

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Redmond, Incorporated v. Jason Ramirez, Sara Boyd
Case No. D2026-3391

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Redmond, Incorporated, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Parsons Behle & Latimer, United States.

The Respondents are Jason Ramirez and Sara Boyd, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain names <getredmondagriculture.shop> and <redmondagriculturestore.shop> are registered with Dynadot LLC (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 names. On August 10, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Dynadot Privacy Service, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) 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 14, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 21, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 10, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents’ default on September 22, 2026.

The Center appointed Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa as the sole panelist in this matter on September 28, 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, a company incorporated in Utah, United States, develops, manufactures, and sells agricultural products including soil amendments, feed, and supplements for livestock. It is the proprietor of several trademarks, including United States Trademark Registration No. 3421355 for REDMOND (word mark), registered on May 6, 2008 for goods in classes 19, 30 and 31, claiming a date of first use in 1968.

The Complainant operates its primary business and e-commerce website at the domain name <agriculture.redmond.com>, which also resolves from the domain name <redmondagriculture.com>, which is also registered by the Complainant.

The disputed domain name <getredmondagriculture.shop> was registered by Jason Ramirez on April 17, 2026. At the time of the Complaint and of this Decision, it resolved to an e-commerce website purportedly offering agricultural products for sale by “Redmond Agriculture”. The home page states: “Elevate Your Farm’s Vitality. Harness premium salt and clay minerals to maximize your livestock’s health and natural productivity.” It displays images of products branded with the name and logo of “Redmond Agriculture”.

The disputed domain name <redmondagriculturestore.shop> was registered by Sara Boyd on May 14, 2026. At the time of this Decision, it did not resolve to an active website. The record contains evidence that it previously resolved to a website similar to that at the other disputed domain name.

5. Parties’ Contentions

5.1. Complainant

A. Consolidation

The Complainant request consolidation of the Respondents for the following reasons: on information and belief, the disputed domain names are under common control. The Respondents share the same Registrar, privacy service, and hosting company. The geolocation of both IP addresses is located in China and associated with the same entity there. Both disputed domain names incorporate the term “redmondagriculture” and use the same “.shop” Top-Level Domain. They were registered within one month of each other. The Respondent email addresses share similar formats and both employ the domain <outlook.com>. Finally, the disputed domain names resolve to similar websites that impersonate the Complainant and appear to offer the Complainant’s products.

B. Substantive allegations

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that both disputed domain names incorporate the entirety of its REDMOND mark and are very similar to the Complainant’s domain name <redmondagriculture.com>. The inclusion of the additional terms “agriculture”, “store”, and “shop” does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. Both disputed domain names resolve to highly similar copycat sites that impersonate the Complainant in an attempt to defraud customers. The sites use unauthorized copies of the Complainant’s logos and photographs copied from the Complainant’s website. The Respondents are not affiliated with the Complainant and have no rights to use its mark or images. The Respondents’ websites display an email

address incorporating Redmond's domain name <redmondagriculture.com>, thereby falsely indicating that Respondents are the Complainant or are associated with it.

The Complainant requests transfer of the disputed domain names.

5.2. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Consolidation of Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The 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 the Complainant's request.

The principles to assess a request to consolidate multiple respondents are set forth in the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.11.2.

Noting the circumstances of the case, the Panel considers disputed domain names to be under common control. In particular, the Panel notes the shared Registrar, privacy service, and hosting company, common geolocation of IP addresses, similar naming patterns, and temporal proximity of the two registrations. The Panel additionally notes the use of the disputed domain names to resolve to similar websites.

The Respondents do not challenge the Complainant's assertions. 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 accepts the Complainant's request to consolidate the present proceedings pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 10(e). The Respondents are hereinafter referred to as the "Respondent".

6.2. Substantive Matters

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 entirety of the Complainant's REDMOND 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 other terms (here, "get" and "store") 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 Panel notes the composition of the disputed domain names, which reflects part or all of the Complainant’s REDMOND trademark together with terms referring to the Complainant’s business, carries a risk of implied affiliation to the Complainant that cannot constitute fair use. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

The Panel notes there is no evidence that the Respondent has used the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain names. There is no evidence that the Respondent has made a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names.

Rather, the record indicates that the disputed domain names have been used for websites purporting to be operated by the Complainant and allegedly offering its goods for sale. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, claimed, passing off, or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark. The disputed domain names were registered more than a decade after the Complainant registered its REDMOND trademark, and over 50 years after the Complainant first commenced use of this mark. The disputed domain names reflect the Complainant’s mark in its entirety or in part, plus the term “agriculture”, referring to the Complainant’s business, and the terms “get” and “shop”, which do not distinguish it. Such composition implies a connection to the Complainant, which is underlined by the similarity to the Complainant’s own domain name at <redmondagriculture.com>. Under these circumstances, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names were registered in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, claimed passing off, or other types of fraud) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. The record contains evidence that the disputed domain names both resolved to websites featuring the Complainant's mark and purporting to offer for sale the Complainant's products. The websites purport to be operated by "Redmond Agriculture" and display contact email addresses associated with the Complainant. Such conduct is clearly indicative of bad faith use of the disputed domain names.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes 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 names <getredmondagriculture.shop> and <redmondagriculturestore.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa/

Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa

Sole Panelist

Date: October 12, 2026