



NATIONAL ARBITRATION FORUM

DECISION

Deckers Outdoor Corporation v. Karen McDougall, Frances Kirwan, Richard Abbots, Nicola Hammill, Sadika Ekemen, Stephen Gould, Christina Papadaki, Felicity Poole, Wang Changgui and [redacted]
Claim Number: FA0908001281082

PARTIES

Complainant is **Deckers Outdoor Corporation** (“Complainant”), represented by **Justin R. Gaudio**, of **Greer, Burns & Crain, Ltd.**, Illinois, USA. The Respondents named in the Complaint are **Karen McDougall, Frances Kirwan, Richard Abbots, Nicola Hammill, Sadika Ekemen, Stephen Gould, Christina Papadaki, Felicity Poole, Wang Changgui and [redacted]** (collectively “Respondents”), United Kingdom, the United States and Hong Kong.

REGISTRAR AND DISPUTED DOMAIN NAMES

The domain names at issue are <buyituggboots.com>, <uggboots-uk.com>, <buyituggboots.net>, <uggbootsweb.com>, <buyuggbootsnow.com>, <ugg-ca.com>, <buyuggbootsnow.net>, <ugg-eu.com>, <selluggboots.net>, <uggeuro.com>, <uggaustralia-euro.com>, <ugg-euro.com>, <uggaustralia-uk.com>, <uggonline-uk.com>, <uggboots2u.com>, <uggstore-uk.com>, and <uggboots-au.com>, registered with **Todaynic.com, Inc.**

PANEL

The undersigned certifies that he has acted independently and impartially and to the best of his knowledge has no known conflict in serving as Panelist in this proceeding.

Bruce E. Meyerson as Panelist.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Complainant submitted a Complaint to the National Arbitration Forum electronically on August 24, 2009; the National Arbitration Forum received a hard copy of the Complaint on August 25, 2009.

After numerous requests, the Registrar, Todaynic.com, Inc., has not confirmed to the National Arbitration that the <buyituggboots.com>, <uggboots-uk.com>, <buyituggboots.net>, <uggbootsweb.com>, <buyuggbootsnow.com>, <ugg-ca.com>, <buyuggbootsnow.net>, <ugg-eu.com>, <selluggboots.net>, <uggeuro.com>, <uggaustralia-euro.com>, <ugg-euro.com>, <uggaustralia-uk.com>, <uggonline-uk.com>, <uggboots2u.com>, <uggstore-uk.com>, and <uggboots-au.com> domain names are registered with Todaynic.com, Inc. or that any Respondent is the current registrant of any of the foregoing names. Registrar’s non-compliance has been reported to ICANN. The FORUM’s standing instructions are to proceed with this dispute.

On September 11, 2009, a Notification of Complaint and Commencement of Administrative

Proceeding (the “Commencement Notification”), setting a deadline of October 1, 2009 by which Respondents could file a Response to the Complaint, was transmitted to all Respondents via e-mail, post and fax, to all entities and persons listed on each Respondent’s registration as technical, administrative and billing contacts, and to postmaster@buyituggboots.com, postmaster@uggboots-uk.com, postmaster@buyituggboots.net, postmaster@uggbootsweb.com, postmaster@buyuggbootsnow.com, postmaster@ugg-ca.com, postmaster@buyuggbootsnow.net, postmaster@ugg-eu.com, postmaster@selluggboots.net, postmaster@uggeuro.com, postmaster@uggaustralia-euro.com, postmaster@ugg-euro.com, postmaster@uggaustralia-uk.com, postmaster@uggonline-uk.com, postmaster@uggboots2u.com, postmaster@uggstore-uk.com, and postmaster@uggboots-au.com by e-mail.

Although all Respondents received proper notice of the Complaint, only [redacted] submitted a Response. This matter was determined to be complete on October 1, 2009.

On October 14, 2009, pursuant to Complainant’s request to have the dispute decided by a single-member Panel, the National Arbitration Forum appointed Bruce E. Meyerson as Panelist.

