ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
COLONIAL GHOSTS LLC, Lance Zaal v. Jerry Carter, Amina Hendricks
Case No. D2026-4083

1. The Parties

Complainants are COLONIAL GHOSTS LLC, and Lance Zaal, United States of America ("United States"), internally represented.

Respondents are Jerry Carter, Amina Hendricks, United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <ghostadventuresclub.shop> and <theusghostadventures.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 10, 2026. On September 11, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On September 14, 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 Complainants on September 14, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting Complainants to either file separate complaints 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. Complainants 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 13, 2026. Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondents' default on October 19, 2026.

The Center appointed Frederick M. Abbott as the sole panelist in this matter on October 21, 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.

By email dated September 16, 2026, Complainants submitted to the Center arguments to establish common control of the disputed domain names by two nominally different domain name registrants. The Panel has determined that the disputed domain names are under common control and will hereafter refer to them as "Respondent" unless otherwise specified. It will elaborate further under Discussion and Findings.

4. Factual Background

Complainant Colonial Ghosts LLC is a limited liability company registered in the State of Virginia, United States. Complainant Lance Zaal is an individual residing in the United States who is owner of Colonial Ghosts LLC. Complainants are collectively hereinafter referred to as "Complainant" unless otherwise specified. Complainant provides guided "ghost tours" and services, and it sells ghost-tour related products. Complainant Lance Zaal is also owner of the United States company Ghost Adventures LLC which provides ghost tours and owns and operates physical locations associated with "paranormal" and/or "true crime" events, and it sells ghost tours related products.[1] Complainant operates a commercial website at domain name <usghostadventures.com>. Complainant indicates that it began doing business under its US GHOST ADVENTURES service mark in late 2019.

Complainant is the owner of registration for the service mark US GHOST ADVENTURES on the Principal Register of the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO"), registration number 6,046,260, registration dated May 5, 2020, in International Class 41, covering "conducting guided tours of historical sites of cities by walking and hiking; conducting guided tours of historical sites of cities by scooter, bicycle or vehicle". Complainant's USPTO registration disclaims the exclusive right to use "US GHOST".

According to the Registrar's verification, Respondent is registrant of the disputed domain names. According to the WhoIs report the disputed domain name <ghostadventuresclub.shop> was registered on April 17, 2026, and the disputed domain name <theusghostadventures.shop> was registered on May 20, 2026.

Respondent has used the disputed domain names to direct Internet users to websites on which they are identified by Complainant's US GHOST ADVENTURES trademark. The "About Us" page at disputed domain name <theusghostadventures.shop> refers in bold letters to "About US Ghost Adventures", describing itself as "a premier provider of professional-grade paranormal investigation equipment and specialized electronic monitoring tools". Each of the websites identified by the disputed domain names offers for sale products that are also offered on Complainant's website. Photos of products are displayed at Respondent's website at the disputed domain name <theusghostadventures.shop>, and a number of these products appear to be identical to Complainant's branded products, incorporating Complainant's distinctive US GHOST ADVENTURES logo. Respondent's website at the disputed domain name <ghostadventuresclub.shop> displays identical product names as Complainant's branded products, but the referenced images are not properly displaying. The products on both websites show prices reflecting discounts from the prices for the same products offered on Complainant's website.[2] The Respondent's website at the disputed domain name

---

[1] Because of Complainant's ownership of United States Ghost Adventures LLC, the Panel treats that additional entity as a controlled affiliated party of Complainant for purposes of this dispute.

[2] Panel's visit to Respondent's websites that the disputed domain names <ghostadventuresclub.shop> and <theusghostadventures.shop> resolve to as of October 23, 2026.

< ghostadventuresclub.shop> include a copyright notice identifying “US Ghost Adventures” as the copyright owner. According to Complainant, several of the paranormal-influenced products referenced on Respondent’s websites are owned by Complainant Lance Zaal. There is no evidence on the record of this proceeding as to how Respondent may have acquired products that appear to be the same as those offered by Complainant at its website.[3]

There is no evidence on the record of this proceeding of any association, commercial or otherwise, between Complainant and Respondent.

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 owns rights in the service mark US GHOST ADVENTURES as evidenced by registration at the USPTO, and as further established as a matter of common law by use in commerce. Complainant alleges that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to Complainant’s trademark.

Complainant argues that Respondent lack rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names because: (1) Respondent has engaged in use of “colorable imitations” of Complainant’s trademark which was famous and/or distinctive prior to registration of the disputed domain names, and; (2) by registering the disputed domain names Respondent has attempted to leverage the source-indicating significance of Complainant’s trademark for its own gain.

Complainant alleges that Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain names in bad faith because: (1) Respondent is intentionally and knowingly using counterfeit versions of Complainant’s mark in connection with websites selling precisely the same products offered by Complainant; (2) Respondent is using spurious designations on goods or services covered by Complainant’s federal trademark registration including through fraudulent websites designed to replicate Complainant’s website; (3) Respondent has used designations knowing that they are counterfeit; (4) Respondent has used Complainant’s trademark to sell goods and/or services without its consent; (5) Respondent has used a counterfeit version of Complainant’s mark on websites in connection with the advertisement promotion and sale of goods or services; (6) Respondent’s use of Complainant’s trademark is likely to cause confusion and lead Internet users to believe that Complainant has authorized or is otherwise affiliated with Respondent’s activities ; (7) it is obvious that Respondent registered the disputed domain names to divert business away from Complainant’s legitimate business, and; (8) Complainant’s trademark was registered before Respondent’s registration of the disputed domain names.

