Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108133

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108133
Time of filing	2025-11-09 23:34:46
Domain names	chewydogshome.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Chewy, Inc.

Complainant representative

Organization	RODENBAUGH LAW LLC

Respondent

Name	Pedro Bittingawes

OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The Panel is not aware of any other legal proceedings which are pending or decided, and which relate to the disputed domain name.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant has evidenced to be the owner of the following trademark registration relating to its CHEWY company name and brand:

- word trademark CHEWY, United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), registration No.: 5,028,009, registration date: August 23, 2016, status: active;

- word trademark CHEWY.COM, USPTO, registration No.: 4,346,308, registration date: June 4, 2013, status: active.

Also, the Complainant has demonstrated to own since April 2004 the domain name <chewy.com> which resolves to the Complainant's official website at "www.chewy.com" used to promote the Complainant's goods and services in the online retail industry focusing on pet supplies and pet wellness-related services.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The disputed domain name was registered on October 9, 2025. By the time of the rendering of this decision, it resolves to a typical landing page provided by the Registrar. The Complainant, however, has demonstrated that at some point before the filing of the Complaint, e.g. on November 5, 2025, the disputed domain name resolved to a website at "www.chewydogshome.com" which

purported to offer dog supplies for online sale, including products under the brand “Frisco” which are undisputedly proprietary products sold exclusively by the Complainant. Such a website apparently does not contain any disclaimer on to the non-existing business relationship between the Parties.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain name should be transferred to it.

No administratively compliant Response has been filed.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy).

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the Respondent to have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy).

BAD FAITH

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy).

PROCEDURAL FACTORS

The Panel is satisfied that all procedural requirements under UDRP were met and there is no other reason why it would be inappropriate to provide a decision.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

First, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s CHEWY trademark, as it incorporates the latter in its entirety, simply added by the descriptive terms “dogs” and “home”. Numerous UDRP panels have recognized that incorporating a trademark in its entirety can be sufficient to establish that the disputed domain name is at least confusingly similar to a registered trademark. Moreover, it has also been held in many UDRP decisions and has meanwhile become a consensus view among UDRP panels that the mere addition of descriptive or other terms (such as e.g. the terms “dogs” and “home”) is not capable of dispelling the confusing similarity arising from such entire incorporation of the Complainant’s CHEWY trademark in the disputed domain name.

Therefore, the Complainant has established the first element under the Policy as set forth by paragraph 4(a)(i).

Second, the Complainant contends, and the Respondent has not objected to these contentions, that the Respondent has neither made use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor is the Respondent commonly known under the disputed domain name, nor is the Respondent making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name without intent for commercial gain.

The Respondent is neither affiliated with the Complainant, nor has it been authorized to use the Complainant’s CHEWY trademark, either as a domain name or in any other way. Also, there is no reason to believe that the Respondent’s name somehow corresponds with the disputed domain name, and the Respondent does not appear to have any trademark rights associated with the terms “chewy” and/or “chewydogshome” on its own. Finally, the Complainant has demonstrated that – at some point before the filing of the Complaint, e.g. on November 5, 2025 – the disputed domain name resolved to a website at “www.chewydogshome.com” which purported to offer dog supplies for online sale, including products under the brand “Frisco” which are undisputedly proprietary products sold exclusively by the Complainant. Such use of the disputed domain name, obviously in a manner that aims at somehow unduly profiting from the Complainant’s CHEWY trademark’s reputation, neither qualifies as a bona fide nor as a legitimate

noncommercial or fair use under the UDRP, not even under the so-called Oki Data test which would have required the Respondent e.g. to disclose the non-existing business relationship between the Parties which the Respondent clearly did not.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, and that, therefore, the Complainant has also satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) and, thus, the second element of the Policy.

Finally, the Panel holds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used by the Respondent in bad faith.

It is obvious from the circumstances of this case that the Respondent was well aware of the Complainant's business in the pet supplies and pet wellness-related services industry and its rights in the undisputedly reputed CHEWY trademark when registering the disputed domain name, and that the latter is directly targeting the Complainant and such reputed trademark. Moreover, resolving the disputed domain name to a website at "www.chewydogshome.com" which purported to offer dog supplies for online sale, including products under the brand "Frisco" which are undisputedly proprietary products sold exclusively by the Complainant, leaves no doubt that the Respondent, by registering and using the disputed domain name, had the intention to somehow unduly profit from the reputation attached to the Complainant's CHEWYI trademark, and, thus, the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its own website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's CHEWYI trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the Respondent's own website. Such circumstances are evidence of registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Therefore, the Complainant has also satisfied the third element under the Policy as set forth by paragraph 4(a)(iii).

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

AND THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME(S) IS (ARE) TO BE

1. **chewydogshome.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Stephanie Hartung**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-12-10

Publish the Decision