

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Manic Panic N.Y.C., Inc. v. Treena Crisp
Case No. D2026-2479

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Manic Panic N.Y.C., Inc., United States of America ("United States" or "U.S."), represented by Tarter Krinsky & Drogin LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Treena Crisp, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <manicpanicpdx.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 8, 2026. On June 9, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 10, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 11, 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 June 11, 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 June 16, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 6, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 8, 2026.

The Center appointed Phillip V. Marano as the sole panelist in this matter on July 14, 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 company with global operations that distributes, markets, and sells hair dye, as well as hair care and cosmetic products, and related goods and services. The Complainant offers information about its goods and services on its official <manicpanic.com> website. The Complainant owns valid and subsisting registrations for the MANIC PANIC trademark in the United States, including MANIC PANIC (U.S. Reg. No. 3,940,934), registered on April 5, 2011, with the earliest priority dating back to July 1, 1977.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on May 6, 2026. At the time of this Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to an AI-generated Registrar parking page titled “Manic Panic PDX”, which reads “Express Your Unique Style” and “Contact Us; Drop us a line!” with the ability to “Sign up for our email list for updates, promotions, and more”. Respondent’s website also ostensibly depicts a hair stylist in a salon.

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 asserts ownership of the MANIC PANIC trademark and has adduced evidence of trademark registration, dated back to 2011 with earliest priority dating back to 1977. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s MANIC PANIC trademark, according to the Complainant, because it contains the trademark in its entirety.

The Complainant further asserts that the Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name based on: the lack of any relationship with the Complainant; the lack of any license, permission, or authorization from the Complainant; the lack of any evidence the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or the Complainant’s MANIC PANIC trademark; the Respondent is engaged in illegal activity through its website, where the Respondent attempts to pass itself off as the Complainant.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith for numerous reasons, including: the global prominence of the Complainant’s MANIC PANIC trademark; the Respondent’s use of the eponymous mark MANIC PANIC in the disputed domain name; and the Respondent’s intent to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent’s website, where the Respondent attempts to pass itself off as the Complainant; and the Respondent’s use of the Complainant’s identical MANIC PANIC trademark in connection with offers to “Contact Us” in connection with goods or services, presumably related to hair care and cosmetics.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed in its Complaint, the Complainant must establish in accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy:

- the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights;
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Although the Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions, the burden remains with the Complainant to establish by a balance of probabilities, or a preponderance of the evidence, all three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.3 ("A respondent's default [...] 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 accurate [...] panels have been prepared to draw certain inferences in light of the particular facts and circumstances of the case e.g., where a particular conclusion is prima facie obvious, where an explanation by the respondent is called for but is not forthcoming, or where no other plausible conclusion is apparent."); *The Vanguard Group, Inc. v. Lorna Kang*, WIPO Case No. [D2002-1064](#) ("The Respondent's default does not automatically result in a decision in favor of the complainant. The Complainant must still prove each of the three elements required by Policy paragraph 4(a)").

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.

Ownership of a nationally or regionally registered trademark serves as prima facie evidence that the Complainant has trademark rights for the purposes of standing to file this Complaint. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1. The Complainant submitted evidence that the MANIC PANIC trademark has been registered in the United States as of 2011 with priority dating back to 1977, nearly fifty years before the disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent. Thus, the Panel finds that the Complainant's rights in the MANIC PANIC trademark have been established pursuant to the first element of the Policy.

The only remaining question under the first element of the Policy is whether the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's MANIC PANIC trademark. In this case, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's MANIC PANIC trademark because, disregarding the .com generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD"), the entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7. ("This test typically involves a side-by-side comparison of the domain name and the textual components of the relevant trademark to assess whether the mark is recognizable within the domain name [...] In cases where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark, or where at least a dominant feature of the relevant mark is recognizable in the domain name, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar [...]"). gTLDs, such as ".com" in the disputed domain name, are generally viewed as a standard registration requirement and are disregarded under the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.

The confusing similarity is not prevented by combination with the term "pdx". [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8 (Additional terms "whether descriptive, geographic, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise" do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name); see also *OSRAM GmbH v. Cong Ty Co Phan Dau Tu Xay Dung Va Cong Nghe Viet Nam*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-1583](#) ("[T]he addition of the letters 'hbg' to the trademark OSRAM does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Name and the said trademark."). The

Complainant did not submit any evidence with respect to the meaning of the letters “pdx”, but a simple Internet search compared to the Respondent’s registration data confirms that it most likely refers to the geographic region of Portland, Oregon. Nevertheless, it is also well established that neither the mere addition or removal of a geographic term is sufficient to prevent confusing similarity. See *BHP Billiton Innovation Pty Ltd v. Oloyi*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-0284](#) (“[T]he Domain Name comprises the entirety of the Mark together only with the geographical term ‘usa’ [which] does not detract from the confusing similarity of the Domain Name to the Mark.”)

