

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

DoubleTake Archery LLC v. Alex Harrison
Case No. D2026-3974

1. The Parties

The Complainant is DoubleTake Archery LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Taboada Law Firm, PLLC, United States.

The Respondent is Alex Harrison, Ireland.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <halonocks.org> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 4, 2026. On September 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 7, 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 (Private Registration) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 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 September 15, 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 18, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 8, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 12, 2026.

The Center appointed Steven A. Maier as the sole panelist in this matter on October 16, 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 supplier of archery products including illuminated nocks, a nock being the notched component at the end of an arrow which contains a slot for the bowstring. The Complainant's products include illuminated nocks offered under the brand name HALO NOCK.

The Complainant registered the domain name <halonock.com> on December 19, 2022.

On April 17, 2026, the Complainant was awarded the transfer of the domain name <halonocks.com> in a separate proceeding under the UDRP, namely *DoubleTake Archery LLC v. Vadym Bayev*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-0609](#).

The Complainant has used both the domain names <halonock.com> and <halonocks.com> to redirect to its principal website at "www.doubletakearchery.com".

The disputed domain name was registered on May 12, 2026.

The Complainant exhibits evidence that the disputed domain name has resolved to a website headed "Halo Nocks Official Website". The website refers to the Complainant's business, and includes descriptions and images of the Complainant's products, accompanied by buttons marked "Check Price".

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant produces evidence that it has, since at least July 14, 2023, offered products branded as HALO NOCK on its website. It contends that, by virtue of its continuous and extensive use of that name, together with the domain names referred to above, it has obtained unregistered or common law trademark rights in the mark HALO NOCK, which has acquired a meaning which has become distinctive of the Complainant's goods in the marketplace.

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

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to its HALO NOCK trademark.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. It submits that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and is not making either bona fide commercial use nor legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. It asserts that, instead, the Respondent is using the disputed domain name misleadingly to attract Internet users to its website, from which it obtains referral revenues via the Amazon.com Affiliate Program.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. It contends that the disputed domain name is virtually identical to its HALO NOCK trademark and to its <halonock.com> and <halonocks.com> domain names. It points to the Respondent's website content, and

provides additional evidence of the reproduction on that website of a promotional video, entitled “Halo Nock Night Shoot”, taken from the Complainant’s own YouTube channel.

The Complainant asserts that it is clear from the circumstances that the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name in order to create confusion with the Complainant’s trademark, and to obtain advertising revenue via the Amazon Affiliate Program from Internet users who are misleadingly attracted to the Respondent’s website.

The Complainant also provides evidence of 16 prior proceedings under the UDRP against what appears to be the Respondent, dated between March 25, 2025 and August 6, 2026, all of which resulted in the transfer or cancellation of the relevant domain name.

The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In order to succeed in the Complaint, the Complainant is required to show that all three of the elements set out under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are present. Those elements are 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 respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 does not identify any registered trademark rights in this case, but claims to have acquired unregistered or common law trademark rights in the name and mark HALO NOCK by virtue of its extensive use of that mark in commerce.

While the Complainant provides some evidence of the use of the HALO NOCK name to promote its products online since 2023, it would be usual in a case of this nature to provide evidence of matters such as sales revenue, promotional spend, customer numbers, areas of geographical operation, press coverage and social media engagement in support of a claim to have acquired unregistered trademark rights. Save for a passing reference to the Complainant’s YouTube channel, such evidence is lacking in this case. However, despite that deficiency, and in view in particular of the distinctive nature of the HALO NOCK name and evidence of online activity, the Panel is prepared to find that the mark HALO NOCK has become sufficiently distinctive of the Complainant’s goods that the Complainant has acquired unregistered or common law trademark rights in that mark for the purposes of the Policy.

Further, as recognized in section 1.3 of [WIPO Overview 3.1](#):

“The fact that a respondent is shown to have been targeting the complainant’s mark (e.g., based on the manner in which the mark is used on the related website or impersonating documents or other instruments) may also support the complainant’s assertion and evidence that its mark has achieved significance as a source identifier.”

The Panel finds those circumstances clearly to be present in this case.

The Panel also takes notice of the findings in *DoubleTake Archery LLC v. Vadym Bayev*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-0609](#), referred to above, including that the Complainant had acquired unregistered or common law rights in the HALO NOCK mark for the purposes of the Policy.

The disputed domain name comprises the Complainant’s HALO NOCK mark in full, with the addition only of the additional letter “s”, which does not prevent the Complainant’s trademark from being recognizable within the disputed domain name. Noting also that the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.org” may typically be ignored for the purposes of comparison, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark.

The first element under the Policy is therefore 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 finds, moreover, that the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name for the purpose of impersonating the Complainant, and attempting misleadingly to attract Internet users to its website for financial gain. Such circumstances cannot invest the Respondent with rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

The second element under the Policy is therefore established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The disputed domain name is highly similar to the Complainant’s distinctive HALO NOCK trademark, its domain name <halonock.com>, and also its domain name <halonocks.com>, which it appears to have acquired prior to the date of registration of the disputed domain name. The Respondent has provided no explanation for its choice of the disputed domain name, which has been used for the purpose of a website which falsely purports to be an official website of the Complainant, and includes the Complainant’s products together with “Check Price” links. While the Complainant does not produce evidence expressly to

demonstrate the click-through of these links to Amazon pages, the Panel is prepared to infer from all the circumstances that this is the most likely function of the website and that, as the Complainant claims, the Respondent receives revenues by way of the Amazon.com Affiliate Program.

It is clear to the Panel that Internet users are likely to be attracted to the Respondent's website by virtue of the inherently misleading disputed domain name, such confusion being exacerbated by the Respondent's website content which impersonates the Complainant. Accordingly, by using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website or of a product or service on its website (paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy).

The evidence of numerous prior adverse findings against the Respondent, amounting in the Panel's view to a pattern of abusive registrations, further supports the overall impression of bad faith in this case.

The third element under the Policy is therefore established.

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 <halonocks.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Steven A. Maier/

Steven A. Maier

Sole Panelist

Date: October 22, 2026