

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

That Mom With A Laser, Inc v. Shay Petrone
Case No. D2026-1207

1. The Parties

Complainant is That Mom With A Laser, Inc, United States of America (“United States”), represented by The GigaLaw Firm, Douglas M. Isenberg, Attorney at Law, LLC, United States.

Respondent is Shay Petrone, United States, self-represented.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The Disputed Domain Names <thatmomwithalaser.com> and <tmwal.com> are registered with Squarespace Domains II LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) initially only in regard to the <thatmomwithalaser.com> domain name on March 20, 2026. On March 20, 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 <thatmomwithalaser.com> Disputed Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on March 23, 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 March 28, 2026, requesting the addition of the <tmwal.com> domain name to the dispute. On March 20, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the added domain name. On April 7, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming the registrant and contact information for the added domain name.

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 April 8, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 28, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on April 28, 2026.

The Center appointed Richard W. Page as the sole panelist in this matter on April 30, 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. On April 30, 2026, Complainant submitted a reply to the Response. On May 9, 2026, Respondent sent an email communication to the Center requesting to be granted an opportunity to reply to Complainant's submission. The Panel allowed Respondent to submit a reply by May 20, 2026, and the Respondent filed its submission on May 19, 2026. In this regard, although the Panel has reviewed both Complainant's supplemental filing and Respondent's reply, it does not find the matters contained therein to impact the decision in this matter.

4. Factual Background

Complaint was founded as a sole proprietorship in September 2019 by Emilia Banke and was incorporated under the laws of the State of Florida on July 20, 2020.

Complainant operates its official website known as "That Mom With a Laser" (also known by its acronym "TMWAL") at the domain name <thatmomwithalaser.co> which was created on January 8, 2021. Complainant is also the registrant of the domain name <thatmomwithalaser.com> which was created on July 20, 2020, and which Complainant redirects to its official, primary website at "www.thatmomwithalaser.co".

On its official website, Complainant offers an ecommerce shop with an extensive collection of laser files and video tutorials, multiple laser tutorials, numerous resources, and a laser file club.

Complainant is the owner of the trademark registration United States Registration No. 6,642,997 for THAT MOM WITH A LASER Mark, with a first use in commerce claim as of November 29, 2019, and registered on February 15, 2022 for use in connection with, among others, "providing education courses in the field of the use of laser and non-laser engraving". Complainant also claims common law trademark rights in the acronym "TMWAL" which Complainant claims to have used since approximately 2019 in connection with the same services.¹ The THAT MOM WITH A LASER Mark and the TMWAL Mark shall be collectively referred to as the "Marks".

The Disputed Domain Name <thatmomwithalaser.com> was registered on September 7, 2020, and redirects to the YouTube account "@ThatMomWithALaserAndCat" featuring videos of a cat chasing a laser .

The Disputed Domain Name <tmwal.com> was registered on September 7, 2020, and redirects to a YouTube video for a song by the artist Ludacris.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that Ms. Banke, the creative mind behind Complainant, is a trailblazer in the laser engraving industry, celebrated for building a successful business that blends creativity and entrepreneurship. When she is not designing and creating high-quality products, she is teaching others how to use equipment such as lasers, grow their businesses, and achieve success on their own terms. A natural educator and social media enthusiast, she brings a fun and approachable energy to everything she does.

¹ The Panel notes that the evidence provided by the Complainant as to the use of the TMWAL mark dates back to as early as May 9, 2020.

Complainant further contends that, on behalf of Complainant and under the brand THAT MOM WITH A LASER, Ms. Banke has served as the Brand Ambassador and face of Aeon Laser USA, a company operating in the laser engraving equipment industry; has been a keynote speaker and featured educator at major industry events, including Next Level Maker events and the LightBurn software Conference; has been featured in industry publications and company blogs, including MakerFlor, PiBurn Rotary (LensDigital) and Laser Focused Magazine; and has developed and hosted proprietary educational programs and industry events, including Laser Maker Con and Laser Launch Academy.

Complainant further contends that it has a significant social media presence on Facebook, YouTube, Instagram, and TikTok.

Complainant further contends that the Disputed Domain Names are confusingly similar to the Marks because they contain the Marks in their entirety and that the elimination of spaces in the Disputed Domain Name <thatmomwithalaser.com> does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

Complainant submits that each of the Disputed Domain Names was created on September 7, 2020 – one year after Complainant was founded, almost 10 months after Complainant first used the THAT MOM WITH LASER Mark in commerce and almost two months after Complainant registered the domain name <thatmomwithalaser.com>.

