

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Starbucks Corporation v. Queenie Farrell, Junior Hettinger, Howard Kihn
Case No. D2026-3013

1. The Parties

Complainant is Starbucks Corporation, United States of America ("United States" or "US"), represented by Focal PLLC, United States.

Respondents are Queenie Farrell, United States, Junior Hettinger, United States, and Howard Kihn, American Samoa, United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <starbuckscareer.pilot.com>, <starbucks.hirefocus.com>, <starbucks.jobfleet.com>, and <starbucks.talentcore.com> are registered with Unstoppable Domains Inc.

The disputed domain name <starbucks.interview.schedule.com> is registered with Gname.com Pte. Ltd.

(collectively, the "Registrars").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 8, 2026. On July 9, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars requests for registrar verifications in connection with the disputed domain names. On July 9, 2026, and July 13, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Unstoppable Privacy Service LLC/Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on July 13, 2026, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on July 17, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 4, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 24, 2026. Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondents’ default on August 26, 2026.

The Center appointed Colin T. O’Brien as the sole panelist in this matter on September 1, 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 is one of the world’s most recognized consumer brands, operating over 41,000 retail stores in 85 markets worldwide. Complainant has used the STARBUCKS mark continuously since the opening of its first store in 1971 and currently owns trademark registrations for the STARBUCKS mark in a number of jurisdictions, including longstanding US registrations dating to 1985 (for example, US Registration No. 1,372,630, for STARBUCKS dated November 26, 1985; US Registration No. 1,452,359, for STARBUCKS dated August 11, 1987).

The disputed domain names had the following dates of registration:

<starbuckscareerpilot.com> May 16, 2026;
<starbucksjobfleet.com> May 16, 2026;
<starbuckstalentcore.com> May 16, 2026;
<starbuckshirefocus.com> May 16, 2026; and
<starbucksinterviewschedule.com> June 9, 2026.

All of the disputed domain names were used to send fraudulent emails.

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 names.

Notably, Complainant contends that it is the owner of all rights in and to the STARBUCKS mark in connection with a wide variety of goods and services. Complainant owns numerous trademark and service mark registrations for the STARBUCKS mark in the United States and around the world.

The disputed domain names are confusingly similar to Complainant’s STARBUCKS mark. Panels have routinely held that the addition of generic or descriptive terms (like, in this instance, “career”, “pilot”, “job”, “fleet”, “talent”, “core”, “hire”, “focus”, “interview”, or “schedule”) does not sufficiently distinguish a domain name that incorporates a complainant’s mark in its entirety.

Respondents were undoubtedly aware of Complainant’s STARBUCKS mark when the disputed domain names were registered. There is no evidence to support an argument that any of the Respondents are commonly known by any of the disputed domain names. Complainant has never licensed or otherwise

authorized Respondents' use of its STARBUCKS mark in any domain name, much less the confusingly-similar disputed domain names.

Respondents' passive holding of the disputed domain names — which resolve to inactive landing pages as evidenced by the screenshots showing an error messages — does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Given the global fame and distinctiveness of the STARBUCKS mark, there is no plausible reason for Respondents to hold these disputed domain names other than to capitalize on Complainant's brand or to prevent Complainant from reflecting its mark in a corresponding domain name.

Respondents used email addresses associated with the disputed domain names to send very similar emails in order to perpetuate fraud by soliciting sensitive personal information under the premise of recruitment for nonexistent employment opportunities with Complainant.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Preliminary Issue: Consolidation of Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or under common control. Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that four of the disputed domain names were all registered on the same day and the fifth was registered less than a month later, all contain Complainant's trademark, have a similar composition, and were used to engage in phishing email attacks. Given the totality of the evidence the Panel concludes that the disputed domain names are under common control and this case should be consolidated.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

6.2. Substantive Issues

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Complainant has demonstrated it owns long-standing registered trademark rights in the STARBUCKS mark. The Top-Level Domain (“TLD”) “.com” is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such may be disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11. Accordingly, the disputed domain names reproduce the STARBUCKS mark in its entirety. The addition of other terms “career”, “pilot”, “job”, “fleet”, “talent”, “core”, “hire”, “focus”, “interview”, or “schedule” does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark in which Complainant has rights and the first element of the Policy is established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Complainant has presented a prima facie case that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names and has not been commonly known by the disputed domain names. The fact that Respondent registered the disputed domain names which incorporate Complainant’s registered and famous STARBUCKS trademark and merely adds the terms “career”, “pilot”, “job”, “fleet”, “talent”, “core”, “hire”, “focus”, “interview”, or “schedule” indicates that Respondent likely sought to impersonate Complainant and piggyback on the mark for illegitimate reasons, namely, to engage in a phishing scheme targeting potential employees of Complainant; a conclusion supported by Complainant’s evidence.

After a complainant has made a prima facie case, the burden of production shifts to a respondent to present evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. See, e.g., *Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2003-0455](#).

Here, Respondent has not come forward with any evidence of any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. Moreover, the use of a domain name for illegal activity, such as phishing, and passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests upon a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.

In the absence of any evidence rebutting Complainant’s prima facie case indicating Respondent’s lack of rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names, the Panel finds that Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The disputed domain names were registered many years after Complainant first registered and used the famous STARBUCKS trademark. The evidence on the record provided by Complainant with respect to the extent of use and fame of STARBUCKS trademark is sufficient to satisfy the Panel that, at the time the disputed domain names were registered, Respondent undoubtedly knew of Complainant’s STARBUCKS trademark.

The Panel cannot contemplate any other reason as to why Respondent would have registered the disputed domain names containing the entirety of the STARBUCKS trademark with the terms “career”, “pilot”, “job”, “fleet”, “talent”, “core”, “hire”, “focus”, “interview”, or “schedule” other than to target and unfairly benefit from the reputation and goodwill associated with Complainant’s mark.

Further, the Panel finds the use of the disputed domain names by Respondent is in bad faith. Paragraph 4(b)(iv) states that evidence of bad faith may include a respondent’s use of a domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to respondent’s website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with complainant’s mark. Complainant has alleged and provided evidence

that Respondent used the disputed domain names to send fraudulent emails to individuals interested in employment with Complainant, which amounts to bad faith use on the part of Respondent.

In the absence of any evidence or explanation from Respondent, the Panel finds that the only plausible basis for registering and using the disputed domain names has been for illegitimate and bad faith purposes.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(iii) 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 names <starbuckscaererpilot.com>, <starbuckshirefocus.com>, <starbucksinterviewschedule.com>, <starbucksjobfleet.com>, and <starbuckstalentcore.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Colin T. O'Brien /

Colin T. O'Brien

Sole Panelist

Date: September 16, 2026