

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Ghost Management Group, LLC v. Taylor Niklaas, Airbnb Capetown
Case No. D2026-1540

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 Taylor Niklaas, Airbnb Capetown, South Africa.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <weedmapslogistics.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 11, 2026, electing a three-member panel. 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 14, 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 (“Redacted, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf”) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 14, 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 amendments to the Complaint on April 14, 2026, and April 17, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendments 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 21, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 11, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 18, 2026.

The Center appointed Jeremy Speres, Kimberley Chen Nobles, and Wilson Pinheiro Jabur, as panelists in this matter on June 2, 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 platform for cannabis-related products, consumers and businesses. In the Complainant's official website, available at <weedmaps.com>, the Complainant describes itself as "a community connecting cannabis consumers, patients, retailers, doctors, and brands since 2008."

The <weedmaps.com> domain name was registered on July 21, 2008, and the Complainant is the owner, amongst others, of the following trademark registrations (Annexes 5-12 to the Complaint):

- United States trademark registration No. 4,321,512 for the word mark WEEDMAPS, filed on May 5, 2011, and registered on April 16, 2013, subsequently renewed, in classes 35 and 38;
- United States trademark registration No. 4,321,513 for the word mark WEEDMAPS, filed on May 5, 2011, and registered on April 16, 2013, subsequently renewed, in class 42; and
- United States trademark registration No. 4,943,997 for the word and device mark WEEDMAPS, filed on November 7, 2014, and registered on April 26, 2016, in classes 9, 35, 38, and 42.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 19, 2026, and presently resolves to an active webpage impersonating the Complainant. A customer of the Complainant received a fraudulent email message impersonating the Complainant from an email address using the disputed domain name on March 24, 2026 (Annex 13 to the Complaint).

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 identically incorporates the Complainant's WEEDMAPS trademark and is indisputably confusingly similar therewith.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name given that the Respondent has not been commonly known by the disputed domain name and is not making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further asserts that the registration of the disputed domain name was done clearly in bad faith given the full knowledge of the Respondent in the Complainant's trademark, clearly depicted on the website available at the disputed domain name, as well as in the email message impersonating the Complainant to one of the Complainant's customers and attempting to induce payments for non-existent fees (Annex 13 to the Complaint) thus creating a likelihood of confusion and disrupting the Complainant's business.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy sets forth the following three requirements, which have to be met for this Panel to order the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant:

- (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 has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Section 4.3 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)") states that a respondent's default (i.e., failure to submit a formal response) would not by itself mean that the complainant is deemed to have prevailed; a respondent's default is not necessarily an admission that the complainant's claims are true.

The Complainant must prove in this administrative proceeding that each of the aforesaid three elements is present in order to obtain the transfer of the disputed domain name.

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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable and indeed incorporated in its entirety within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7. Although the addition of another term ("logistics") 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 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 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.

Under the Policy, paragraph 4(a)(ii), the Complainant has the burden of establishing that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. According to the evidence submitted, the Complainant has made a prima facie case against the Respondent that it has not been commonly known by the disputed domain name and that the Respondent has not been authorized to register or use the disputed domain name.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, such as phishing/identity theft, copycat sites, passing off, or other types of fraud, as in this case, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

Also, according to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the use made of the disputed domain name in connection with a fraudulent email message sent to the Complainant's customer cannot be considered a legitimate or fair use of the disputed domain name. Furthermore, the Panel finds the nature of the disputed domain name carries a high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant and supports a finding that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

Under these circumstances and absent evidence to the contrary, the Panel finds that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, the Complainant must show that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Policy indicates in paragraph 4(b)(iv) that bad faith registration and use can be found in respect of a disputed domain name, where a respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the respondent's website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with a complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website or location or of a product or service on the website or location.

In this case, both the registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith can be found pursuant to the Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv) in view of the reproduction of the Complainant's trademark and logo on the webpage available at the disputed domain name as well as the impersonation attempt described above seeking to induce the Complainant's customers to pay for non-existent fees, which create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement thereof.

In the present case, the Panel further notes another factor that may corroborate a finding of the Respondent's bad faith: the privacy protection service was used most likely to conceal the Respondent's true identity when registering the disputed domain name, in light of the clear evidence of targeting of the Complainant, discussed above.

For the reasons above, the Respondent's conduct has to be considered, in this Panel's view, as bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name and the Complainant succeeds under the third element of paragraph 4(a) 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 <weedmapslogistics.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Wilson Pinheiro Jabur/

Wilson Pinheiro Jabur

Presiding Panelist

/Jeremy Speres/

Jeremy Speres

Panelist

/Kimberley Chen Nobles /

Kimberley Chen Nobles

Panelist

Date: June 9, 2026