

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Chris Robles, Trippy Tacos LLC v. Rajat Gupta  
Case No. D2026-1634

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Chris Robles, Trippy Tacos LLC, United States of America (“United States”), internally represented.

The Respondent is Rajat Gupta, India.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <trippytacos.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 16, 2026. On April 17, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 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 (Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 21, 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 27, 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 28, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 18, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 22, 2026.

The Center appointed Deanna Wong Wai Man as the sole panelist in this matter on June 3, 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 Trippy Tacos LLC, a company located in Maryland, United States and is self-represented in this proceeding. The Complainant operates a restaurant, catering, and food truck business under the name TRIPPY TACOS. The Complainant claims that it has used the TRIPPY TACOS mark in commerce since at least 2019 in connection with restaurant, catering, and food truck services. In support of this assertion, the Complainant has provided evidence including customer reviews dating from 2019 and 2020, a catering invoice issued under the TRIPPY TACOS name in 2021, social media promotions from 2023, and materials relating to a Google Business profile associated with the Complainant's business.

The Complainant is the owner of United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO") Registration No. 8,036,425 for the mark TRIPPY TACOS, registered on November 25, 2025. The trademark application was filed on March 5, 2024, with a first use date of July 8, 2019. The abovementioned registration includes a disclaimer for the term "tacos". The Complainant further submits that, through its use of the TRIPPY TACOS mark in commerce since at least 2019, it has acquired unregistered or common law trademark rights in the mark.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 7, 2023. The registration of the disputed domain name therefore predates the registration of the Complainant's above-mentioned trademark registration, but not the claimed first use in commerce. The evidence provided shows that the disputed domain name has resolved to a domain name sales landing page on the GoDaddy/Afternic marketplace where it is offered for sale to the public for USD 8,995.

The disputed domain name was initially registered through a privacy service and, following registrar verification, the underlying registrant was identified.

#### **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, with respect to the first element of the Policy, that the disputed domain name is identical to its TRIPPY TACOS trademark. The Complainant relies on its registered trademark for the mark TRIPPY TACOS, registered on November 25, 2025. The Complainant further contends that it has established common law trademark rights in the TRIPPY TACOS mark through continuous use of the mark in connection with its restaurant, food truck, and catering business since at least 2019.

With respect to the second element of the Policy, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant submits that it has never authorized the Respondent to use its TRIPPY TACOS mark and that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Complainant further submits that the disputed domain name is not currently and has not been used in the past in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or for any legitimate noncommercial purpose, but has instead been configured solely for sale to the public for USD 8,995 through the Afternic/GoDaddy domain name marketplace.

With respect to the third element of the Policy, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is identical to its TRIPPY TACOS mark and was registered at a time when the Complainant had already been operating its business under that name for several years. The Complainant further submits that the disputed domain name has only been offered for sale for USD 8,995, a sum significantly exceeding the Respondent's out-of-pocket registration costs. The Complainant also relies on the Respondent's renewal of the disputed domain name registration after the Complainant's trademark was officially registered with the USPTO, as well as the Respondent's use of a privacy service, the absence of any active use or plausible legitimate use of the disputed domain name, and the Respondent's failure to respond to the Complainant's pre-Complaint communications.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **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 registered trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy, as listed in paragraph 4 above. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. 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**

In light of the Panel's findings under the third element of the Policy, the Panel does not consider it necessary to address the second element under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

Under the third element of the Policy, the Complainant must establish that the disputed domain name was both registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name was registered on December 7, 2023, whereas the Complainant's trademark registration for TRIPPY TACOS was registered on November 25, 2025. Accordingly, the Complainant is constrained in the manner in which it can rely on this registered trademark to establish bad faith registration and must therefore demonstrate that it possessed relevant and sufficient trademark rights prior to the registration of the disputed domain name and that the Respondent targeted those rights on the date of registration of the disputed domain name.

