

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Ghost Management Group, LLC v. Dickson oru
Case No. D2026-3390

1. The Parties

Complainant is Ghost Management Group, LLC, United States of America (the “United States”), represented by Friedland Cianfrani, LLP, United States.

Respondent is Dickson oru, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <weedmapscouriers.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 July 31, 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 4, 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 (The RDAP server redacted the value, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on August 4, 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 August 4, 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 August 11, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 31, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on September 1, 2026.

The Center appointed Lorelei Ritchie as the sole panelist in this matter on September 7, 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 a limited liability corporation based in the United States. For over a decade prior to the registration of the disputed domain name, Complainant has offered online services related to cannabis products under the mark WEEDMAPS. Complainant owns registered trademarks for WEEDMAPS in various jurisdictions. These registrations include, among others, United States Registration No. 4321513 (registered on April 16, 2013) for WEEDMAPS, and United States Registration No. 5044201 (registered on September 20, 2016) for the word mark WEEDMAPS.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 10, 2026. Respondent has used the disputed domain name to resolve to a website that mimics an official website by Complainant, including prominent display of Complainant's word and design marks without any disclaimer of affiliation.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to Complainant's trademarks; (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; and (iii) Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Specifically, Complainant contends that it owns rights to the well-known WEEDMAPS mark which Complainant has used for more than a decade in connection with various online services related to cannabis products. Complainant contends that the disputed domain name incorporates in full Complainant's WEEDMAPS mark, with only the addition of the term "couriers." Complainant further contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's own domain name <weedmaps.com>, which Complainant uses to communicate with consumers online.

Complainant asserts that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and rather has registered and is using it in bad faith, presumably for Respondent's own commercial gain, by creating a website used to impersonate Complainant with the intent to defraud consumers. Complainant alleges that Respondent has further shown bad faith in using an email address associated with the disputed domain name to send fraudulent email correspondence impersonating Complainant.

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 the WEEDMAPS mark, for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1. The Panel finds that the WEEDMAPS mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name.

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 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.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name has been used for a website that prominently displays Complainant’s marks and presents itself as “Weedmaps Couriers”, without any disclaimer of affiliation. The record also includes evidence that Respondent used an email address associated with the disputed domain name to impersonate Complainant in correspondence with one of Complainant’s customers. Such use cannot confer rights or legitimate interests on Respondent. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13. Respondent has not come forward with any evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

There are several ways that a complainant can demonstrate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith. As noted in Section 4 of this Panel’s Decision, the record includes evidence that Respondent has used the disputed domain name to resolve to a website that impersonates an official website by Complainant, with prominent display of Complainant’s marks, and with no disclaimer of affiliation. The Panel finds that the Respondent has further used an email address associated with the disputed domain name to send correspondence impersonating Complainant, and which references Complainant’s official website.

The Panel thus finds sufficient evidence that Respondent was aware of Complainant’s rights and Complainant’s marks at the time of registering the disputed domain name and deliberately selected it with the Complainant’s mark in mind. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

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

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 <weedmapscouriers.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Lorelei Ritchie/

Lorelei Ritchie

Sole Panelist

Date: September 15, 2026