

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios Inc. v. Le Anh
Case No. D2026-1806

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Le Anh, Viet Nam.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <pinkpanthershop.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 28, 2026. On April 28, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 29, 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 (Namecheap, Inc. / Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 4, 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 May 6, 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 22, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 11, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 12, 2026.

The Center appointed Gareth Dickson as the sole panelist in this matter on June 22, 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 Delaware, United States corporation responsible for producing and/or distributing numerous motion pictures under the “Pink Panther” franchise, including *The Pink Panther* (1963), *A Shot in the Dark* (1964), *Inspector Clouseau* (1968), *The Return of the Pink Panther* (1975), *The Pink Panther Strikes Again* (1976), *Revenge of the Pink Panther* (1978), *Trail of the Pink Panther* (1982), *Curse of the Pink Panther* (1983), *Son of the Pink Panther* (1993), *The Pink Panther* (2006), and *The Pink Panther 2* (2009), together with associated animated television series, shorts, and merchandise (the “Pink Panther Franchise”). The Complainant also owns the copyrights in the Pink Panther character.

The Complainant owns numerous trade mark registrations for or comprising PINK PANTHER (the “Mark”). These include:

- Canadian trade mark registration no. TMA152832 for PANTHER & DESIGN (a design mark for the Panther character), registered on September 1, 1967, in classes 36 and 41;
- United States trade mark registration no. 1122758 for THE PINK PANTHER, registered on July 24, 1979, in classes 16, 25, and 28; and
- Australian trade mark registration no. 392228 for PINK PANTHER, registered on March 22, 1989, in class 41.

The disputed domain name, registered under the “.com” generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”), was registered on January 25, 2026. It resolves to a website titled “PINK PANTHER SHOP – OFFICIAL PINK PANTHER MERCH,” which describes itself as “the Official Merchandise Store for Pink Panther fans” and offers for sale merchandise, including apparel, mugs, phone cases, tote bags and home décor bearing the Mark and depicting the Pink Panther character in a pink colour scheme. The website lists a United States warehouse address and a contact email address at the disputed domain name. There is no indication in the record that the use of the disputed domain name has changed since registration.

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: (i) the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Mark which, in addition to being protected by the registrations listed above, the Complainant states has been in use since at least as early as 1964, because it wholly incorporates the Mark together with the descriptive term “shop” and the “.com” gTLD; (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because the Respondent is not authorised to use the Mark, is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and is using the disputed domain name to operate a website that falsely purports to be the Complainant’s official merchandise store while offering counterfeit goods; and (iii) the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith by intentionally attempting to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and the products offered there.

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 trade mark 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 trade mark or service 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. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Mark for the purposes of the Policy, disregarding the ".com" gTLD, which is a standard registration requirement. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.11.

Although the addition of other terms (here, "shop") 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 recognised 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, the claimed sale of counterfeit goods under multiple misrepresentations that they are "official" products) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel finds 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name decades after the Complainant's rights in the Mark arose, and is using it to operate a website that copies the Mark, the Pink Panther character, and the Complainant's associated pink colour scheme, while falsely describing itself as the Complainant's official merchandise store. The Panel finds that, by this conduct, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and the products offered on it, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, the claimed sale of counterfeit goods alongside false claims that the products are in fact "official") constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 <pinkpanthershop.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Gareth Dickson/

Gareth Dickson

Sole Panelist

Date: July 14, 2026