

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Rightlane, LLC v. Sightone Game
Case No. D2026-1539

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Rightlane, LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Cole Schotz P.C., United States.

The Respondent is Sightone Game, Singapore.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ironhillbrewery.com> is registered with WillametteNames.com LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on April 10, 2026. On April 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 13, 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 (Perfect Privacy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 17, 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 amended Complaint on April 22, 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 April 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 13, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 15, 2026.

The Center appointed Jane Seager as the sole panelist in this matter on May 26, 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 is a limited liability company incorporated under the laws of the State of Delaware, United States. The Complainant acquired a significant portion of the assets, including intellectual property and trademarks, of Iron Hill Brewery LLC, a restaurant chain established in 1996 that subsequently expanded to 22 locations in the mid-Atlantic region of the United States. This acquisition occurred following Iron Hill Brewery LLC's bankruptcy in late-2025, as reflected in a bankruptcy court order and an intellectual property assignment.

The Complaint is based on several registered trademarks, including United States Trademark Registration No. 5345162, IRON HILL BREWERY, registered on November 28, 2017, assigned to the Complainant.

Iron Hill Brewery LLC was the former registrant of the disputed domain name, hosting Iron Hill Brewery's official website. After the acquisition of Iron Hill Brewery LLC's assets by the Complainant, further to the bankruptcy of Iron Hill Brewery LLC, the disputed domain name was inadvertently allowed to lapse. The disputed domain name was subsequently registered by the Respondent on March 7, 2026.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website (the "Respondent's website") that reproduces the contents of the original Iron Hill Brewery website, including by displaying the IRON HILL BREWERY trademark, copyrighted imagery, text, and videos. The Respondent's website now also includes banners and links redirecting Internet users to third-party websites including gambling or pornographic websites.

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.

The Complainant asserts rights in the trademark IRON HILL BREWERY. The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is identical to its trademark.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. There is no evidence of the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor has the Respondent been commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not making any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, and its use serves as a confusing dead-end for potential visitors seeking information about the Complainant.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant alleges that after acquiring the disputed domain name, the Respondent unlawfully copied images, videos, and logos from the former Iron Hill Brewery website and displayed the Complainant's trademarks without authorization. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name in connection with a website that displays banners and deceptive links redirecting users to gambling and pornographic websites amounts to bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

In order to prevail, the Complainant must demonstrate that it has satisfied the requirements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy:

- (i) The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) The 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

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 the trademark IRON HILL BREWERY for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1. The Panel notes in this regard that rights in the trademarks owned by Iron Hill Brewery LLC, including the trademark IRON HILL BREWERY upon which the Complaint is based, were assigned to the Complainant further to an assignment agreement dated January 15, 2026.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. The Panel finds that 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 not rebutted the 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.

There is no evidence of there being any connection between the Parties. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use its trademark in any way.

As noted above, the disputed domain name resolves to a website that reproduces the contents of the former Iron Hill Brewery website, incorporating the Complainant's trademarks, images, text, and videos, and adding banners and links redirecting users to gambling and pornographic websites from which the Panel infers that the Respondent likely obtains click-through revenue. The Panel finds that such use trades on the

Complainant's trademark and reputation for commercial gain. The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name also risks diverting Internet users seeking information about the Complainant's restaurants online to third-party websites. The Panel finds that the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services pursuant to paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy.

The Respondent is identified as "Sightone Game", whose name bears no resemblance to the disputed domain name. There is no evidence of the Respondent having acquired any rights in the name "Iron Hill Brewery". The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to reproduce substantial parts of the official former Iron Hill Brewery website does not give rise to any legitimate claim of being commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Panel finds that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

Nor is the Respondent making any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name as contemplated by paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy. Indeed, panels have categorically held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, including passing off or copycat sites, can never confer rights or legitimate interests in a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and that 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.

The disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's IRON HILL BREWERY trademark. Moreover, the disputed domain name itself was owned by the Complainant's predecessor in interest, Iron Hill Brewery LLC. Noting the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name, as described above, the Panel infers that the Respondent was aware of the IRON HILL BREWERY trademark when registering the disputed domain name. The Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name opportunistically, after it had been allowed to lapse during the course of bankruptcy proceedings, with a view to trading on the goodwill and reputation associated with the IRON HILL BREWERY trademark, in bad faith.

The Panel further finds that by using the disputed domain name, as described above, the Respondent has sought to mislead Internet users seeking information about the Iron Hill Brewery restaurants online. The Panel infers that the Respondent likely obtains click-through revenue from the banner advertising now featured on the Respondent's website. The Panel therefore finds that by using the disputed domain name the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the IRON HILL BREWERY trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website, in bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The Panel further finds that the redirection of Internet users to websites displaying gambling-related or pornographic content has the effect of tarnishing the Complainant's trademark, further supporting a finding of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.12.

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 <ironhillbrewery.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Jane Seager/

Jane Seager

Sole Panelist

Date: June 1, 2026