

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Rabbitsvault Corp v. Dickson Oru  
Case No. D2026-2713

### **1. The Parties**

Complainant is Rabbitsvault Corp, United States of America ("United States"), internally represented.

Respondent is Dickson Oru, United States.

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

The disputed domain name <plugplaycannabis.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 June 22, 2026. On June 23, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 24, 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 (Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on June 24, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on June 24, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 30, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 20, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on August 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Timothy D. Casey as the sole panelist in this matter on August 11, 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

Complainant operates an online retail store featuring apparel and smoking accessories among other related items. Complainant first began using PLUGPLAY as trademark for its retail services as early as May 2018, and owns the following registration (the “PLUGPLAY Mark”):

| Mark     | Jurisdiction  | Class(es) | Registration No. | Registration Date |
|----------|---------------|-----------|------------------|-------------------|
| PLUGPLAY | United States | 35        | 7,296,663        | February 6, 2024  |

Complainant also operates the online retail store using a stylized “P” design mark as trademark. The design mark was also used for retail services as early as May 2018. Complainant owns the following registration:

| Mark       | Jurisdiction  | Class(es) | Registration No. | Registration Date |
|------------|---------------|-----------|------------------|-------------------|
| P (design) | United States | 35        | 7,296,664        | February 6, 2024  |

The disputed domain name was registered on March 3, 2026. Complainant provided evidence indicating that as of the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website providing an online retail store selling smoking accessories, such as THC pods, vape devices, and battery systems for the same, under the PLUGPLAY Mark as well as under a similar design mark registered by Complainant..

#### 5. Parties’ Contentions

##### A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, Complainant contends that it has rights in the PLUGPLAY Mark as evidenced herein, and that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the PLUGPLAY Mark because the disputed domain name incorporates the PLUGPLAY Mark in its entirety and merely appends the descriptive term “cannabis”, leaving the PLUGPLAY Mark recognizable within the disputed domain name. Complainant asserts that the addition of the descriptive terms does not distinguish the disputed domain name but rather serves to increase a likelihood of confusion given Respondent’s use of the PLUGPLAY Mark and the design mark, as well as branded product packaging, at Respondent’s website.

Complainant contends Respondent should not be considered to have rights or a legitimate interest in the disputed domain name. Complainant asserts Complainant has not licensed, authorized, permitted, or otherwise consented to Respondent’s registration or use of the disputed domain name or Respondent’s use of the PLUGPLAY mark, Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name given Respondent’s commercial use of the PLUGPLAY mark, the design mark and other product imagery and brand language at Respondent’s copycat website.

Complainant contends the disputed domain name should be considered to have been registered and used in bad faith because: (1) Respondent registered the disputed domain name long after Complainant’s first use of the PLUGPLAY mark; (2) Respondent’s use of the PLUGPLAY mark on its website is not generic or coincidental and clearly indicates that Respondent knew of Complainant and the PLUGPLAY mark when it registered the disputed domain name; (3) Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to

its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the PLUGPLAY mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of Respondent's website and products; (4) Respondent's use of a privacy service coupled with the use of its copycat website infers bad faith; and (5) Respondent's conduct tarnishes Complainant's goodwill and threatens consumer trust by associating the PLUGPLAY Mark with unauthorized products offered through a domain name that Complainant does not control.

## **B. Respondent**

Respondent did not reply to 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 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.

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 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. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Panel finds the mark is also recognizable 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 other terms (here, "cannabis"), 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 Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent has not rebutted 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 illegitimate activity here, claimed operation of a copycat website, 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 Respondent is operating a copycat website that uses the PLUGPLAY Mark and other branding and identifiers of Complainant in an attempt to pass off as Complainant and as such may disrupt the business of Complainant while also intentionally attempting to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's mark.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed operation of a copycat website constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that 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 <plugplaycannabis.com> be transferred to Complainant.

*/Timothy D. Casey/*

**Timothy D. Casey**

Sole Panelist

Date: August 25, 2026