RELIEF SOUGHT

Complainant requests that the domain names be transferred from Respondents to Complainant.

PARTIES’ CONTENTIONS

A. Complainant makes the following assertions:

1. Respondents’ <buyituggboots.com>, <uggboots-uk.com>, <buyituggboots.net>, <uggbootsweb.com>, <buyuggbootsnow.com>, <ugg-ca.com>, <buyuggbootsnow.net>, <ugg-eu.com>, <selluggboots.net>, <uggeuro.com>, <uggaustralia-euro.com>, <ugg-euro.com>, <uggaustralia-uk.com>, <uggonline-uk.com>, <uggboots2u.com>, <uggstore-uk.com>, and <uggboots-au.com> domain names are confusingly similar to Complainant’s marks.
2. Respondents do not have any rights or legitimate interests in the <buyituggboots.com>, <uggboots-uk.com>, <buyituggboots.net>, <uggbootsweb.com>, <buyuggbootsnow.com>, <ugg-ca.com>, <buyuggbootsnow.net>, <ugg-eu.com>, <selluggboots.net>, <uggeuro.com>, <uggaustralia-euro.com>, <ugg-euro.com>, <uggaustralia-uk.com>, <uggonline-uk.com>, <uggboots2u.com>, <uggstore-uk.com>, and <uggboots-au.com> domain names.
3. Respondents registered and used the <buyituggboots.com>, <uggboots-uk.com>, <buyituggboots.net>, <uggbootsweb.com>, <buyuggbootsnow.com>, <ugg-ca.com>, <buyuggbootsnow.net>, <ugg-eu.com>, <selluggboots.net>, <uggeuro.com>, <uggaustralia-euro.com>, <ugg-euro.com>, <uggaustralia-uk.com>, <uggonline-uk.com>, <uggboots2u.com>, <uggstore-uk.com>, and <uggboots-au.com> domain names in bad faith.

B. Only one Respondent submitted a Response in this proceeding and that Respondent disclaimed any interest in one of the domain names.

FINDINGS

Complainant holds trademark registrations of the UGG mark with the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”) (Reg. No. 3,050,925 issued Jan. 2, 2006), IP Australia (Reg. No. 130,017 issued March 14, 1990), and the United Kingdom Patent Office (“UKPO”) (Reg. No. 1,409,721 issued Jan. 31, 2001). Complainant also has rights in the UGG AUSTRALIA mark via its registrations of the mark with, among other international trademark authorities, IP Australia (Reg. No. 785,466 issued Aug. 2, 2000) and the UKPO (Reg. No. 2,373,334 issued Sept. 18, 2004).

The <uggstore-uk.com> domain name was registered on December 8, 2008 by the Respondent who disclaimed any interest in this domain name. The following domain names were registered by Karen McDougall on the following dates.

<uggaustralia-euro.com>	November 16, 2008
<uggboots-au.com>	July 16, 2008
<uggboots-uk.com>	July 22, 2008
<uggbootswb.com>	November 16, 2008
<ugg-euro.com>	July 10, 2008
<uggonline-uk.com>	August 11, 2008

The websites resolving from the disputed domain names are commercial websites selling counterfeits of Complainant’s goods.

DISCUSSION

Preliminary Issue: Multiple Respondents

Complainant has alleged that the entities which control the domain names at issue are effectively controlled by the same person and/or entity, which is operating under several aliases. Paragraph 3I of the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”) provides that a “complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.” The Panel finds that Complainant has not sufficiently presented evidence demonstrating that the listed entities are jointly controlled, and thus the Panel, under the National Arbitration Forum’s Supplemental Rule 4(f)(ii), is required to dismiss the Complaint as to all Respondents except Karen McDougall. Thus, the Panel will limit this proceeding to the following domain names registered by Karen McDougall: <uggboots-uk.com>, <uggbootswb.com>, <uggaustralia-euro.com>, <ugg-euro.com>, <uggonline-uk.com>, and <uggboots-au.com>.

