

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Planet Paws Media, LLC v. Damien Lafrance, SeleneNAD
Case No. D2026-1657

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Planet Paws Media, LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Reinhart Boerner Van Deuren s.c., United States.

The Respondent is Damien Lafrance, SeleneNAD, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <foreverdoglab.com> is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 17, 2026. On April 20, 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 (“Unknown”) 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 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 May 1, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 21, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. The Center commenced the panel appointment process on May 29, 2026.

The Center appointed William F. Hamilton as the sole panelist in this matter on June 5, 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 United States company active in the field of canine health and wellness. Its owner, Dr. Karen Shaw Becker, co-authored “The Forever Dog”, a #1 New York Times bestseller on canine health and nutrition, together with a follow-up title, “The Forever Dog Life”. The Complainant has operated a website at “www.foreverdog.com” since 2021, on which it provides canine health and wellness information and content under the name FOREVER DOG (hereinafter referred to as the “Mark”).

The Complainant does not hold a trademark registration for the Mark. It relies on unregistered rights, claiming continuous use of FOREVER DOG as a trademark and trade name since at least 2021 (Annex 4 and Annex 5 to the Complaint).

The disputed domain name was registered on January 17, 2026 (Annex 1 to the Complaint). It resolves to an active commercial website that prominently displays “Forever Dog” as a brand name and operates as an online store. The website offers a dietary supplement for dogs marketed as a “NAD+ Formula for Dog” and “Forever Dog NMN & NAD+ Drops”, shown in a dropper bottle bearing the “Forever Dog” name, alongside customer reviews, promotional discounts, and pages for customer contact and order tracking. The website also displayed the Complainant’s support email address, “[...]@foreverdog.com” (Annex 8 to the Complaint).

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it holds unregistered trademark rights in FOREVER DOG arising from its continuous use of the Mark since 2021 in connection with canine health and wellness, including its two books and its website at “www.foreverdog.com.”

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Mark because it incorporates the Mark in full and adds only the term “lab”, which does not distinguish the disputed domain name from the Mark.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. It states that it has not authorized the Respondent to use the Mark, that the Respondent is not commonly known by the Mark, and that the Respondent’s use is neither a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use, the Respondent instead using the disputed domain name to sell a dog wellness product under the Mark in a field related to that of the Complainant.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. It states that the disputed domain name was registered in January 2026, years after the Complainant’s rights in the Mark arose, and that the Respondent uses the disputed domain name to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Mark and passing itself off as, or creating a false association with, the Complainant. The Complainant also asserts that the Respondent’s website displayed the Complainant’s own support email address and that a consumer who purchased from the website, believing it to be the Complainant’s, contacted the Complainant (Annex 7 and Annex 8 to the Complaint).

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires the Complainant to prove each of the following three elements:

- (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.

The Respondent's default does not by itself entitle the Complainant to a decision in its favor. The Complainant must establish each element, and the Panel may draw such inferences from the Respondent's default as it considers appropriate under paragraph 14(b) of the Rules.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant does not rely on a registered trademark. A complainant may nonetheless establish unregistered or common law rights for purposes of the UDRP by showing that the mark has become a distinctive identifier that consumers associate with the complainant's goods or services. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.3. Relevant considerations include the duration and nature of use, the degree of public recognition, and the extent of media references to the mark.

The Mark is suggestive of the field in which it is used, so the Complainant must show that it has acquired distinctiveness. The Panel finds that it has. The Complainant has used FOREVER DOG continuously since 2021 in connection with canine health and wellness, including through its website at "www.foreverdog.com" and through the book "The Forever Dog", a #1 New York Times bestseller, and its follow-up, "The Forever Dog Life". The public recognition reflected in that bestseller status, together with the continuous branded use, is sufficient to establish for the purposes of the UDRP that consumers associate FOREVER DOG with the Complainant.

The Complainant's owner, Dr. Karen Shaw Becker, co-authored the above-referenced books, and the Complainant operates the FOREVER DOG website and conducts the branded activity. A complainant may rely on rights that it holds or controls through such an arrangement. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.4.1.

The disputed domain name incorporates the unregistered Mark in its entirety and adds the term "lab". Where a mark is recognizable within a disputed domain name, the addition of other terms, here the term "lab" which is presumably an abbreviation for "laboratory", does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8. The unregistered Mark remains clearly recognizable in the disputed domain name. The top-level domain ("TLD") ".com" is disregarded as a standard requirement of registration. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the unregistered Mark.

The first element of the Policy is satisfied.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy sets out circumstances that may demonstrate a respondent's rights or legitimate interests. Once a complainant makes a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production shifts to the respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use the Mark. Nothing in the record indicates that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name; the Registrar identified the registrant as Damien Lafrance of SeleneNAD. Nor is the Respondent's use a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. The Respondent uses the disputed domain name for a commercial website that displays "Forever Dog" as a brand and sells a dog wellness product under that name, in a manner that suggests an association with the Complainant. Such use does not give rise to rights or legitimate interests. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

The Complainant has made a prima facie case, which the Respondent has not rebutted. The Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The second element of the Policy is satisfied.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The disputed domain name was registered on January 17, 2026, years after the Complainant began using the unregistered Mark. The website at the disputed domain name displays "Forever Dog" prominently as a brand and offers a dietary supplement for dogs, a product within the Complainant's field of canine health and wellness. The adoption of the Mark in both the disputed domain name and the website branding, for a product of this kind, leads the Panel to find that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant and the Mark and with the intention of targeting them. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2.

By using the disputed domain name for a "Forever Dog" branded storefront, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and the product offered on it. This falls within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The use of a domain name to impersonate the Complainant, or to falsely suggest an affiliation with the Complainant, is itself evidence of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

Two further features of the record reinforce this conclusion. The website at the disputed domain name displayed the Complainant's support email address, "[...]@foreverdog.com", in a footer that otherwise carried the Respondent's own Sheridan, Wyoming contact details. The record includes an email communication in which a consumer who had purchased the Respondent's product, believing it originated from the Complainant, contacted the Complainant. This is direct evidence of the actual confusion that the Respondent's conduct was likely to cause.

The Respondent has offered no explanation for its conduct. On the evidence presented, the Panel finds that the Respondent sought to capitalize on the Complainant's Mark and its popular books by registering the disputed domain name and using it to sell a dog health product to confused consumers, and therefore concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The third element of the Policy is satisfied.

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 <foreverdoglab.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/William F. Hamilton/

William F. Hamilton

Sole Panelist

Date: June 18, 2026