

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108692

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108692
Time of filing	2026-06-02 09:39:10
Domain names	thenuclearblast.shop, buynuclearblastrecords.shop, nuclearblastworld.shop

Case administrator

Name	Olga Dvořáková (Case admin)
------	-----------------------------

Complainant

Organization	Nuclear Blast GmbH
--------------	--------------------

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.
--------------	-------------------

Respondents

Name	scott hill
Name	Jacob Stewart
Name	Laura Parker

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 names.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant has evidenced to be the owner of various trademark registrations relating to its NUCLEAR BLAST company name and brand, including, but not limited to, the following:

- word trademark NUCLEAR BLAST, European Union Intellectual Property Office ("EUIPO"), registration No.: 010941854, registration date: October 1, 2012, status: active.

Also, the Complainant has demonstrated to own since 2000 the domain name <nuclearblast.com> which resolves to the Complainant's official website at "www.nuclearblast.com", used to promote the Complainant's products and services in the metal music industry.

The disputed domain names were registered as follows: <buynuclearblastrecords.shop> on May 12, 2026, <nuclearblastworld.shop> on May 14, 2026, and <thenuclearblast.shop> on April 13, 2026,

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain names 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 names are 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 Respondents to have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names (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 names have been registered and are 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 has accepted this single Complaint relating to three disputed domain names registered by three different Respondents given that (1) all disputed domain names were set up in a similar way by combining the Complainant's entire NUCLEAR BLAST trademark with other descriptive terms or additional components and under the same generic top-level domain .shop, (2) all disputed domain names were registered in a close temporal connection (e.g. between April 13, 2026 and May 14, 2026) through the same Registrar, (3) all Respondents use similar Outlook email addresses (with the form <unrelatedname+number@outlook.com>), and (4) all disputed domain names resolve to similar websites which prominently display the Complainant's NUCLEAR BLAST trademark and pretend to offer records and other products relating to Metal Music, thereby obviously impersonating the Complainant; these factors, in turn, allow this Panel to conclude that all three disputed domain names are subject to some common control (paragraph 3(c) of the Rules).

Second, the Panel finds that all disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's NUCLEAR BLAST trademark, as they all incorporate the latter in its entirety, simply added by e.g. a variety of descriptive terms, e.g. "records" and "world". 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 "records" and "world") is not capable to dispel the confusing similarity arising from such entire incorporation of the Complainant's NUCLEAR BLAST trademark in the disputed domain names.

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

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

The Respondents are neither affiliated with the Complainant, nor have they been authorized to use the Complainant's NUCLEAR BLAST trademark, either as a domain name or in any other way. Also, there is no reason to believe that the Respondents' names somehow correspond with the disputed domain names, and the Respondents do not appear to have any trademark rights associated with the terms "nuclear" and/or "blast" on their own. Finally, all disputed domain names resolve to similar websites

which prominently display the Complainant's NUCLEAR BLAST trademark and pretend to offer records and other products relating to metal music, thereby obviously impersonating the Complainant. Such use of the disputed domain names that aims at somehow unduly profiting from the Complainant's NUCLEAR BLAST trademark's reputation, neither qualifies as a bona fide nor as a legitimate noncommercial or fair use under the UDRP. Also, UDRP panels widely agree that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here: the Complainant's impersonation/passing off by the Respondent for some unlawful purpose) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names, 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 names were registered and are being used by the Respondents in bad faith.

It is undisputed between the Parties that the Complainant's NUCLEAR BLAST trademark enjoys relevant reputation in the metal music industry. Moreover, the fact alone that all disputed domain names resolve to similar websites which prominently display the Complainant's NUCLEAR BLAST trademark and pretend to offer records and other products relating to metal music, thereby obviously impersonating the Complainant, clearly demonstrates that the Respondents were well aware of the Complainant's business and its rights in the undisputedly well-reputed NUCLEAR BLAST trademark when registering the disputed domain names, and that the latter are targeting the Complainant and its trademark. These factors, in turn, allow the Panel to find that the Respondents intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to their own websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's NUCLEAR BLAST trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the Respondents' own websites. Such circumstances are evidence of registration and use of the disputed domain names in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. Also, UDRP panels have long held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, Complainant's impersonation/passing off by Respondent) constitutes bad faith, too.

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. **thenuclearblast.shop**: Transferred
2. **buynuclearblastrecords.shop**: Transferred
3. **nuclearblastworld.shop**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Stephanie Hartung
------	--------------------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION **2026-07-06**

Publish the Decision