Preliminary Issue: Identity Theft

A response was submitted to the Complainant by the party who allegedly registered the <uggstore-uk.com> domain name. That Response stated the following:

My association with this website lies solely in the purchase of a pair of boots in November 2008. My home address is obviously linked to the site in order to receive shipment of said boots. Other than one e-mail contact to inquire about the shipment date, I have no association with the party in question.

The **<uggstore-uk.com>** domain name was registered on December 8, 2008. The Panel concludes that this Respondent was a victim of identity theft, and accordingly, the Panel chooses to redact this Respondent's personal information from the decision to prevent the further victimization of this Respondent. In *Wells Fargo & Co. v. John Doe as Holder of Domain Name <wellzfargo.com>*, FA 362108 (Nat. Arb. Forum Dec. 30, 2004) and *Wells Fargo & Co. v. John Doe as Holder of Domain Name <wellsfargossl>*, FA 453727 (Nat. Arb. Forum May 19, 2005), the panels omitted the respondents' personal information from the decisions in an attempt to protect the respondents who claimed to be victims of identity theft from becoming aligned with acts the actual registrants appeared to have sought to impute to the respondents. *See also National Westminster Bank plc v. [Redacted]*, FA 1028337 (Nat. Arb. Forum July 25, 2007).

This Respondent submitted a Response asserting that she/he did not register the disputed domain name, but rather an unknown third-party using Respondent's identity must have registered the **<uggstore-uk.com>** domain name. Respondent asserts she/he has no relation to the **<uggstore-uk.com>** domain name. Under these circumstances, the Panel infers that this Respondent, and Complainant, have consented to a transfer of the **<uggstore-uk.com>** domain name. As to this Respondent, the Panel chooses to forego the traditional UDRP analysis of the **<uggstore-uk.com>** domain name and orders the immediate transfer of the domain name without a decision on the merits. *See Boehringer Ingelheim Int'l GmbH v. Modern Ltd. – Cayman Web Dev.*, FA 133625 (Nat. Arb. Forum Jan. 9, 2003) (transferring the domain name registration where the respondent stipulated to the transfer); *see also Malev Hungarian Airlines, Ltd. v. Vertical Axis Inc.*, FA 212653 (Nat Arb. Forum Jan. 13, 2004) ("In this case, the parties have both asked for the domain name to be transferred to the Complainant . . . Since the requests of the parties in this case are identical, the Panel has no scope to do anything other than to recognize the common request, and it has no mandate to make findings of fact or of compliance (or not) with the Policy.").

Applicable Rules

According to Policy ¶ 4(j), "[a]ll decisions under this Policy will be published in full over the Internet, except when an Administrative Panel determines in an exceptional case to redact portions of its decision." The Panel has determined that under the circumstances of the present case, including the claim of identity theft by Respondent, the redaction of this Respondent's personal information from the Panel's decision is warranted.

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Rules") instructs this Panel to "decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable."

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that the Complainant must prove each of the following three elements to obtain an order that a domain name should be cancelled or transferred:

- (1) the domain name registered by the Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (2) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and
- (3) the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Identical and/or Confusingly Similar

Complainant submitted evidence that it holds trademark registrations of the UGG mark with the

United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”) (Reg. No. 3,050,925 issued Jan. 2, 2006), IP Australia (Reg. No. 130,017 issued March 14, 1990), and the United Kingdom Patent Office (“UKPO”) (Reg. No. 1,409,721 issued Jan. 31, 2001). The holding of over 100 trademark registrations of the UGG mark around the world establishes Complainant’s rights in the UGG mark under Policy ¶ 4(a)(i). *See The Royal Bank of Scot. Group plc v. TRB*, FA 622345 (Nat. Arb. Forum Feb. 22, 2006) (“The Panel accepts Complainant’s registration of the THE ROYAL BANK OF SCOTLAND mark with the United Kingdom Patent Office as evidence of Complainant’s rights in the mark pursuant to Policy ¶ 4(a)(i).”); *see also Miller Brewing Co. v. Miller Family*, FA 104177 (Nat. Arb. Forum Apr. 15, 2002) (finding that the complainant had established rights to the MILLER TIME mark through its federal trademark registrations).

