

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Raising Cane's USA, LLC v. Mane Dave
Case No. D2026-3941

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Raising Cane's USA, LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Kelley Drye & Warren LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Mane Dave, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <careers-raisingcanes.com> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 2, 2026. On September 3, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 3, 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 (Privacy User #20f060e2, See PrivacyGuardian.org) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 4, 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 September 4, 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 September 11, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 1, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Kathryn Lee as the sole panelist in this matter on October 8, 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 Louisiana limited liability company which operates the Raising Cane's restaurant business. The Complainant has used the RAISING CANE'S mark since at least 1996, and its business comprises more than 1,000 locations across 42 states and six countries. The Complainant has the following trademark registrations for the RAISING CANE'S mark in the United States: Trademark Registration Number 3,272,782 registered on July 31, 2007, Trademark Registration Number 3,583,353 registered on March 3, 2009, and Trademark Registration Number 5,821,934 registered on July 30, 2019. In addition, the Complainant operates its principal website at <raisingcanes.com> and a dedicated recruitment website at <jobs.raisingcanes.com>.

The Respondent appears to be an individual with an address in the United States.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 22, 2026. It does not currently resolve to any website with active content, but on September 2, 2026, it resolved to a registrar parking page displaying pay-per-click (PPC) links to categories such as "Real Estate", "Technology & Computing", and "Business and Finance".

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 RAISING CANE'S mark since it incorporates the mark in its entirety, with the addition of the term "careers" and a hyphen.

The Complainant also contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and that there is no evidence of the Respondent's use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant contends that it is a globally recognized company and that its mark is distinctive and well known. Therefore, the Complainant contends, the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name cannot be coincidental or in good faith, and the only reasonable inference is that the Respondent registered it intending to exploit the recognition and reputation associated with the mark. The Complainant also contends that the absence of an active substantive website does not prevent a finding of bad faith and that no plausible good-faith justification exists for the registration.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the 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 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 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, “careers” and a hyphen – may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that such additions do 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.

Moreover, where a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term, UDRP panels have largely held that such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1. Here, the descriptive term “careers” is added to the RAISING CANE'S mark which may mislead Internet users into believing that the disputed domain name is the official recruitment website of the Complainant.

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 registered the disputed domain name which is confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark. Based on the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's mark, its longstanding use predating registration of the disputed domain name, and the combination of the mark with the term "careers", the Panel finds that the Respondent knew of the Complainant and its trademark and targeted the Complainant when registering the disputed domain name. Further, the addition of "careers" suggests an official recruitment website, particularly given the Complainant's operation of its own recruitment website at <jobs.raisingcanes.com>. It is highly improbable that the disputed domain name was registered in good faith and without knowledge of the Complainant's trademark.

The Respondent at one point linked the disputed domain name to a parking page displaying PPC links to other businesses. Given the composition of the disputed domain name, which suggests an official recruitment website of the Complainant, such use supports an inference that the Respondent sought to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of 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 name <careers-raisingcanes.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Kathryn Lee/

Kathryn Lee

Sole Panelist

Date: October 22, 2026