ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Riverbend Management, Inc. v. Liam Harris, George Johnson
Case No. D2026-3963

1. The Parties

Complainant is Riverbend Management, Inc., United States of America ("United States" or "U.S."), internally represented.

Respondents are Liam Harris, United States, and George Johnson, United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <riverbendranchshop.shop> and <riverbendranchsteaksquality.shop> are registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 3, 2026. On September 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On September 4, 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 Complainant on September 7, 2026, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on September 11, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 18, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 8, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Colin T. O'Brien as the sole panelist in this matter on October 19, 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 has offered goods and services in the United States under the RIVERBEND RANCH mark since at least 1995.

Complainant owns the <riverbendranch.com> domain name through which its goods and services are offered.

Complainant is the owner of registered trademarks for RIVERBEND RANCH ("the Marks") including and not limited:

RIVERBEND RANCH (U.S. Registration No. 7,666,159) for "beef, meat, frozen, beef steaks, fresh meat, ground meat" registered on January 28, 2025;
RIVERBEND RANCH (U.S. Registration No. 8,077,802) for "beef jerky, beef sticks" registered on December 23, 2025;
RIVERBEND RANCH (U.S. Registration No. 2,616,899) for "cattle and horse raising and breeding services and ranching services", registered on September 10, 2002; and
RIVERBEND RANCH (Canadian Registration No. TMA1298390) for "Spices; sauce mixes; sauces for meat; spice blends; barbecue sauce; edible spices; r eady-made sauces for meat; steak sauce", registered on March 12, 2025.

The disputed domain names were registered on the following dates <riverbendranchshop.shop> registered April 13, 2026; and <riverbendranchsteaksquality.shop> registered May 22, 2026.

Both <riverbendranchsteaksquality.shop > and < riverbendranchshop.shop> are currently blocked because they have been deemed deceptive sites. Previously, the disputed domain names resolved to websites which purported to sell meat products.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

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

Notably, Complainant contends that it has prominently and extensively used, promoted, and advertised the Marks and domain name for many years. By virtue of these efforts, the Marks have become well recognized by consumers as designating Complainant as the source of the goods and services so marked.

The RIVERBEND RANCH Marks have generated substantial goodwill and are associated by consumers with Complainant and its goods and services. Each of the disputed domain names incorporates Complainant's RIVERBEND RANCH mark in its entirety. The addition of the terms "shop" in <riverbendranchshop.shop> and "steaksquality" in <riverbendranchsteaksquality.shop> does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

To the contrary, those terms relate directly to Complainant's sale of beef and steak products. The ".shop" generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") does not distinguish the disputed domain names from Complainant's mark.

Complainant has not licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted either Respondents to use the RIVERBEND RANCH mark or any confusingly similar variation. Neither Respondent is commonly known by either of the disputed domain names or by the RIVERBEND RANCH mark.

Respondents registered and are using the disputed domain names in bad faith. The disputed domain names were selected to target Complainant's registered and distinctive RIVERBEND RANCH mark and to create a likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement. The terms "shop" and "steaksquality" reinforce the impression that the domain names relate to Complainant's products or official sales channels. Upon information and belief, Respondents intentionally attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating confusion with Complainant's mark. The disputed domain names resolve to commercial websites displaying RIVERBEND RANCH branding and purporting to offer beef and steak products of the same type offered by Complainant. The websites also display branding substantially corresponding to Complainant's RIVERBEND RANCH branding, including the oval logo design. Respondents' use of Complainant's mark in connection with such commercial websites demonstrates an intentional attempt to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement.

B. Respondent

Respondents did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Preliminary Issue: Consolidation of Multiple Respondents

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

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that both of the disputed domain names were registered within a short time of each other, both contain Complainant's trademark, both used the same registrar, both set up a phony website purporting to sell Complainant's products. Given the totality of the evidence the Panel concludes that the disputed domain names are under common control and this case should be consolidated.

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 decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "Respondent") in a single proceeding.

6.2. Substantive Issues

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Complainant has demonstrated it owns long-standing registered trademark rights in the RIVERBEND RANCH mark. The gTLD ".shop" is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such may be disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11. Accordingly, the disputed domain names reproduce the RIVERBEND RANCH mark in its entirety. The addition of the terms "shop" and "steaks quality" do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8.

Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark in which Complainant has rights and the first element of the Policy is established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Complainant has presented a prima facie case that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names and has not been commonly known by the disputed domain names. The fact that Respondent registered the disputed domain names which incorporate Complainant's registered RIVERBEND RANCH trademark and merely adds the terms "shop" and "steaks quality" indicates that Respondent likely sought to impersonate Complainant and piggyback on the mark for illegitimate reasons. Further, Respondent's use of the disputed domain names did not comply with the test laid down in *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. D2001-0903, as the websites did not accurately and prominently disclose Respondent's relationship (or lack thereof) with Complainant.

After a complainant has made a prima facie case, the burden of production shifts to a respondent to present evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. See, e.g., *Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd*., WIPO Case No. D2003-0455.

Here, Respondent has not come forward with any evidence of any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. Moreover, the use of a domain name for illegal activity, such as passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests upon a respondent. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.

In the absence of any evidence rebutting Complainant's prima facie case indicating Respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names, the Panel finds that Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The disputed domain names were registered many years after Complainant first registered and used the RIVERBEND RANCH trademark. The evidence on the record provided by Complainant with respect to the extent of use of the RIVERBEND RANCH trademark is sufficient to satisfy the Panel that, at the time the disputed domain names were registered, Respondent undoubtedly knew of Complainant's RIVERBEND RANCH trademark.

The Panel cannot contemplate any other reason as to why Respondent would have registered the disputed domain names containing the entirety of the RIVERBEND RANCH trademark with the terms "shop" and "steaks quality" other than to target and unfairly benefit from the reputation and goodwill associated with Complainant's mark.

Further, the Panel finds the use of the disputed domain names by Respondent is in bad faith. Paragraph 4(b)(iv) states that evidence of bad faith may include a respondent's use of a domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to respondent's website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with complainant's mark. Complainant has alleged and

provided evidence that Respondent used the disputed domain names to set up websites purported to sell Complainant's meat products which was not authorized. This passing off amounts to bad faith use on the part of Respondent.

In the absence of any evidence or explanation from Respondent, the Panel finds that the only plausible basis for registering and using the disputed domain names has been for illegitimate and bad faith purposes.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(iii) 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 <riverbendranchshop.shop> and <riverbendranchsteaksquality.shop> be transferred to Complainant.

/Colin T. O'Brien/
Colin T. O'Brien
Sole Panelist
Date: November 2, 2026