

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Sazerac Brands, LLC v. Work Banshee
Case No. D2026-2804

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Sazerac Brands, LLC, United States of America ("United States" or "U.S"), represented by Dorsey & Whitney, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Work Banshee, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <wellerantiques107.com> is registered with Global Domain Group LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 26, 2026. On June 29, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 30, 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 July 1, 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 July 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 July 8, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 28, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 30, 2026.

The Center appointed Raj Sachdev as the sole panelist in this matter on August 13, 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, Sazerac Brands, LLC, is a limited liability company organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, with its principal place of business in the state of Kentucky and is in the business of alcoholic and distilled spirits beverages. The Complainant owns the Buffalo Trace Distillery. The Complainant is the owner of various federal trademark registrations for WELLER marks, including, but not limited to:

U.S. Trademark Registration No.	Mark	Goods/Services (International Class)	Date of Registration
5,588,642	WELLER	33	October 23, 2018
5,768,613	WILLIAM LARUE WELLER	33	June 4, 2019
5,813,299	W (Design)	33	July 23, 2019
5,970,619	WELLER THE ORIGINAL WHEATED BOURBON (Design)	33	January 28, 2020

The Complainant also has, as part of its product portfolio, a bourbon known as W.L. WELLER Antique 107 and which the Complainant states has won seventy-one awards at international spirits competitions, including silver at the 2025 International Wine & Spirits Competition, and gold at both the 2024 Global Whiskey Challenge and 2024 American Whiskey Masters.

The Registrar confirmed that the Respondent's, Work Banshee, is the registrant of the disputed domain name and provided contact details indicating an address in the United States. The disputed domain name was registered on December 6, 2025, and resolves to a website that prominently displays the Complainant's WELLER trademark, together with branding elements and imagery associated with the Complainant and purports to offer for sale the Complainant's products.

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 the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its registered WELLER marks because it contains the WELLER mark. The Complainant also contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, is not generally known by the disputed domain name, is not a licensee or authorized nor has any relationship or affiliation with the Complainant, has never engaged in any bona fide commercial activity in connection with the disputed domain name, nor is making legitimate or fair use of the disputed domain name. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith, inter alia, to pass itself off as the Complainant and sell goods of the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed the Complainant must satisfy the Panel that: (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 was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7. Moreover, the goods and/or services for which the mark is registered or used in commerce, the filing/priority date, date of registration, and date of claimed first use, are not considered relevant to the first element test. These factors may however bear on a panel's further substantive determination under the second and third elements (see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.1.3).

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the WELLER marks for the purposes of the Policy through its trademark registrations including the United States registrations referenced in the Factual Background section above (see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1).

The WELLER mark is entirely reproduced within the disputed domain name along with the addition of "antiques107". As is the case here, 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 to that mark (see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7). Although the addition of another term, here, "antiques107," 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 (see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8 and *Sazerac Brands, LLC v. Work Banshee*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-0195](#)). Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's WELLER mark for the purposes of the Policy.

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 (see [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 submitted a response and accordingly 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. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not a licensee or authorized nor has any relationship or affiliation with the Complainant. Further, there is no evidence of any bona fide offering of goods or services, or legitimate noncommercial use. In fact, the Complainant has

submitted evidence that the disputed domain name is being used to pass off or otherwise use the Complainant's mark on an unauthorized basis as discussed in the next section. UDRP panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate or illegal, here claimed passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent (see [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. 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 (see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1).

UDRP panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate or illegal activity, here claimed passing off, constitutes bad faith (see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4). The disputed domain name itself, registered well after the Complainant established rights in the WELLER marks, directly incorporates the Complainant's WELLER mark, thereby creating a likelihood of confusion.

Beyond the disputed domain name itself, the Complainant has submitted evidence that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to operate a website clearly displaying the WELLER mark, specifically featuring the Complainant's product "Weller Antique 107" and other products, which supports a finding of bad faith.

This was done with clear knowledge of the Complainant's marks and their history as the website to which the disputed domain name resolves to clearly targets the Complainant's marks and products (see *America Online, Inc. v. Anson Chan*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0004](#)), using images of the Complainant's products displaying the WELLER mark, referencing the Buffalo Trace Distillery owned by the Complainant, using an "About Us" statement that discusses "Weller Antique 107" as representing a legacy of "craftsmanship, tradition, and bold bourbon character" as if it were the legacy of the Respondent, using an "Our Heritage" statement tracing the history of the brand back to the Complainant as if it was the Respondent's own history, using an "Our Commitment to Quality" statement describing the crafting process and stating that "Quality, authenticity, and tradition are at the heart of everything we do", and displaying a copyright notice for the website stating "Copyright 2026 WELLER ANTIQUE 107" as if the website were operated by or affiliated with the Complainant. All this is done without being authorized to use the Complainant's mark to offer the goods, without any disclaimer indicating that the website is not associated, affiliated or otherwise authorized by the Complainant, and through the clear passing off and unauthorized use of Complainant's marks and related imagery. The Complainant submits evidence that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the disputed domain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the disputed domain and of products on the disputed domain.

Further, the Respondent is the same respondent in *Sazerac Brands, LLC v. Work Banshee* WIPO Case No. [D2026-0195](#), resulting in a transfer of a similar domain name <wellerantique107.com>. The difference between the domain name in that case and the disputed domain name in the present proceeding is only the addition of the letter "s" (pluralizing the term "antique" in the disputed domain name) which further supports the Panel's finding that the Respondent has engaged in similar bad faith conduct in the present proceeding. The Respondent also did not respond to the Complaint, further indicating bad faith (see *Lonza Ltd v. Geral Gera, SEGLINK*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-1342](#)).

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute 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 <wellerantiques107.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Raj Sachdev/

Raj Sachdev

Sole Panelist

Date: August 13, 2026