Complainant further submits that previously Respondent used the Disputed Domain Name <thatmomwithalaser.com> to redirect to a website for Boss Laser, a direct competitor of Aeon Laser USA (for which Ms. Banke served as a Brand Ambassador). Complainant further submits that Respondent used the Disputed Domain Name <thatmomwithalaser.com> and the Disputed Domain Name <mtwal.com> to redirect to a YouTube music video for a song by the rapper Ludacris which includes the use of derogatory terms. Multiple people contacted Complainant about the Disputed Domain Names redirected to Boss Laser.

Complainant further submits that Respondent, also, offered to sell the Disputed Domain Name <thatmomwithalaser.com> to Complainant for USD 57,235 on January 8, 2021 – four months after Respondent had registered the Disputed Domain Names.

Complainant further submits that Respondent is a former member of Complainant's Facebook group who was removed from the group by Complainant in 2020.

Complainant further submits that it has never assigned, granted, licensed, sold, transferred or in any way authorized Respondent to register the Marks in any manner.

Complainant further submits that, by failing to currently use the Disputed Domain Names in connection with active websites, Respondent has not used the Disputed Domain Names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or for any other legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

Complainant further submits that by redirecting the Disputed Domain Names to Boss Laser which is a direct competitor of Aeon Laser USA (for which Banke has served as Brand Ambassador) and is an ecommerce website seeking economic gain from customers being redirected, Respondent falsely implied an association with Complainant.

Complainant further submits that Respondent has never been commonly known by either of the Disputed Domain Names and has never acquired any trademark or service mark right in the Disputed Domain Names.

Complainant further submits that Respondent redirecting the Disputed Domain Names to the YouTube video of a song by artist Ludacris, which includes the use of derogatory terms tarnishes Complainant.

Complainant alleges that Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Names to target Complainant's Mark and to demand payment for their transfer.

Complainant further alleges that Respondent had actual knowledge of Complainant's common law use of the THAT MOM WITH A LASER and TMWAL businesses, as prior member of the Facebook group.

Complainant further alleges that Respondent's subsequent passive holding of the Disputed Domain Names does not prevent a finding of bad faith.

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

B. Respondent

Respondent contends that he is a laser engraving enthusiast who has registered laser-related and personal domain name registrations since April 2019. Respondent further contends that the Disputed Domain Names are part of a consistent pattern of domain acquisition and entrepreneurial activity, without a concrete pre-formed commercial plan but with genuine intent for potential future personal or family use.

Respondent further contends that, at the time of the registration of the Disputed Domain Names, Complainant was an informal hobbyist community, without a standalone website, no registered trademark, and no commercial brand programs beyond a hobbyist Etsy store.

Respondent acknowledges that he had been invited to Complainant's Facebook community as one of many laser groups he joined, which at the time was an informal hobbyist forum discussing laser equipment from many brands. Respondent further contends that his awareness of an informal community using a descriptive phrase that was not yet protected as a trademark does not establish bad faith targeting under the Policy.

Respondent further contends that, during his period of ownership, Respondent has made limited informal personal use of the Disputed Domain Names, with redirects changing periodically. Respondent further contends that none of the redirects involved commercial activity, generated revenue, or formed part of any organized scheme to harm Complainant.

Respondent further contends that, in January 2021, Complainant – through Jonathan Banke, an officer of Complainant's organization – contacted Respondent twice on the same day seeking to purchase the Disputed Domain Names. Respondent had no intention of selling and provided a price reflecting that position. Respondent contends that Complainant returned 20 days later with a second inquiry which was again declined. Respondent followed up in May 2022, but received no response. No further contact occurred for approximately four years until this Complaint was filed in March 2026.

Respondent further contends that the Disputed Domain Names remain undeveloped due to documented life circumstances.

Respondent further contends that he has retained the Disputed Domain Names with continued intent for future personal use. Respondent further contends that Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Names as part of a genuine personal project consistent with his multi-year engagement in laser engraving. Respondent has been involved in the laser industry since 2018, owns a Boss Laser machine purchased in March 2019, has registered multiple laser-related domains since 2019, and his household has engaged in active laser crafting across multiple years.

Respondent further contends that he has made only noncommercial personal use of the Disputed Domain Names. They have not been used to offer competing goods or services, generate revenue, or mislead consumers for commercial gain. The Disputed Domain Names reflect Respondent's own independent laser interest, not Complainant's brand.

Respondent contends that Complainant is engaging in Reverse Domain Name Hijacking.

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.”

