

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Ruggable LLC v. Zander Preston
Case No. D2026-3666

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Ruggable LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Meunier Carlin & Curfman LLC, United States.

The Respondent is Zander Preston, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ruggable.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 August 14, 2026. On August 17, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 17, 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 (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 22, 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 26, 2026, and an amendment to the Complaint on September 1, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint and 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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 4, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 24, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 29, 2026.

The Center appointed Nicolas Ulmer as the sole panelist in this matter on October 2, 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 is a company based in California, United States; its primary business is the sale of various textile products including, notably, rugs. The Complainant is active on the Internet and, according to the Complaint, the vast majority of the Complainant's sales are made through its official website at "www.ruggable.com".

The Complainant is the owner of five United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO") registered trade or service marks for the mark RUGGABLE, including:

USPTO Registration No. 4,016,507 for the standard character mark RUGGABLE in association with "Area rugs; Carpet underlays, namely, rug grippers; Carpets and rugs; Carpets, rugs, mats and matting" in Class 27, registered August 23, 2011; and

USPTO Registration No. 6,042,582 for the standard character mark RUGGABLE in association with "On-line retail store services featuring rugs" in Class 35, registered April 28, 2020.

Little is known concerning the Respondent, who is apparently an individual living in the United States.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 18, 2026. It resolves to a website allegedly selling Ruggable branded products with heavy discount.

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 submits: that the disputed domain name incorporates its trademarks and is identical or confusingly similar to the same; that it has not licensed or given permission to the Respondent to use its trademarks and that the Respondent has no right or interest to do so; and that it is evident that the disputed domain name was both registered and used in bad faith, essentially to seek illicit commercial gain from the confusion between the Complainant's well-known products and those marketed by the Respondent through the website at the disputed domain name.

The Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to it.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The disputed domain name begins with and contains the entirety of the Complainant's RUGGABLE trademarks; and is therefore identical to those trademarks. The applicable Top-Level Domain ("TLD") in a domain name, here ".shop" is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.11.1.

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

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant has clearly stated that the Respondent is not its licensee and has been given no permission or authorisation to use its trademarks in the disputed domain name or otherwise; more generally, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest of any kind in the disputed domain name. There is, furthermore, no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or any variation thereof. The record in this case, likewise provides no evidence or indicia that would suggest that the Respondent has any rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name, or has been making any legitimate noncommercial use of the disputed domain name.

UDRP decisions and doctrine provide that where, as here, the Complainant has clearly denied any rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in its trademark this establishes a prima facie case to that effect the burden of production shifts to the Respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating a right or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

The Respondent here failed to respond to the Complaint or come forward with any evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests. The Panel finds that the Complainant has met its burden under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, and the second element of the Policy is thus proven.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The disputed domain name was registered some fifteen years after the Complainant's first RUGGABLE trademark and long after the Complainant had developed a significant, largely online, rug sale business making use of its trademarks. The addition of the TLD ".shop" to the Complainant's trademark in the disputed domain name obviously indicates an intention to use the disputed domain name for commercial purposes; presumably to attract Internet users for commercial gain by engendering a confusion with the Complainant's trademarks and business. The indicia, evidence and inferences to be drawn from the file here thus all point to a registration in bad faith.

This view is further sustained by the use to which the Respondent has put the disputed domain name. The Complainant alleges and submits annexed evidence to the effect disputed domain name has resolved to a website that deliberately imitates the Complainant's trademarks and business and suggest that it is marketing the Complainant's products by, inter alia, copying the Complainant's distinctive typeface for the mark RUGGABLE and reproducing designs and descriptions that are confusingly similar or identical to the Complainant's website product presentations. The Complainant also submits that the very low prices offered by the Respondent for the putatively Ruggable branded rugs it markets on its website suggest that the Respondent may be involved in the sale of counterfeit goods. It is in any event clear that the disputed domain name has been used in connection with an illegitimate and bad faith attempt to obtain commercial gain by trading on the Complainant's reputation and goodwill through an unauthorised and wrongful use of its trademarks.

The Panel thus 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 <ruggable.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nicolas Ulmer/

Nicolas Ulmer

Sole Panelist

Date: October 16, 2026