Complainant also asserts that it has rights in the UGG AUSTRALIA mark via its registrations of the mark with, among other international trademark authorities, IP Australia (Reg. No. 785,466 issued Aug. 2, 2000) and the UKPO (Reg. No. 2,373,334 issued Sept. 18, 2004). The Panel finds that Complainant’s registrations of the UGG AUSTRALIA mark establishes its rights in this mark under Policy ¶ 4(a)(i). *See The Royal Bank of Scot. Group plc, supra*; *see also Morgan Stanley v. Fitz-James*, FA 571918 (Nat. Arb. Forum Nov. 29, 2005) (finding from a preponderance of the evidence that the complainant had registered its mark with national trademark authorities, the Panel determined that “such registrations present a *prima facie* case of Complainant’s rights in the mark for purposes of Policy ¶ 4(a)(i).”).

Complainant argues that <ugg-euro.com> domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant’s UGG mark under Policy ¶ 4(a)(i). This domain name contains Complainant’s UGG mark, a geographic identifier, and the generic top-level domain (“gTLD”) “.com.” The domain name also uses a hyphen between Complainant’s UGG mark and the geographic term. The Panel finds that the <ugg-euro.com> domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant’s UGG mark under Policy ¶ 4(a)(i). *See Isleworth Land Co. v. Lost in Space, SA*, FA 117330 (Nat. Arb. Forum Sept. 27, 2002) (“[I]t is a well established principle that generic top-level domains are irrelevant when conducting a Policy ¶ 4(a)(i) analysis.”); *see also Health Devices Corp. v. Aspen S T C*, FA 158254 (Nat. Arb. Forum July 1, 2003) (“[T]he addition of punctuation marks such as hyphens is irrelevant in the determination of confusing similarity pursuant to Policy ¶ 4(a)(i).”); *see also Expedia, Inc. v. Mandanice*, FA 146598 (Nat. Arb. Forum Apr. 7, 2003) (finding that the <expedia-uk.com> domain name was confusingly similar to the complainant’s EXPEDIA mark).

Complainant contends that the <uggbootsweb.com>, domain name is confusingly similar to its UGG mark. These disputed domain name is made up of the Complainant’s UGG mark, the gTLD “.com” or “.net,” the word “boots” (which has an obvious relationship to Complainant’s footwear business), and the generic word “web.” The Panel finds that this disputed domain names is confusingly similar to Complainant’s UGG mark under Policy ¶ 4(a)(i). *See Whitney Nat’l Bank v. Easynet Ltd*, FA 944330 (Nat. Arb. Forum Apr. 30, 2007) (“The additions of generic words with an obvious relationship to Complainant’s business and a gTLD renders the disputed domain name confusingly similar to Complainant’s mark pursuant to Policy ¶ 4(a)(i).”); *see also AOL LLC v. iTech Ent, LLC*, FA 726227 (Nat. Arb. Forum July 21, 2006) (finding that the <theotheraol.com> and <theotheraol.net> domain names were confusingly similar to the AOL mark, as the addition of common terms to a mark does not distinguish the domain names from the mark).

The <uggonline-uk.com>, and <uggstore-uk.com> domain names consist of Complainant’s UGG mark, a descriptive or generic word (“boots,” “online,” or “store”), the geographic abbreviations “uk,” and the gTLD “.com.” The <uggonline-uk.com> and <uggstore-uk.com>

domain names insert a hyphen between the generic word and the geographic abbreviation. Complainant contends these additions are insufficient to distinguish the disputed domain names from Complainant's UGG mark for the purposes of Policy ¶ 4(a)(i). The Panel agrees that these two disputed domain names are confusingly similar to Complainant's UGG mark under Policy ¶ 4(a)(i). See *Whitney Nat'l Bank v. Easynet Ltd*, *supra*; see also *AOL LLC v. iTech Ent, LLC*, *supra*; see also *Health Devices Corp.*, *supra*; *Isleworth Land Co.*, *supra*.

