

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

RezPlot Systems, LLC d/b/a Campspot v. Oneandone Private Registration,  
1&1 Internet Inc, Laura Glaab, Olli-Loup LLC  
Case No. DAI2025-0065

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is RezPlot Systems, LLC d/b/a Campspot, United States of America (“United States”), internally represented.

The Respondents are Oneandone Private Registration, 1&1 Internet Inc., United States / Laura Glaab, Olli-Loup LLC, United States, internally represented.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <campspot.ai> is registered with Internetx GmbH (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 5, 2025. On December 5 and 12, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 9 and 19, 2025, 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 (PrivateName, Services, Inc.) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 22, 2025, 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 amendment to the Complaint on December 30, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 January 5, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 25, 2026. Third Party email communications, from

persons somehow connected to the Respondent, were received by the Center on January 21, 23, and 26, 2026.

The Center appointed W. Scott Blackmer as the sole panelist in this matter on February 5, 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 limited liability company organized under the laws of the State of Michigan and headquartered in Grand Rapids, Michigan, United States. The Complainant provides a searchable online business directory of lodging locations and descriptions for tent sites, recreational vehicles, and other outdoor accommodations via several websites, including one at “www.campspot.com” (the Complainant’s website). The Panel notes that the Internet Archive’s Wayback Machine has screen captures of the Complainant’s website dated from December 2015 onward.<sup>1</sup>

The Complainant holds United States Trademark Registration Number 6549313 (registered on November 2, 2021) for CAMPSPOT as a word mark in International Class 35 on the Supplemental Register of the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”), claiming first use in commerce on December 19, 2015. As indicated in the USPTO Nonfinal Office Action on September 16, 2021, the registration on the Supplemental Register followed from the USPTO examiner’s conclusion that the mark was not registrable on the Principal Register because it was merely descriptive but was capable of acquiring distinctiveness over time.

The disputed domain name was created on July 10, 2025, and is registered in the name of the Respondent Oneandone Private Registration, listing the organization 1&1 Internet Inc. The Panel notes that the domain services provider “1&1” (now “IONOS”, see the “About” page at “www.ionos.com”) is part of the publicly traded IONOS Group SE based in Germany, a large digital hosting and Internet services group.

The Registration details provided by the Registrar listed Laura Glaab of Olli-Loup LLC as the Registrant Contact, with a postal address in the State of Colorado, United States. The Complainant added Laura Glaab and Olli-Loup LLC as Respondents, although they are not expressly identified as the underlying registrant behind the private registration of the disputed domain name. The Response was filed by counsel for Olli-Loup LLC, and the online database of the Colorado Secretary of State shows that this is a Colorado limited liability company formed on June 2, 2020, with Laura Glaab as registered agent. The state database shows that this company became delinquent for failure to file a periodic report in 2022 but that this was cured in January 2026 and the company’s status is now listed as in “good standing”.

The private registration service of 1&1 Internet Inc. (or IONOS) has expressed no interest in this proceeding, and the Panel refers hereafter to Laura Glaab and Olli-Loup LLC collectively as the “Respondent”.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website headed “Campspot.ai” with the tagline, “Your Spot for Camping Gear and Adventure!” followed by this explanatory text:

“Our Boulder, CO, based team uses AI to develop exceptional camping apparel crafted for adventurers. Elevate your outdoor experience with quality and style. Shop now.”

---

<sup>1</sup> Noting the general powers of a panel articulated in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, it is commonly accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record, as the Panel has done in these proceedings. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), section 4.8.

Although the website is replete with photos of men and women in the outdoors and includes “rave reviews” from putative customers, there are no specific product descriptions, and there is no e-commerce facility to made orders or purchases of apparel online. The website operator is not identified. A “Contact” button allows site visitors to send an email to [...]@campspot.ai.

The Complainant attaches a screenshot of the website to which the disputed domain name previously redirected, a landing page at “www.mountainstandard.com” that simply promised, “The next big thing is coming ... and it’s going to be the GOAT” (an abbreviation for “greatest of all time”). This text appeared over a close-up photo of gloved hands sawing a tree branch. The landing page also invited visitors to enter their email addresses to get updates about “our 2024 Fall Relaunch”.

## **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 identical to its registered CAMPSPOT trademark, which the Respondent or its client has never used in business. The Complainant also contends that it “registered the mark in 2015” and that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name and redirected it to “the competing business” in July 2025. The Complainant further contends that “there is no valid use of the website campspot.ai other than to divert business from the trademark holder to the competing business”.

### **B. Respondent**

The Respondent’s reply is in the form of emails, lacking the certification of accuracy and completeness required by the Rules, which the Panel must take into account.

