ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Re-Logic, Inc. v. Willowbank Capital, WBC
Case No. D2026-3985

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Re-Logic, Inc., United States of America ("U.S."), represented by Gray Ice Higdon, PLLC, U.S.

The Respondent is Willowbank Capital, WBC, Canada.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <merchterraria.store> and <terrariaofficial.shop> are registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar") and Porkbun LLC (the "Registrars"), respectively.

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 4, 2026. On September 7, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On September 8, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent ("Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf" / "Whois Privacy – Private by Design, LLC") and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 8, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrars, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The 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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 16, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 6, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 7, 2026.

The Center appointed Mario Soerensen Garcia as the sole panelist in this matter on October 14, 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 Re-Logic, Inc., an Indie gaming development & publishing company, based in Indiana, U.S., founded in 2011.

The Complainant owns the following trademark registrations:

Trademark	Trademark number	Classes
TERRARIA	U.S. Reg. No. 4176854, registered on July 17, 2012.	9, 41
TERRARIA & design	U.S. Reg. No. 6032904, registered on April 14, 2020.	9, 41
TERRARIA & design	U.S. Reg. No. 5206169, registered on May 16, 2017.	16, 18, 25, 28

The Complainant also owns the domain names <terraria.org>, registered on January 21, 2011, and <terraria.shop>, registered on August 12, 2020.

The Respondent is Willowbank Capital, WBC, from Canada.

The disputed domain names were registered on May 29, 2026, and February 10, 2026, respectively; <merchterraria.store> currently redirects to <terrariaofficial.shop>, which advertises and offers for sale products which feature the TERRARIA marks, characters and iconography from the Complainant's Terraria video game (Annexes 3 and 4 of the Complaint).

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 names.

The Complainant argues that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the trademark TERRARIA.

The Complainant submits that there is no evidence that the Respondent has made demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain names for legitimate purposes, nor is there any evidence that the Respondent is using the disputed domain names in connection with any noncommercial or fair use. The Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names.

That being the case, the Complainant finds that the disputed domain names are likely to make Internet users assume that the disputed domain names offer goods/services supplied by the Complainant.

According to the Complainant, it has prior rights over the trademark TERRARIA and has not authorized the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names.

The Complainant's intellectual property rights for TERRARIA trademarks predate the registration of the disputed domain names.

The Complainant argues that the registration and use of the disputed domain names have been conducted in bad faith.

The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain names, and alternatively the cancellation of the disputed domain names.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the following three elements is satisfied:

(i) the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to the 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 names; and

(iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and are 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 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 mark TERRARIA is reproduced within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are 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, "merch" and "official") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms 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 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 names. 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 names, such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

There is no evidence that the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names or that, before any notice of the dispute, the Respondent has made use of, or demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain names or a name corresponding to the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

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 finds that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademarks as the disputed domain names incorporate the TERRARIA marks, and resolve to a website claiming that it is an "Official Terraria merchandise store" offering "official Terraria merch" only. The website to which the disputed domain names resolve also suggests that the Respondent is supported by or affiliated to the Complainant and incorporates a link to the Complainant's official Twitter/X account. Besides, the Complainant's trademark registrations predate the registration dates of the disputed domain names by several years.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here, claimed as passing off, constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under 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 <merchterraria.store> and <terrariaofficial.shop> be transferred to the Complainant**.**

/Mario Soerensen Garcia/
Mario Soerensen Garcia
Sole Panelist
Date: October 28, 2026