Complainant contends that the <**uggaustralia-euro.com**> domain name is confusingly similar to its UGG AUSTRALIA mark under Policy ¶ 4(a)(i). This domain name is comprised of Complainant's UGG AUSTRALIA mark, it omits the space between the terms of the mark, and adds a hyphen, a geographical term, and the gTLD ".com." Omitting a space and adding a hyphen and gTLD are irrelevant to an analysis under Policy ¶ 4(a)(i). See *Bond & Co. Jewelers, Inc. v. Tex. Int'l Prop. Assocs.*, FA 937650 (Nat. Arb. Forum Apr. 30, 2007) (finding that the elimination of spaces between terms and the addition of a gTLD do not establish distinctiveness from the complainant's mark under Policy ¶ 4(a)(i); see also *Health Devices Corp. v. Aspen S T C*, *supra*. The Panel may further find that the addition of the geographic term "euro" is not sufficient to distinguish Respondent's domain name from Complainant's mark under Policy ¶ 4(a)(i). See *Expedia, Inc. v. Mandanice*, *supra*. The Panel may therefore find that the <**uggaustralia-euro.com**> domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's UGG AUSTRALIA mark under Policy ¶ 4(a)(i).

Finally, Complainant states that the <**uggboots-au.com**> domain name is confusingly similar to its UGG AUSTRALIA mark. The disputed domain name abbreviates the second word of the mark from "AUSTALIA" to "au," which is the online country-code for Australia. It also adds the generic words "boots," a hyphen, and the gTLD ".com." The Panel finds that the <**uggboots-au.com**> domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's UGG AUSTRALIA mark under Policy ¶ 4(a)(i). See *Isleworth Land Co.*, *supra*; see also *Health Devices Corp.*, *supra*; *Whitney Nat'l Bank v. Easynet Ltd*, *supra*.

Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Panel finds that Complainant has made a *prima facie* case that Respondent Karen McDougall lacks rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain names under Policy ¶ 4(a)(ii), and therefore the burden shifts to this Respondent to show she does have rights or legitimate interests. See *Hanna-Barbera Prods., Inc. v. Entm't Commentaries*, FA 741828 (Nat. Arb. Forum Aug. 18, 2006) (holding that the complainant must first make a *prima facie* case that the respondent lacks rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name under UDRP ¶ 4(a)(ii) before the burden shifts to the respondent to show that it does have rights or legitimate interests in a domain name); see also *AOL LLC v. Gerberg*, FA 780200 (Nat. Arb. Forum Sept. 25, 2006) ("Complainant must first make a *prima facie* showing that Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interest in the subject domain names, which burden is light. If Complainant satisfies its burden, then the burden shifts to Respondent to show that it does have rights or legitimate interests in the subject domain names.").

Respondent Karen McDougall's failure to answer the Complaint raises a presumption that she has no rights or legitimate interests in the <**uggboots-uk.com**>, <**uggbootsweb.com**>, <**uggaustralia-euro.com**>, <**ugg-euro.com**>, <**uggonline-uk.com**>, and <**uggboots-au.com**> domain names. See *America Online, Inc. v. AOL Int'l*, D2000-0654 (WIPO Aug. 21, 2000) (finding no rights or legitimate interests where the respondent fails to respond); see also *BIC Deutschland GmbH & Co. KG v. Tweed*, D2000-0418 (WIPO June 20, 2000) ("By not submitting a response,

Respondent has failed to invoke any circumstance which could demonstrate, pursuant to ¶ 4(c) of the Policy, any rights or legitimate interests in the domain name”). However, the Panel will now examine the record to determine if this Respondent has rights or legitimate interests under Policy ¶ 4(c).

