

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Ghost Management Group, LLC v. Dickson oru
Case No. D2026-3670

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Dickson oru, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <weedmapscarriers.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 August 15, 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 18, 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 (Redacted, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 19, 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 amendment to the Complaint on August 19, 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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 26, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 15, 2026. The Respondent did not submit

any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 22, 2026. The Center appointed Angela Fox as the sole panelist in this matter on September 29, 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 the United States which provides advice and information to businesses and consumers on cannabis brands and dispensaries. It trades under the name and trademark WEEDMAPS and has operated through its website, "www.weedmaps.com", for more than a decade. It uses the trademark WEEDMAPS prominently in word and logo form on that website. It owns numerous trademark registrations for WEEDMAPS in word and logo form, including the following, details of which were annexed to the Complaint:

- US trademark registration no. 4321512 for WEEDMAPS in Classes 35, and 38, filed on May 5, 2011 and registered on April 16, 2013;
- US trademark registration no. 4321513 for WEEDMAPS in Class 42, filed on May 5, 2011 and registered on April 16, 2013; and
- US trademark registration no. 4943997 for WEEDMAPS Logo in Classes 9, 35, 38 and 42, filed on November 7, 2014 and registered on April 26, 2016.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 1, 2026. It has been in use to host a website impersonating the Complainant, including prominent use of the Complainant's WEEDMAPS trademark including in the Complainant's stylized logo form. Annexed to the Complaint were screenshots from the website linked to the disputed domain name showing this use, as well as a copy of an apparently fraudulent email from an address linked to the disputed domain name to a customer of the Complainant, inviting the recipient to pay a "one-time activation top-up payment" of USD1,140 in order to obtain a refund of an order made with the Complainant.

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 contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's registered WEEDMAPS trademark.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. In particular, the Respondent has not been commonly known by the domain name, has not been authorized by the Complainant to use the Complainant's trademark, and is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of it.

Finally, the Complainant submits that the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name in bad faith, citing the Respondent's hosting of a website impersonating the Complainant and its business and using the Complainant's WEEDMAPS trademark, including in the Complainant's specific logo form. The Complainant also points to an email, a copy of which was annexed to the Complaint, which was sent from an email address associated with the disputed domain name on

August 12, 2026, to a customer of the Complainant, inviting the recipient to pay a “one-time activation top-up payment” of USD1,140 in order to obtain a refund of an order made with the Complainant. The Complainant submits that this email was an attempt to defraud the Complainant’s customers.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant’s contentions and is in default. No exceptional circumstances explaining the default have been put forward. Therefore, in accordance with paragraphs 14 (a) and (b) of the Rules, the Panel will decide the Complaint and shall draw such inferences as it considers appropriate from the Respondent’s default.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, a complainant can only succeed in an administrative proceeding under the Policy if the panel finds that:

- (i) the disputed 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 the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith.

All three elements must be present before a complainant can succeed in an administrative proceeding under the Policy.

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 that it has rights in the trademark WEEDMAPS for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Complainant’s mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name, and is clearly recognizable within it. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, “carriers”, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such a term 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity such as the hosting of impersonation or copycat website or other types of fraud can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

In this case, there is evidence that the disputed domain name has been used to host a website falsely impersonating the Complainant and that at least one fraudulent email was sent to a customer of the Complainant from an email address associated with the disputed domain name.

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.

Under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, such circumstances include that by using the domain name, the respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website or location or of a product or service on its website or location.

In the present case, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s WEEDMAPS trademark, and the Respondent has used the disputed domain name in connection with a website impersonating the Complainant and copying the Complainant’s logo mark and images from the Complainant’s own website. It is evident from this that the Respondent was aware of and targeting the Complainant when it registered and used the disputed domain name, and that it intended to create the impression of a connection with the Complainant in order to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant.

Panels have also held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity such as impersonation or other types of fraud constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. The Complainant provided evidence that the disputed domain name has been used in connection with an impersonation website and with the sending of at least one fraudulent email to a customer of the Complainant.

Taking all of the above into account, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and has been used in bad faith. The Complainant has therefore 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 <weedmapscarriers.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Angela Fox/

Angela Fox

Sole Panelist

Date: October 4, 2026