

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

AG Products LLC v. Weston J Sigler, Blue River Digital
Case No. D2026-1129

1. The Parties

Complainant is AG Products LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by John Berryhill, Ph.d., Esq., United States.

Respondent is Weston J Sigler, Blue River Digital, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <monsterbucksupply.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 16, 2026. On March 18, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 20, 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 (MONSTERBUCK SUPPLY, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on March 20, 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 April 20, 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 March 27, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 16, 2026. Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on April 17, 2026. Accordingly, the Center notified Commencement of Panel Appointment Process on April 17, 2026.

The Center appointed Georges Nahitchevansky as the sole panelist in this matter on April 23, 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, AG Products LLC, is an agricultural products company. Complainant offers seeds, scents and related supplies and materials for deer feed lots under the name and mark MONSTERBUCK. Complainant owns trademark registrations in the United States for the MONSTERBUCK mark and the variant MONSTERBUCK in two words in connection with its products including, inter alia, Registration No. 6,662,066 that was filed on November 13, 2017 and issued to registration on March 8, 2022 with a claim of first use on October 1, 2008 and Registration No. 6,950,213 that was filed June 3, 2015 and issued to registration on January 10, 2023 with a claim of first use of January 6, 2020. Complainant also owns and uses the domain name <monsterbuck.com> to promote and sell its various products.

Respondent, who appears to be based in the United States, registered the disputed domain name on August 15, 2019. At some point thereafter, Respondent began using the disputed domain name for a website with the title "Monster Buck Supply" which purported to offer for sale seeds for fall and spring deer food plots, scents, deer cover and related products. Currently, the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website or page.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, Complainant contends that it has rights in the MONSTERBUCK mark on account of its trademark registrations and as a result of its use of the MONSTERBUCK mark for decades. Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar as it fully incorporates the MONSTERBUCK mark with the word "supply" that enhances the confusing similarity since Complainant uses the MONSTERBUCK mark with supplies for deer food lots. Lastly, Complainant argues that Respondent does not have a legitimate interest in the disputed domain name and is acting in bad faith as Respondent has no license or authorization to use the MONSTERBUCK mark and is not commonly known as MONSTERBUCK. Complainant also asserts that Respondent is using the disputed domain name to purportedly sell products of brands that compete with Complainant's products and "for attracting traffic based on Complainant's MONSTERBUCK mark." Complainant further urges that because Complainant is a longstanding seller of deer food scent and seed products it is more likely than not that Respondent was aware of Complainant's rights when it registered and used the disputed domain name for a website offering competing products.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not formally reply to Complainant's contentions. On April 17, 2026, a party purporting to act on behalf of Respondent, but using Respondent's email address, sent an email to Complainant and the Center asserting that they managed the disputed domain name for those who currently owned it and that they had been asked to release the disputed domain name but could not do so because it was locked.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed Complainant must satisfy the Panel that:

- (i) the disputed 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 disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Ownership of a trademark registration is generally sufficient evidence that a complainant has the requisite rights in a mark for purposes of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”) at section 1.7. Complainant has provided evidence that it owns trademark registrations for the MONSTERBUCK mark and its variant MONSTER BUCK in two words. While the registrations issued after the disputed domain name was registered, Complainant filed its applications well before the disputed domain name was registered and has claimed first use of the MONSTERBUCK mark since October 1, 2008, Registration No. 6,6,662,066. In addition, Complainant has provided some evidence of the MONSTERBUCK name and mark on the website at <monsterbuck.com> going back to 2006.

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. *Id.*

Here, the disputed domain fully incorporates the MONSTERBUCK mark. Although the addition of the common word “supply” may bear on the 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 MONSTERBUCK mark for purposes of the Policy [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

The Panel thus finds that 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 a 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 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 that 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.

Here, the disputed domain name is clearly based on Complainant's MONSTERBUCK mark given the use of the disputed domain name for a website purportedly selling products competing with those of Complainant. Notably, Respondent's website provides no information concerning Respondent and features an antler logo with the MONSTERBUCK mark that arguably plays on the logo used by Complainant on its website at <monsterbuck.com>. In all, because Respondent's website looks to have been set up to appear as a website connected to Complainant, such underscores that Respondent has used the disputed domain name and associated website to conjure up Complainant and its products and to mislead consumers into believing there is a connection between the website and Complainant when none exists. Such use of the disputed domain name for the profit of Respondent is not a legitimate interest. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) at section 2.5.3.

The Panel thus 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.

There are several factors here that establish that Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name has been done in bad faith, the disputed domain name incorporates Complainant's exact MONSTERBUCK mark with the term "supply" and was likely registered with the goal of attracting and redirecting consumers to Respondent's website that is likely to be viewed as linked to Complainant to purportedly sell competing products. Such an attempt to ride on the coattails of Complainant for the profit of Respondent is in itself opportunistic and in bad faith.

Additionally, the fact that Respondent has failed to appear in this matter to contest Complainant's contentions and has simply communicated that it wants to release the disputed domain name, further supports a finding that Respondent was likely aware of Complainant and registered and used the disputed domain name based on the MONSTERBUCK mark to sell products that directly compete with those of Complainant.

The Panel thus 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 <monsterbucksupply.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Georges Nahitchevansky/

Georges Nahitchevansky

Sole Panelist

Date: May 5, 2026