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied all of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name. The Respondent argues that “camp” and “spot” are dictionary words that the Respondent legitimately uses in its tag line, “Your Spot for Camping Gear and Adventure”, to sell camping apparel and equipment. The Respondent asserts that it is currently “relaunching” its outdoor apparel business, based in Boulder, Colorado, where its company has been registered since 2020, pointing to its federal tax registration and its registration with the Colorado Secretary of State. The Respondent denies that this business in “hard goods” competes with the Complainant’s software business to manage trailer park space rentals in recreational areas.

The Respondent states that it had no prior knowledge of the Complainant until the Complainant’s representative contacted the Respondent. The Respondent also states that the Complainant’s representative said he had no issue signing a non-compete agreement.

The Respondent suggests that the Complainant has no reasonable claim to a “generic camping term” or one using the .ai TLD (Top-Level Domain), as the Complainant is not evidently using artificial intelligence as the Respondent is for its website.

The Respondent requests a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking (RDNH).

## **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 3.1](#) section 1.7.

The Complainant has not shown rights in respect of a registered trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1. Registration on the USPTO Supplemental Register indicates that a mark is inherently descriptive but capable of acquiring distinctiveness ("secondary meaning"). Therefore, like an unregistered mark, it requires supporting evidence that it has done so. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.2. Notably, the Complainant has not applied to the USPTO to register the CAMPSPOT mark on the Principal Register since obtaining registration on the Supplemental Register on November 2, 2021.

The Panel does not find that the Complainant has established unregistered trademark or service mark rights for the purposes of the Policy. The Panel notes the descriptive nature of the mark and the fact that the USPTO found it unregistrable on the Principal Register even after nearly six years of use online. The Complaint offered no evidence of sales or consumer recognition in this proceeding to support a common law trademark claim. The Panel notes that the Complainant's website does link to some media advertising and news stories. However, given the descriptive nature of the mark and the USPTO decision, this is insufficient to meet the requirements for a finding of probable common law protection for UDRP purposes. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.3.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has not been established.

This finding on the first element is dispositive, but the Panel offers guidance on the other two elements for the benefit of the Parties.

### **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

The Respondent Olli-Loup LLC was evidently not a company in good standing with the Colorado Secretary of State at the time it registered the disputed domain name, and neither has a name corresponding to the disputed domain name. The Respondent's website, posted by an AI website developer, is non-functional except for allowing emails to be sent to the Respondent. The Respondent has not furnished evidence beyond this of an actual retail business in operation or under development before notice of the dispute ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.2).

However, the Respondent could claim a legitimate interest in making relevant use of the dictionary meaning of the terms comprising the disputed domain name, as long as this was not likely a pretext for exploiting a trademark of the Complainant; see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.10. Thus, and assuming it could satisfactorily address the Complainant's claims that it was merely a competitor seeking to divert confused customers, the Respondent may prevail on this element of the Complaint.

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

The Complainant must predicate the inference of bad faith on the Respondent's likely intent to exploit the Complainant's trademark. The Complainant first asserts that it registered its mark in 2015, which is clearly not true but can perhaps be chalked up to a pro se/non-legal misunderstanding of trademark prosecution and registration practice; it began to use the name CAMPSPOT in 2015, and the USPTO found that it was descriptive and had not acquired secondary meaning by 2021. The Complainant then states that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in 2025 and redirected it to a "competing business",.

Apart from the fact that the Complainant has failed to establish that it had a protectible common law mark at that time, the problem is that the Complainant assumes that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant's brand and intended to exploit it. The Respondent denies prior awareness of the Complainant, and this denial is plausible. The disputed domain name is descriptive and composed of dictionary terms, and the Respondent is not in the same market. The Complainant has not established that it is so well known that the Respondent's denial of knowledge simply lacks credibility. The Complainant bears the burden of proof, and on this record the Panel would have to find for the Respondent on this element of the Complaint.

#### **D. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking**

Paragraph 15(e) of the Rules provides that, if after considering the submissions, the Panel finds that the Complaint was brought in bad faith, for example in an attempt at Reverse Domain Name Hijacking or to harass the domain-name holder, the Panel shall declare in its decision that the Complaint was brought in bad faith and constitutes an abuse of the administrative proceeding. The mere lack of success of the complaint is not, on its own, sufficient to constitute reverse domain name hijacking. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.16.

It does not appear that either Party has had the benefit of UDRP experienced counsel, and the Panel does not find on this record that the Complaint has been brought in bad faith and constitutes an attempt at Reverse Domain Name Hijacking.

#### **7. Decision**

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

*/W. Scott Blackmer/*

**W. Scott Blackmer**

Sole Panelist

Date: February 20, 2026