, Complainant has made extensive use of the FEETFINDER mark (the "FEETFINDER mark"). Complainant has registered rights in the FEETFINDER Mark with the European Union Intellectual Property Office ("EUIPO") and the United Kingdom Intellectual Property Office ("UKIPO"), including without limitation the following:

- EUIPO Registration No. 018918577 for FEETFINDER registered on December 8, 2023, in class 35; and
- UKIPO Registration No. UK000003951117 for FEETFINDER registered on November 24, 2023, in class 35.

Complainant, also, has a United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO") Registration No. 7284524 for FEETFINDER in class 35 which was filed on December 2, 2022, and registered on January 23, 2024. Further, Complainant has developed extensive common law rights throughout the world.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on December 18, 2025, and direct users to a "Coming Soon" page for an online marketplace for buying and selling feet content, encouraging visitors to stay tuned for the official launch. The website features a pink and purple color scheme, which shares certain similarities with the color scheme used on Complainant's website.

#### **5. Parties' Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

Complainant contends that its website is the most popular website in the world to view, buy, and sell content depicting feet. Complainant further contends that, according to "Similarweb.com", Complainant's website received nearly three million monthly visitors as of November 2024.

Complainant further contends that, the FEETFINDER Mark has been registered since November 2023, well before Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name, and that Respondent was aware of Complainant's rights in the FEETFINDER Mark at the time it registered the Disputed Domain Name.

Complainant further contends that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the FEETFINDER Mark. The Disputed Domain Name is merely the word version of the FEETFINDER Mark with the additional word "pics", which describes the digital goods sold by Complainant's users to Complainant's other users.

Complainant submits that Respondent has no connection or affiliation with Complainant and has not received any authorization, license, or consent, whether express or implied, to use the FEETFINDER Mark in the Disputed Domain Name or in any other manner. Complainant further submits that Respondent's offer to sell goods and services from its website are not bona fide or legitimate. Complainant further submits that Respondent is not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name.

Complainant alleges that Respondent is using the Disputed Domain Name to advertise for a website offering similar adult entertainment services in direct competition with Complainant's registered services in International class 35. Complainant further alleges that Respondent's website has a "look and feel" replicating Complainant's website, specifically including the pink and purple colors common on Complainant's website.

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

## **B. Respondent**

Respondent did not reply to 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 Name registered by Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to the FEETFINDER Mark in which Complainant has rights; and,
- ii) that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name; and,
- iii) that the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

[WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1 states that registration of the FEETFINDER Mark is prima facie evidence of Complainant having enforceable rights in the FEETFINDER Mark. Complainant has shown rights in respect of the FEETFINDER Mark for the purposes of the Policy.

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

The entirety of the FEETFINDER Mark is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the FEETFINDER Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here the term "pics", 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 FEETFINDER 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 a legitimate interest in the Disputed Domain Name:

- (i) before any notice to you [Respondent] of the dispute, your use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Disputed Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Disputed Domain Name 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 Name, 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 Name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the FEETFINDER 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 Name 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 Name (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 Name. 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 Name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The evidence in the case file shows that by using the disputed domain name that incorporates Complainant’s Mark in its entirety together with a term “pics” closely related to Complainant’s business, Respondent intends to set up an online marketplace for buying and selling feet content using a similar color scheme as the one on Complainant’s website, which may mislead Internet users into believing the website is connected to Complainant. The Panel find such use does not confer any rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent.

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 the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith.

- (i) circumstances indicating that you [Respondent] have registered or you have acquired the Disputed Domain Name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the Disputed Domain Name registration to Complainant who is the owner of the FEETFINDER 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 Name; or
- (ii) you [Respondent] have registered the Disputed Domain Name in order to prevent the owner of the FEETFINDER Mark from reflecting the FEETFINDER 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 Name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the Disputed Domain Name, 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 FEETFINDER 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 the Disputed Domain Name was registered years after the FEETFINDER Mark and Complainant's domain name <feetfinder.com>. It direct users to a "Coming Soon" page for an online marketplace for buying and selling feet content, encouraging visitors to stay tuned for the official launch. The website features a pink and purple color scheme, which shares certain similarities with the color scheme used on Complainant's website and intends to provide services similar to those of Complainant. The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent knew or should have known of Complainant at the time of registration of the Disputed Domain Name.

Although the Disputed Domain Name has not been actively used, panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a "coming soon" page 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 of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name, and Respondent's intended use as described on the website at the Disputed Domain Name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds Respondent's registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name constitutes 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 Name <feetfinderpics.com> be transferred to Complainant.

*/Richard W. Page/*

**Richard W. Page**

Sole Panelist

Date: April 30, 2026