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 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 disputed 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. Where, as in this case, the Respondent fails to come forward with any relevant evidence, the Complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

It is evident that the Respondent, identified by registration data for the disputed domain name as “Treena Crisp”, is not commonly known by the disputed domain name or the Complainant’s MANIC PANIC trademark.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name resolves to an AI-generated Registrar parking page, which displays the Complainant’s trademark in its heading, along with a contact form, and a background picture of a hair stylist. The evidence in this case suggests at a minimum that the Respondent has adopted a confusingly similar domain name based on the Complainant’s longstanding and federally registered MANIC PANIC trademark, with website content in the fields of hair care or cosmetics, the Complainant’s area of activity.

Furthermore, the Respondent has used the Complainant’s identical MANIC PANIC trademark to solicit Internet users to contact the Respondent, and sign up for promotions from the Respondent, all amidst a lack of clarity as to the specific nature of any legitimate business activity by the Respondent, or its relationship to the Complainant. The Respondent’s website content, in conjunction with the nature of the disputed domain name itself (which contains the Complainant’s MANIC PANIC trademark in its entirety), carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. To that end, the Panel concurs that the Respondent has erroneously suggested sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. Indeed, the inclusion by the Respondent of the geographic term “pdx”, which likely references Portland, Oregon (a geographic region covered by the Complainant’s nationwide trademark rights) further supports that conclusion. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

Lastly, the Complainant has raised the possibility that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name to engage in illegal activity, specifically attempting to pass itself off as the Complainant. However, the record does not contain sufficient evidence for the Panel to draw that same conclusion. The record appears to lack any of the usual hallmarks or typical circumstantial evidence of illegal activity, such as (i) copycat website content with copywritten pictorial or literary works taken from the Complainant's official website, (ii) the configuration of MX records on the disputed domain name, (iii) successful takedown notices as independent corroboration of abuse from the Registrar or webhost, (iv) placement of the disputed domain name on various Reputation Block Lists, (v) false or fictitious registration data, (vi) emails or email headers that clearly establish phishing or spoofing, etc. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), Section 2.13.2 ("Panels are generally not prepared however to accept merely conclusory or wholly unsupported allegations of illegal activity [...] even when the respondent is in default").

Nevertheless, for the reasons stated above, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy proscribes the following non-exhaustive circumstances as evidence of bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name:

- Circumstances indicating that the Respondent has registered or the Respondent has acquired the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the disputed domain name registration to the Complainant who is the owner of the trademark to a competitor of that Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the Respondent's documented out of pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name; or
- the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- by using the disputed domain name, the 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 the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website or location or of a product or service on the Respondent's website or location.

In this Panel's view, when the disputed domain name was registered on May 6, 2026, the Respondent most likely knew of the Complainant's pre-existing rights in its MANIC PANIC trademark in the United States. Indeed, circumstances in this case corroborate the Respondent's awareness of the Complainant and the Complainant's MANIC PANIC trademark, including: the Respondent's incorporation of the entire MANIC PANIC trademark into the disputed domain name; the Respondent's addition of the ostensibly geographic term "pdx" into the disputed domain name, which describes a geographic area where the Complainant provides goods and services; the arbitrary nature of the Complainant's MANIC PANIC trademark in relation to hair care and cosmetic goods; and the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name in connection with a parked website ostensibly related to hair care and cosmetic goods in direct competition with the Complainant, as well as putative offers to contact the Respondent or receive promotions from the Respondent without any clarification of the nature of any legitimate business activity by the Respondent or the Respondent's relationship to the Complainant.

Here, the disputed domain name wholly incorporates the Complainant's MANIC PANIC trademark and resolves to the Respondent's website titled "Manic Panic PDX", which reads "Express Your Unique Style" and "Contact Us; Drop us a line!" with the ability to "Sign up for our email list for updates, promotions, and more". The Respondent's website also ostensibly depicts a hair stylist in a salon, suggesting the targeting of

the Complainant and the industry of the Complainant. Accordingly, the Panel finds that use of the disputed domain name will divert potential customers from the Complainant's business to the website under the disputed domain name by attracting Internet users who mistakenly believe that the disputed domain name is affiliated with the Complainant.

As explained above, the Panel need not further analyze the Complainant's conclusory arguments concerning illegal activity. Nevertheless, the Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 <manicpanicpdx.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Phillip V. Marano/

Phillip V. Marano

Sole Panelist

Date: July 28, 2026