

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Central Garden & Pet Company v. Vladimir Veselovskiy  
Case No. D2026-2839

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Central Garden & Pet Company, United States of America ("United States"), represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Vladimir Veselovskiy, Ukraine.

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

The disputed domain name <alaskafishfertilizer.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 30, 2026. On June 30, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 1, 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 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 2, 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 3, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 23, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 28, 2026.

The Center appointed Iris Quadrio as the sole panelist in this matter on August 6, 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, Central Garden & Pet Company, is a United States company founded in 1980 and operating in the pet and garden industries. The Complainant is based in Walnut Creek, California, United States, and owns a portfolio of brands, including ALASKA, used in connection with pet and garden products.

The Complainant uses the ALASKA mark in connection with organic plant food products made from fish. The Complainant's ALASKA-branded fish fertilizer products are promoted through the website associated with the domain name <pennington.com> and are sold through retail and e-commerce outlets in North America.

The Complainant is the owner of trademark registrations for the ALASKA mark in the United States and Canada. For the purposes of this proceeding, the Panel notes in particular the following registrations: (i) United States: Reg. No. 977092, registered on January 22, 1974, for class 1; Reg. No. 3901796, registered on January 4, 2011, for class 1; and (ii) Canada: Reg. No. TMA303508, registered on June 7, 1985, for classes 1 and 21.

The Complainant maintains an online presence through its principal website at the domain name <central.com>. Information concerning the Complainant's ALASKA-branded fish fertilizer products is also available through the website associated with the domain name <pennington.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 5, 2024. At the time of the filing of the Complaint, the publicly available Whois information identified a privacy service as the registrant. Following the Registrar's verification, the underlying registrant was disclosed as Vladimir Veselovskiy, located in Dnipro, Ukraine.

According to the evidence submitted with the Complaint and the records of the Center, the disputed domain name resolved to an active website presenting itself as "Alaska Fish Fertilizer" and promoting ALASKA-branded fish fertilizer products. The website displayed the ALASKA mark and images of the Complainant's products and included the statement "We're Alaska Fish Fertilizer, An Organic Plant Food Manufacturer". It also used first-person statements referring to "our fertilizers", "our customers", and "our company".

The website displayed several ALASKA-branded fertilizer products together with "Check Price" buttons. According to the evidence submitted with the Complaint, those buttons and other links identified as "Contact us now", "Reach Out Now", and "Learn More" did not lead to additional content. Although the website also displayed an email address, the evidence submitted with the Complaint indicates that the disputed domain name did not have active Mail Exchanger ("MX") records.

The website did not identify the Respondent as its operator, nor did it refer to the Complainant or its PENNINGTON brand or disclose the nature of any relationship between the Respondent and the Complainant. The record does not indicate that the Complainant has authorized the Respondent to use the ALASKA mark or to register any domain name incorporating it, nor does it indicate any relationship between the Parties.

At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name continues to resolve to an active website with substantially the same presentation. The website continues to present itself as "Alaska Fish Fertilizer", describing its operator as an organic plant food manufacturer, promoting ALASKA-branded fertilizer products, and using first-person statements concerning the products and the purported business. It does not identify the Respondent as the operator or disclose the nature of any relationship with the Complainant.

There are other UDRP decisions against the Respondent, including *Stove Kraft Limited v. Vladimir Veselovskiy*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-1455](#); *Hachette Book Group, Inc. / Perseus Books, LLC v. Vladimir Veselovskiy*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-1340](#); *Lund, Inc. v. Vladimir Veselovskiy*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-5262](#); *Masco Corporation and Masco Corporation and Liberty Hardware Mfg. Corp. v. Vladimir Veselovskiy*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-5060](#); and *Pure Fishing, Inc. v. Vladimir Veselovskiy*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-4796](#). The panels in those proceedings ordered the transfer of the respective disputed domain names.

## **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 ALASKA trademark, as it reproduces the mark in its entirety together with the terms "fish" and "fertilizer", which directly describe the Complainant's ALASKA-branded product. The Complainant further argues that the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" should be disregarded for purposes of the comparison.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not affiliated with or authorized by the Complainant, is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and has used it for a website displaying the Complainant's ALASKA mark and product images. According to the Complainant, the website presents its operator as "Alaska Fish Fertilizer" and as an organic plant food manufacturer, without accurately and prominently disclosing the Respondent's lack of relationship with the Complainant. The Complainant submits that such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or legitimate noncommercial fair use.

Moreover, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant submits that the composition of the disputed domain name and the content of the associated website demonstrate that the Respondent knew of and targeted the Complainant and its ALASKA mark. According to the Complainant, the Respondent has intentionally used the disputed domain name to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and the products promoted therein. The Complainant further relies on the Respondent's alleged involvement in previous UDRP proceedings as evidence of a pattern of conduct.