Complainant requests the Panel to direct the Registrar to transfer the disputed domain names to Complainant.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant’s contentions.

[3] In the case of the disputed domain name <ghostadventuresclub.shop> without corresponding images being properly displayed.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy sets forth three elements that must be established by a complainant to merit a finding that a respondent has engaged in abusive domain name registration and use and to obtain relief.

These elements are that:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which complainant has rights;

(ii) 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.

Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are 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 the 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 the websites identified by the disputed domain names bear similar content and each of the disputed domain name registrations uses the same naming conventions for the contact email address.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party. Neither domain name registrant has responded to the Complaint, having been contacted by the Center. The abusive conduct alleged by Complainant applies with equal force to each nominal Respondent and the Panel has assessed their situations in an equivalent way.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants in a single proceeding.

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 3.1, section 1.7.

Complainant has shown rights in respect of the US GHOST ADVENTURES trademark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1. Complainant has also evidenced sufficient use of that trademark in commerce on goods sold through its website to substantiate an extension to unregistered or common law rights for the surrounding field of goods. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.3

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name <ghostadventuresclub.shop>. Accordingly, this disputed domain names is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7. Although the second-level portion of the disputed domain name, <ghostadventuresclub.shop>, differs from US GHOST ADVENTURES, the dominant element of the Complainant's trademark is incorporated in the disputed domain name, and as such the Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name Moreover, although the addition by Respondent of the term "club" in the disputed domain name may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between this disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8.

With respect to the <theusghostadventures.shop> disputed domain name, 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 "the", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between this disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8.

The use of the generic top-level domain ("gTLD") ".shop" in each of the disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity within the meaning of the Policy as such is considered a standard registration requirement. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1.

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 Complainant, panels have recognized that proving that 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 Respondent. As such, where Complainant, as here, makes out a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to Respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names (although the burden of proof always remains on Complainant). If Respondent, as here, fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, Complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. Respondent has not rebutted 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.

Respondent is using the disputed domain names to direct Internet users to websites using Complainant's trademark to identify itself, offering products that are identical to those offered by Complainant under its trademark. Complainant alleges that the products offered on Respondents' websites are using a "counterfeit" trademark, although it has not specifically argued that the products themselves are counterfeit. The Panel construes Complainant's use of the term "counterfeit" in connection with Complainant's trademark to refer to Respondent's use of a trademark identical to Complainant's trademark in connection with the sale of goods. Given the apparent identity of goods offered on Respondent's websites with those offered on Complainant's website, it is unclear to the Panel how Respondent may have come to possess products (or indeed whether Respondent actually possesses them) apparently identical to those offered by Complainant.

Respondent has not responded to Complainant's Complaint and it has not attempted to provide an explanation that might legitimize its conduct. Complainant has argued that Respondent, without its consent or authorization, is using its trademark in connection with the sale of goods that Complainant has not authorized. The fact that Respondent identifies itself using Complainant's trademark strongly suggests that Respondent impersonates Complainant and is acting in bad faith to take advantage of Complainant and its trademark and that it is not making a bona fide offer of goods or services (whether or not prior to notice of this dispute). Nor does Respondent appear to be making a fair commercial or legitimate noncommercial use of the disputed domain names, or to have been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Moreover, even if , Respondent would have acquired the products offered on its websites from Complainant's website and would be acting as a reseller, noting the prominent use of Complainant's distinctive logo and the absence of a disclosure of the lack of relationship with Complainant, the Panel finds that this would also not grant rights or legitimate interests on Respondent. Moreover Respondent is offering apparently identical products on its websites at prices substantially below those at which the same products are offered on Complainant's website. Basic reseller economics suggests it unlikely that Respondent is engaged in the business of "buying high, selling low", and this would also suggest that the disputed domain names could potentially be in use for fraudulent or illegitimate activity.

Under these circumstances, the Panel concludes that Complainant has established that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name within the meaning of the Policy.

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 Respondent registered the disputed domain names that are confusingly similar to Complainant's trademark substantially following Complainant's acquisition of trademark rights. Respondent created websites that make extensive use of Complainant's trademark and offer apparently identical products at significantly discounted prices, some of them bearing Complainant's logo. In these circumstances, the Panel finds that Respondent was, more likely than not, aware of Complainant's trademark when it registered the disputed domain name.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.1.

Respondent offers goods on its websites using Complainant's trademark and, where shown, identical or substantially identical packaging and Complainant's logo. The Panel finds that Respondent has, for commercial gain, registered and used the disputed domain names for purposes of creating confusion as to Complainant acting as the source, sponsor, affiliate or endorser of Respondent's websites. Respondent is most likely diverting Internet users to its websites who might otherwise have been seeking Complainant's website. Respondent has not sought to justify its conduct.

The Panel determines that Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain names in bad faith within the meaning of the Policy, including but not limited to paragraph 4(b)(iv).

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 <ghostadventuresclub.shop> and <theusghostadventures.shop> be transferred to Complainant.

/Frederick M. Abbott/
Frederick M. Abbott
Sole Panelist
Date: October 23, 2026