# Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108575

| | |
|---|---|
| Case number | CAC-UDRP-108575 |
| Time of filing | 2026-06-11 16:00:30 |
| Domain names | thetidycats.com |

## Case administrator

| | |
|---|---|
| Organization | Iveta Špiclová (Czech Arbitration Court) (Case admin) |

## Complainant

| | |
|---|---|
| Organization | Société des Produits Nestlé S.A. |

## Complainant representative

| | |
|---|---|
| Organization | Thomsen Trampedach GmbH |

## Respondent

| | |
|---|---|
| Organization | Genteq Store |

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 relies on registrations of the mark TIDY CATS including:

- US trademark no. 2,284,115 registered on 5 October 1999 in class 16
- EU trademark no. 002771244 registered on 16 December 2003 in class 31
- Swiss trademark no. 506107 filed on 23 December 2002 in class 31

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, together with its affiliates and licensees, is one of the leading producers of pet products in the world. They or their predecessors have used the PURINA mark in relation to a variety of products including pet food and accessories. One of the most popular PURINA product lines is the TIDY CATS brand, which the Complainant, its affiliates and licensees, or its predecessors, have used for over five decades.

The Complainant is the registered proprietor of the trademarks identified above.

There are dedicated TIDY CATS pages on Facebook, Instagram and YouTube. The Facebook page has over 520,000 followers. There is also a dedicated TIDY CATS page on the Complainants' website at www.purina.com and on Amazon's website at

www.amazon.com.

The disputed domain name was registered on 22 September 2025 and locates a website offering cat litters and related products. The name "Tidy Cats" is extensively used on this website and the mark PURINA is also used.

## 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 disputed domain name consists of the entirety of the Complainant's registered mark, preceded by the generic word "the" and followed by the generic top level domain suffix, .com.

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

## NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The disputed domain name locates a website which sells pet products using the name "Tidy Cats". It is not clear whether any of the products offered on this website have been placed on the market by the Complainant or its affiliates or licensees. However, it is not disputed that the Complainant has not authorised this website, and the website does not make it clear that it is unauthorised. On the contrary, by its use of the disputed domain name and of the name "Tidy Cats" on this website, the Respondent represents misleadingly that the website is authorised by the Complainant. In these circumstances, the Panel does not regard the Respondent's use of the disputed domain or the name Tidy Cats as use for a bona fide offering of goods or services.

On the available evidence, the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name or any corresponding name, and there is no basis for any claim by the Respondent of legitimate non-commercial or fair use.

In the circumstances 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

As stated above, the Respondent has represented misleadingly that its website, located by the disputed domain name, is authorised by the Complainant, when it is not so authorised. Moreover, it is clear from the content of the Respondent's website that the Respondent is aware of the Claimant's TIDY CATS brand.

In these circumstances, the Panel finds that, by using the disputed domain, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of its website. In accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy this constitute evidence of registration and use in bad faith. There is no evidence displacing this presumption.

Accordingly, 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

The disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's long-established, registered mark, TIDY CATS, preceded by the definite

article and followed by the generic top level domain name suffix. The Panel finds that it is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark. The Respondent purports to offer goods of the Complainant and/or goods competing with them on its website located by the disputed domain name, but this is not a bona fide offering as the Respondent misleadingly represents that it is authorised to use the Complainant's mark. Applying the presumption in paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, the Panel considers that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed name in bad faith.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **thetidycats.com**: Transferred

## PANELLISTS

| Name | **Jonathan Turner** |
|---|---|

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-07-24

Publish the Decision