### **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **6.1. Procedural Issue – Location of the Respondent**

Under paragraph 10 of the Rules, the Panel is required to ensure that the Parties are treated with equality and that each Party is given a fair opportunity to present its case, and also that the administrative proceeding takes place with due expedition.

The location of the Respondent disclosed by the Registrar appears to be in Ukraine, which is subject to an international conflict at the date of this Decision that may impact case notification. It is therefore appropriate for the Panel to consider, in accordance with its discretion under paragraph 10 of the Rules, whether the proceeding should continue.

Having considered all the circumstances of the case, the Panel is of the view that it should. The record shows that the Center sent the Notification of Complaint by email to the Respondent at the email address disclosed by the Registrar, and that the electronic delivery to that address was completed without any reported delivery failure. The Center also sent the Written Notice to the Respondent's postal address disclosed by the Registrar. The postal tracking record shows that the Written Notice reached Ukraine, completed customs clearance, and was registered for collection, although delivery was ultimately unsuccessful because the recipient was absent.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name was registered during the international conflict and resolves to an active website. These circumstances indicate that the Respondent appears capable of controlling the disputed domain name and its associated content and of receiving electronic communications concerning it.

The Panel concludes that the Respondent has been given a fair opportunity to present its case. In order that the administrative proceeding takes place with due expedition, the Panel will proceed to a Decision accordingly.

## **6.2. Substantive Issues**

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, for this Complaint to succeed in relation to the disputed domain name, the Complainant must prove each of the following, namely that:

- i. the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar with a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- ii. the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest 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. 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 trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The record shows that the Complainant is the owner of trademark registrations for ALASKA in the United States and Canada, as set out in the Factual Background above.

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.

Although the addition of the terms "fish" and "fertilizer" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms 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 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.

The Complainant asserts that it has not authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the ALASKA mark or to register any domain name incorporating it, and that no relationship exists between the Parties. There is no evidence in the record suggesting that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name or that the Respondent holds any trademark or other rights corresponding to it. The Registrar-disclosed information identifies the Respondent as Vladimir Veselovskiy, a name that does not correspond to the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website displaying the Complainant’s ALASKA mark and images of ALASKA-branded fish fertilizer products. The website presents itself as “Alaska Fish Fertilizer” and states “We’re Alaska Fish Fertilizer, An Organic Plant Food Manufacturer”. It also uses first-person statements referring to “our fertilizers”, “our customers”, and “our company”. The website does not identify the Respondent as its operator nor does it refer to the Complainant or disclose the nature of any relationship between the Respondent and the Complainant.

Furthermore, the website is commercial in its presentation, and there is no evidence that the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant and does not support a finding of fair use. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

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.

The Complainant’s trademark registrations for ALASKA substantially predate the registration of the disputed domain name. The Panel finds that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its ALASKA mark when registering the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name reproduces the ALASKA mark in its entirety together with the terms “fish” and “fertilizer”, which directly describe the Complainant’s ALASKA-branded fish fertilizer product. The Respondent’s subsequent use of the disputed domain name for a website displaying the ALASKA mark and images of the Complainant’s products confirms that the selection of the disputed domain name was not coincidental and is being used in bad faith. The associated website

presents itself as “Alaska Fish Fertilizer” and states “We’re Alaska Fish Fertilizer, An Organic Plant Food Manufacturer”. It also refers in the first person to “our fertilizers”, “our customers”, and “our company”, while displaying ALASKA-branded fish fertilizer products and presenting them together with “Check Price” buttons. Such use conveys the impression that the website is operated by, or otherwise associated with, the Complainant. Yet, the website neither identifies the Respondent as its operator nor discloses the nature of any relationship between the Parties.

The above findings support the inference that the Respondent intended to attract Internet users by taking advantage of the association created with the Complainant and its mark.

The fact that certain links on the website did not lead to additional content does not alter this conclusion. The website was presented as a commercial or manufacturer-operated website for the Complainant’s ALASKA-branded product. The Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name and the overall presentation of the website were therefore capable of creating confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and the products promoted therein.

Under these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the associated website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s ALASKA mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website or of the products promoted therein, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel further finds that the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of conduct within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy. The Respondent has been part of several prior UDRP proceedings involving domain names incorporating third-party trademarks. Taken together, these circumstances support a finding that the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of conduct consisting of the registration of domain names incorporating third-party trademarks, thereby preventing the respective trademark owners from reflecting their marks in corresponding domain names.

The Respondent has not submitted a Response or provided any explanation for its registration and use of the disputed domain name. While the Respondent’s default does not by itself establish bad faith, the absence of any explanation leaves unrebutted the evidence indicating that the Respondent specifically targeted the Complainant and its ALASKA mark.

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 <alaskafishfertilizer.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Iris Quadrio/*

**Iris Quadrio**

Sole Panelist

Date: August 20, 2026