

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Selkirk Sport, LLC v. Stephen Wilson

Case No. D2026-3387

1. The Parties

Complainant is Selkirk Sport, LLC, United States of America (“U.S.” or “United States”), represented internally.

Respondent is Stephen Wilson, U.S.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <selkirksportstore.shop> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 30, 2026. On August 3, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 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 (Unnamed Respondent) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 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 amended Complaint on August 13, 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 August 14, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 3, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 4, 2026.

The Center appointed William Zac Duffy as the sole panelist in this matter on September 9, 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, Selkirk Sport LLC, is a Delaware limited liability company formed in 2014. Complainant develops, manufactures and sells a range of pickleball products, including paddles, balls, bags, apparel, nets, and other accessories.

Complainant owns the following trademark registrations that are relevant to this proceeding:

Mark	Reg. No.	Date of Registration	Jurisdiction	Disclaimer(s)
SELKIRK LABS	6761947	June 14, 2022	USA	N/A
SELKIRK TV	6830968	August 30, 2022	USA	TV
SELKIRK SPORT	5314012	October 17, 2017	USA	SPORT
SELKIRK	7881776	August 5, 2025	USA	N/A
SELKIRK LABS	7892036	August 12, 2025	USA	N/A
SELKIRK SPORT	5818616	July 30, 2019	USA	SPORT
	6396249	June 22, 2021	USA	N/A

Complainant's Websites

Complainant owns and operates <selkirksport.com> since October 29, 2013. It also owns and operates the domain name and website, <selkirk.com>, which features Complainant's pickleball products and services. Complainant provided screenshots from the website <selkirk.com>, but it did not provide a date when it first began operating this domain name. Complainant also did not provide screenshots from the website it operates at the <selkirksports.com>. It appears from the Panel's testing that traffic to <selkirksports.com> resolves to Complainant's website at <selkirk.com>.

The Disputed Domain

The disputed domain name <selkirksportstore.shop> was registered by Respondent, Stephen Wilson, on May 9, 2026. Respondent's website operated at the disputed domain name is highly similar to Complainant's website. Respondent's website offers Selkirk pickleball equipment and includes Complainant's "S" logo depicted in U.S. Registration No. 6396249.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to its trademarks, that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the domain name, and that Respondent registered the domain in bad faith to attract Internet users to purchase items from its website by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website. Complainant contends that it has not authorized, licensed or otherwise permitted Respondent to use its SELKIRK trademark and thus, Respondent's use of the disputed domain name cannot be considered a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Specifically, Complainant alleges that Respondent's domain name incorporates the Complainant's core 'SELKIRK' mark in conjunction with the terms 'sport' and 'store', which directly targets consumers seeking authorized SELKIRK products, and that Respondent's website prominently displays the Complainant's stylized 'S' logo (USPTO Reg. No. 6396249), which is an iconic brand identifier for the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

The Complainant is required to prove each of the following three elements to obtain the remedy it has requested: (i) the 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 domain name; and (iii) the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. 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 of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown it has registered the SELKIRK marks and therefore has established rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name incorporates the entirety of Complainant's SELKIRK SPORT mark together with the generic term "store". The disputed domain name also wholly incorporates Complainant's standalone SELKIRK mark. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Panel also concludes that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the domain name.

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which a 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. Respondent, by failing to file a response, has failed to show that it has been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted by Complainant to use the SELKIRK or SELKIRK SPORT marks, or to register a domain name incorporating those marks. Nor is there any evidence that Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Policy contains a non-exhaustive list of circumstances that may demonstrate when a respondent has rights or legitimate interests in the use of a domain name. The list includes using the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services. Policy, paragraphs 4(c)(i) – (iii).

The record further shows that the Respondent's website is not merely a passive use of the disputed domain name. Rather, Respondent appears to be offering genuine products of Complainant on its website, but the Panel finds that it is doing so in a way that infringes Complainant's trademarks by creating a likelihood of confusion about the source, sponsorship, or affiliation of the products being sold. WIPO UDRP panels have consistently found that selling products on a website in a way that infringes on a complainant's trademark rights cannot be considered a bona fide offering of goods or services. See, e.g., *Nara Aziza Smith v. Vanessa Clarke*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-1839](#).

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 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.

Respondent registered the disputed domain name in the knowledge of Complainant's marks, as evidenced by the fact that Complainant's marks are included on Respondent's website, including its 'S' logo, to sell the same types of pickleball-related products that are offered by Complainant. The appearance and presentation of Respondent's website are highly similar to those of Complainant's website. The Panel finds that Respondent is targeting Complainant in order to leverage the reputation and goodwill in Complainant's marks to encourage Internet users to visit its website and purchase products, likely under the false belief that they are purchasing products from Complainant.

Consequently, the Panel finds that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith by intentionally attempting to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's marks. Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv); See, e.g., *Mercado Libre, Inc. et al. v. Ruslan Kovalenko*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-0045](#).

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraph 4(i) of the Policy and paragraph 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <selkirkssportstore.shop> be transferred to Complainant.

/William Zac Duffy/

William Zac Duffy

Sole Panelist

Date: September 15, 2026