

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Ghost Management Group, LLC v. Zhirayr Gumruyan
Case No. D2026-1297

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Ghost Management Group, LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Friedland Cianfrani LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Zhirayr Gumruyan, United States, self-represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <weedmaps.club> 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 25, 2026. On March 26, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 26, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name(s) which differed from the named Respondent (Domains by Proxy, LLC.) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 1, 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 amendment to the Complaint on April 7, 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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on April 10, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 30, 2026. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on April 2, 2026, and the Response was filed with the Center on April 11, 2026.

The Center appointed W. Scott Blackmer, Steven Auvil, and The Hon Neil Brown K.C. as panelists in this matter on June 8, 2026. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. Each member of 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 limited liability company organized under the laws of the State of Delaware, United States and headquartered in Irvine, California, United States. It uses the mark WEEDMAPS in connection with the business that it conducts, as well as in connection with its website at “www.weedmaps.com” (the “Complainant’s website”), and it has done so for more than a decade. The Complainant describes itself on its website as “[a] community connecting cannabis consumers, patients, retailers, doctors, and brands since 2008”. The Complainant’s website publishes “curated” information about marijuana strains and other cannabis products and accessories, searchable by regions in the United States, and offers advertising solutions for retail and wholesale marketers. Businesses are encouraged to register on the site and advertise their “deals” and delivery options. The Panel notes that the Internet Archive’s Wayback Machine has archived screenshots of the Complainant’s website dating from October 2008 onward.¹

The Complainant holds relevant United States trademark registrations including the following (in addition to state and foreign trademark registrations listed in the Complaint):

Mark	Reg. Number	Reg. Date	International Class
WEEDMAPS (word)	4321512	April 16, 2013	35, 38
WEEDMAPS (word)	4321513	April 16, 2013	42
WEEDMAPS (word)	5044201	September 20, 2016	9

The disputed domain name was created on November 6, 2023, and is registered to the Respondent Zhirayr Gumruyan, listing a postal address in the State of California, United States and a Gmail contact email address.

The Respondent uses the disputed domain name to provide both information and commercial advertising related to cannabis products. The disputed domain name resolves to a website (the “Respondent’s website”) headed “The.Club” with the tagline, “The Cannabis Site with Actually Good Taste”. The main title reads, “Honest Cannabis Strain Reviews & City Guides The Club”. Beneath this, in very small print, is a disclaimer: “definitely not Weedmaps lol”. The home page describes the site as providing “Honest Cannabis Strain Reviews and City Guides” and promises “brutally honest” strain reviews, satirical city guides, and a quiz that tells marijuana consumers “what weed you actually deserve”. A text box advises that “This entire site is satire. If you want a cannabis platform that actually helps you find good weed, check out WeedVader.com. We just roast things here”. The “Drop Zone” page includes a link to “www.weedvader.com”, a site similar to the Complainant’s, and a button labelled “Try WeedVader.com” appears on many other pages of the Respondent’s website.

The Respondent’s website posts articles and anonymous tips and warns that it publishes “unverified” claims and commentary, “not journalism”. Site visitors can click on the name of a marijuana strain for reviews or on the name of a state or city in the United States to retrieve information about the local cannabis laws and markets.

¹ Noting the general powers of a panel articulated in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, it is commonly accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record, as the Panel has done in these proceedings. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), section 4.8.

The “Legal” notice on the Respondent’s website consists of three lines: “This is satire”, “We’re not Weedmaps”, and “21+ only”. The copyright notice is in the name of “Weedmaps.club – a parody. Not affiliated with Weedmaps”. The site operator is not otherwise identified on the website.

The “Weed Vader” website promoted and linked on the Respondent’s website is in fact a direct competitor of the Complainant, offering searchable information about cannabis products and brands, marijuana strains, dispensaries and other retailers, and relevant cannabis laws and regulations in states and cities of the United States.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

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

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical to its registered WEEDMAPS mark. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, as it has no permission from the Complainant to use its trademark, is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and is not using it to make a bona fide offering of goods or services or for legitimate non-commercial or fair use. Rather, the Complainant contends, the Respondent “is only using the domain name and its website to impersonate Complainant and defraud Complainant and its customers”.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent’s registration of a domain name identical to the Complainant’s mark, along with the Respondent’s publication of an imitative website, “epitomize” bad faith. The Complainant quotes a boastful remark on the home page of the Respondent’s website that it is “[t]he cannabis site Weedmaps wishes it was”. The Complainant notes that the favicon (the browser tab logo) for the Respondent’s website uses a similar color scheme (green on black) as the Complainant’s. The Complainant also observes that the Respondent’s website links to the “Weed Vader” website offering services similar to the Complainant’s, and that the Respondent has listed the disputed domain name for sale through the Registrar as of March 2026 for an extremely high price, USD 3 million. Accordingly, the Complainant refers to UDRP precedents finding bad faith in instances of attempting to create confusion with a mark to misdirect Internet users to another site for commercial gain, disrupt the business of a competitor, and in acquiring a domain name primarily for the purpose of selling it to a trademark holder for a price in excess of out-of-pocket costs.