The Panel notes that the Complainant claims unregistered or common law rights in the mark TRIPPY TACOS arising from use in commerce allegedly since at least 2019. In support of this claim, the Complainant has submitted the following evidence: four Google reviews dating from 2019–2020, a catering invoice for a USD 2,000 for a private catering event issued in 2021, three Facebook posts from 2023, and a Google Business profile relating to its restaurant and catering business. The Panel also notes as mentioned

above that the Complainant's registered trademark with the USPTO has a first use date of July 8, 2019. On this basis, the Panel finds that the Complainant has unregistered trademark rights for purposes of the Policy, and these rights predate the registration of the disputed domain name.

While the Panel accepts that this evidence supports the Complainant's assertion that it has operated a business under the name TRIPPY TACOS prior to the registration of the disputed domain name, the Panel is not persuaded that this evidence is sufficient to establish that the claimed mark had acquired the required level of distinctiveness or secondary meaning on the date of registration of the disputed domain name. In this regard, the Panel refers to section 1.3 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), which states that a complainant asserting unregistered trademark rights must show that the mark has become a distinctive identifier associated with the complainant or its goods or services and that "specific evidence including for example documented evidence of figures relating to sales, marketing, and/or social media endorsements supporting assertions of acquired distinctiveness should be included in the complaint, conclusory allegations of unregistered or common law rights, even if undisputed in the particular UDRP case, would not normally suffice to show secondary meaning". The Panel finds that the evidence submitted in the present case is limited and primarily shows operation of a local business under the name TRIPPY TACOS, showing some degree of local recognition, but falling short of establishing that the alleged unregistered mark had acquired distinctiveness or secondary meaning by the time the disputed domain name was registered. Additionally, the Panel refers to section 1.3 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) which states that in cases involving claimed unregistered marks that are comprised solely of descriptive terms, panels require the complainant to present relevant and sufficient examples of evidence of acquired distinctiveness/secondary meaning. In this case, the Panel notes that the Complainant's trademark consists of two common English words and that the registration record for the Complainant's trademark includes a disclaimer of the term "TACOS", which confirms the descriptive nature of that term. On this basis, the Panel finds that the limited evidence submitted by the Complainant is insufficient to conclude that the term TRIPPY TACOS had become uniquely associated with the Complainant by December 2023.

Furthermore, the Panel does not find sufficient evidence that the Respondent targeted the Complainant specifically. The Respondent is located in India and the record contains no evidence linking the Respondent to the Complainant's business (which the record shows has some degree of local recognition), nor any evidence that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant at the time of registration. There is also no evidence of impersonation, phishing, competing services, nor other conduct specifically targeting the Complainant. The Panel further notes that the term TRIPPY TACOS was likely not uniquely associated with the Complainant at the relevant time. Based on limited factual research into publicly available information (section 4.8 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#)), the Panel notes the existence of various third-party uses of the same or a very similar name, including: a pre-existing restaurant (dating back to 2001) operating under the name "Trippy Taco" in Melbourne, Australia with a strong online presence; a restaurant business operating under the identical name "Trippy Tacos" in Austin, Texas, United States; as well as other third party uses of the term in connection with other products and services. While such third-party uses are not determinative, they indicate that the term was not uniquely associated with the Complainant at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. Additionally, while the Complainant argues that the Respondent's renewal of the disputed domain name in 2025 supports a finding of bad faith registration, panels have previously held that the mere renewal of a domain name registration by the same registrant is insufficient to support a finding of registration in bad faith, and there is no evidence in the record that indicates the registrant has changed since the 2023 registration. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.9. In these circumstances, and absent concrete evidence linking the Respondent to the Complainant or otherwise demonstrating awareness of the Complainant, the Panel cannot conclude, on the balance of probabilities, that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name because of the Complainant or its claimed trademark rights.

In conclusion, the Panel finds that the Respondent did not register the disputed domain name in bad faith targeting of the Complainant or its trademark rights.

The Panel finds the third element of the Policy has not been established.

## 7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

*/Deanna Wong Wai Man/*

**Deanna Wong Wai Man**

Sole Panelist

Date: June 17, 2026