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that Complainant must prove each of the following three elements:

- i) that the Disputed Domain Names registered by Respondent are identical or confusingly similar to the Marks in which Complainant has rights;
- ii) that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Names; and
- iii) that the Disputed Domain Names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), section 1.2.1 states that registration of a trademark, here the THAT MOM WITH A LASER Mark, prima facie satisfies the threshold requirement of Complainant having trademark rights for purposes of standing to file a UDRP case.

Complainant has shown rights in respect of the THAT MOM WITH A LASER mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds Complainant has, also, established unregistered trademark or service mark rights in TMWAL Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.3.

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 Marks and the Disputed Domain Names. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The entirety of each of the Marks is reproduced in each of the Disputed Domain Names. Accordingly, each of the Disputed Domain Names is identical to each of the Marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The addition or deletion of other terms, here the deletion of spaces between the words in THAT MOM WITH A LASER does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Names and the Marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

The Panel clarifies, in light of Respondent’s contentions, that the relevant dates ascribed to Complainant’s rights in the Marks would not be relevant for the purposes of the first element of the Policy, but may be a factor in assessment of the second and third elements. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.1.3.

The Panel finds 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 Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Names:

- (i) before any notice to you [Respondent] of the dispute, your use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Disputed Domain Names or a name corresponding to the Disputed Domain Names 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 Names, 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 Names, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish Complainant's Marks.

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 Names 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 Names (although the burden of proof always remains on Complainant). [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Respondent has filed a Response asserting that he has legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Names as such would be as part of a "genuine personal project consistent with his multi-year engagement in laser engraving" and that the Disputed Domain Name <thatmomwithalaser.com> would be comprised of ordinary descriptive words with broad applicability and registered based on its general meaning.

Although the Panel notes that Respondent has provided evidence of being engaged with laser engraving activities, the Panel finds, based on the available record, that Respondent's registration of the Disputed Domain Names would be more indicative of an attempt to trade off the Complainant's Marks, rather than as an alleged "personal project", unrelated to Complainant's Marks. Section 2.10.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

The evidence provided demonstrates that Complainant's Marks were already in use in 2019 and early 2020, and Respondent acknowledges that he had been invited to join and joined Complainant's Facebook community as of May 2020. The Disputed Domain Names are each identical to Complainant's Marks, and although the Panel takes note of Respondent's claim that it was unable to develop the Disputed Domain Names due to a series of personal events, the overall circumstances of the case indicate to the Panel that Respondent's aim with the Disputed Domain Names was not to develop an independent laser-related project, but to target Complainant. As such, no rights or legitimate interests may be found on behalf of Respondent.

The Panel finds that Respondent did not make any bona fide sales of goods or services under the Disputed Domain Names. The Panel further finds that Respondent made no legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Names and that redirecting the Disputed Domain Name <thatmomwithalaser.com> to a competitor of Complainant's business partner, and later redirecting both Disputed Domain Names to an YouTube channel and a video for a song unrelated to lasers and containing derogatory lyrics, interpreted as a dig at Complainant, cannot establish rights or legitimate interests.

The Panel further finds that there is no evidence in this record that Respondent is commonly known by the Disputed Domain Names.

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 a domain name in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets forth four nonexclusive criteria for Complainant to show bad faith registration and use of domain names:

(i) circumstances indicating that you [Respondent] have registered or you have acquired the Disputed Domain Names primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the Disputed Domain Names registration to Complainant who is the owner of the Marks or to a competitor of Complainant, for

valuable consideration in excess of your documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the Disputed Domain Names; or

(ii) you [Respondent] have registered the Disputed Domain Names in order to prevent the owner of the Marks from reflecting the Marks 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 Names primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the Disputed Domain Names, 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 Complainant's Marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your website or location or of a product on your website or location.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that the Disputed Domain Names were registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether Respondent's registration and use of the Disputed Domain Names is in bad faith.

[WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes that Respondent had actual knowledge that Complainant was conducting business as THAT MOM WITH A LASER and under TMWAL when he registered the Disputed Domain Names. Respondent used the Disputed Domain Name <thatmomwithalaser.com> to redirect to a competitor of Complainant's business partner, and later redirected the Disputed Domain Names to a YouTube channel, without further explanation as to such redirection, and a video for a song unrelated to lasers and containing derogatory lyrics. Respondent later indicated it was willing to sell the Disputed Domain Names to Complainant for an amount likely in excess of his documented out-of-pocket costs. The Panel finds that in the circumstances of this case support a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the 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 Names <thatmomwithalaser.com> and <tmwal.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

All other claims including Reverse Domain Name Hijacking are denied.

/Richard W. Page/

Richard W. Page

Sole Panelist

Date: May 25, 2026