B. Respondent

The Respondent (who is not represented by legal counsel) contends that the Complainant has not satisfied all three of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name. The Respondent contends that the disputed domain name is not confusingly similar to the Complainant’s mark “in practice”, because “weed” and “maps” are dictionary words, and combining them in a .club Top-Level Domain (“TLD”) “creates a distinct identity from Complainant’s .com platform”. The Respondent notes that the Respondent’s website is branded as “The.Club”, not as “Weedmaps”, to highlight the difference from the Complainant, so that “[n]o reasonable consumer would confuse the two”.

The Respondent claims a legitimate interest in using the disputed domain name for “satire and commentary”, “informational content” for cannabis users, and as a “digital advertising platform” open to all advertisers, “including Complainant”. According to the Respondent, “Respondent does not restrict Complainant from purchasing advertising on the platform. This demonstrates that Respondent is not targeting or competing with Complainant but operating an independent business”.

The Respondent denies any intent to impersonate the Complainant, pointing to independent branding as “The.Club” and disclaimers of affiliation with the Complainant. The Respondent asserts that the Registrar listed the disputed domain name for sale at the Registrar’s default price of USD 3 million, not at the Respondent’s request. The Respondent also argues that it is not a competitor of the Complainant and provides only information about cannabis products. Finally, the Respondent insists that it chose the disputed domain name for its descriptive rather than trademark value, as the terms composing the disputed domain name refer to cannabis and searchable locations, combined with the TLD .club to suggest a community-oriented platform.

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

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. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ([“WIPO Overview 3.1”](#)), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark (the registered WEEDMAPS word mark) for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name and the domain name includes nothing other than the trademark, apart from the necessary TLD which for present purposes is disregarded. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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 the 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 that 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 the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has no permission to use the Complainant’s registered trademark and is an individual known by a different name; by his own account, the Respondent has branded the Respondent’s website as “The.Club”, not “Weedmaps”. Thus, the Respondent cannot claim a legitimate interest in the disputed domain name as corresponding to a name by which the Respondent is “commonly known” (Policy, paragraph 4(c)(i)).

Instead, the Respondent claims a legitimate interest in using the disputed domain name to publish satire and information. This is already problematic for a disputed domain name that is identical to the Complainant's trademark, where there is a high risk of initial interest confusion and implied affiliation with the trademark holder (see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.6.2), despite the presence of disclaimers after an Internet user opens the associated website. But beyond that initial diversion of consumers seeking the Complainant, the Respondent in effect acknowledges that the Respondent's website is not wholly devoted to non-commercial satire and information, despite the disclaimers: that is because he seeks paid advertising from companies active in the cannabis industry and states in the Response that he would be pleased to accept advertising on an equal basis from the Complainant as well. The Respondent has also specifically stated on its website that "If you want a cannabis platform that actually helps you find good weed, check out WeedVader.com. We just roast things here". The only meaning that can be given to those words is that although its website "just" contains information, Internet users should go to Weed Vader if they actually want to buy cannabis online. In other words, this constitutes an advertisement for Weed Vader, which is a competitor of the Complainant.

Thus, the Respondent would not qualify as making "a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers" as described in the Policy, paragraph 4(c)(iii), as its offering is, at least in part, commercial. Moreover, the Respondent cannot claim that a commercial use that redirects site visitors to a competitor of the trademark holder (in this case, WeedVader) qualifies as "fair use". [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.3. Such use also would undermine any claim that the site facilitated the "bona fide" offering of goods or services required in the Policy, paragraph 4(c)(ii).)

The Panel finds on this record that the Complainant has established its prima facie case and the Respondent has failed to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case. Accordingly, 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, 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. These examples all require prior awareness of the Complainant and its mark, which in this case is clearly evident, given the many express references to the Complainant's trademark on the Respondent's website and the fact that both websites are associated with domain names composed of strings identical to the Complainant's distinctive and well-established mark, disregarding the TLD.

In addition to the Respondent's prior awareness of the Complainant and its mark, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name identical to the Complainant's registered trademark, a mark in use for more than 17 years, and employs it for a commercial site with similar informational content, expressly promoting a competing third-party commercial website, using a favicon with visual similarities, and explicitly compares the Complainant's website to the Respondent's website and the Weed Vader site. The Respondent's website includes several disclaimers of affiliation with the Complainant but in the process of denigrating the Complainant in comparison with others. This is not non-commercial or fair use commentary but rather trademark abuse, as the Respondent relies on initial interest confusion to suggest an association with the Complainant and attract both consumers and dealers in the cannabis market to a site that is not merely informational but involves the placement of relevant paid advertising on the Respondent's site and prominent promotion and links to one of the Complainant's direct competitors. Such conduct meets the examples of bad faith described in the Policy, paragraphs 4(b)(iv) (intentionally attracting Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark) and 4(b)(iii) (disrupting the business of a competitor).

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 name <weedmaps.club> be transferred to the Complainant.

/W. Scott Blackmer/

W. Scott Blackmer

Presiding Panelist

/Steven Auvil/

Steven Auvil

Panelist

/The Hon Neil Brown K.C./

The Hon Neil Brown K.C.

Panelist

Date: June 19, 2026