Complainant states it has not licensed Respondent Karen McDougall to use its UGG or UGG AUSTRALIA marks and that she has not provided any evidence that she is commonly known by any of the disputed domain names. The WHOIS information gives no indication that this Respondent is commonly known by any of the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the Panel finds Respondent Karen McDougall is not commonly known by any of the disputed domain names under Policy ¶ 4(a)(i). *See Tercent Inc. v. Lee Yi*, FA 139720 (Nat. Arb. Forum Feb. 10, 2003) (stating “nothing in Respondent’s WHOIS information implies that Respondent is ‘commonly known by’ the disputed domain name” as one factor in determining that Policy ¶ 4(c)(ii) does not apply); *see also M. Shanken Commc’ns v. WORLDTRAVELERSONLINE.COM*, FA 740335 (Nat. Arb. Forum Aug. 3, 2006) (finding that the respondent was not commonly known by the <cigaraficionada.com> domain name under Policy ¶ 4(c)(ii) based on the WHOIS information and other evidence in the record).

Complainant contends that the disputed domain names registered by Karen McDougall are being used to resolve to websites offering counterfeit UGG boots, thereby diverting customers away from Complainant’s genuine UGG merchandise. The Panel finds that this is not a *bona fide* offering of goods or services under Policy ¶ 4(c)(i) or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use under Policy ¶ 4(c)(iii). *See Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Inversiones HP Milenium C.A.*, FA 105775 (Nat. Arb. Forum Apr. 12, 2002) (“Respondent’s use of the confusingly similar domain name [<hpmilenium.com>] to sell counterfeit versions of Complainant’s [HP] products is not a bona fide offering of goods or services pursuant to Policy ¶ 4(c)(i).”); *see also Computerized Sec. Sys., Inc. v. Hu*, FA 157321 (Nat. Arb. Forum June 23, 2003) (“Respondent’s appropriation of [Complainant’s] SAFLOK mark to market products that compete with Complainant’s goods does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods and services.”).

Registration and Use in Bad Faith

The following disputed domains were registered by Karen McDougall on the following dates, all of which Complainant contends post-date Complainant’s rights in the UGG and UGG AUSTRALIA marks:

<uggaustralia-euro.com>	November 16, 2008
<uggboots-au.com>	July 16, 2008
<uggboots-uk.com>	July 22, 2008
<uggbootsweb.com>	November 16, 2008
<ugg-euro.com>	July 10, 2008
<uggonline-uk.com>	August 11, 2008

The websites resolving from the disputed domain names are a commercial websites selling counterfeits of Complainant’s goods. Accordingly, the Panel finds that Respondent Karen McDougall is disrupting Complainant’s business by operating in direct competition with Complainant and using Complainant’s own UGG mark to do so. This constitutes bad faith registration and use under Policy ¶ 4(b)(iii). *See S. Exposure v. S. Exposure, Inc.*, FA 94864 (Nat. Arb. Forum July 18, 2000) (finding the respondent acted in bad faith by attracting Internet users to a website that competes with the complainant’s business); *see also G.D. Searle & Co. v.*

Celebrex Cox-2 Vioxx.com, FA 124508 (Nat. Arb. Forum Oct. 16, 2002) (“Unauthorized use of Complainant’s CELEBREX mark to sell Complainant’s products represents bad faith use under Policy ¶ 4(b)(iii).”).

Because the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to Complainant’s UGG and UGG AUSTRALIA marks and the resolving websites offer counterfeits of Complainant’s goods, the Panel finds that Internet users would likely be confused as to whether Complainant had authorized Respondent Karen McDougall to sell Complainant’s goods or use its marks. Thus, Internet users might believe that Respondent Karen McDougall is indeed Complainant or at least an authorized distributor. Accordingly, the Panel finds that this Respondent’s attempt to profit from this confusion amounts to bad faith registration and use under Policy ¶ 4(b)(iv). *See Computerized Sec. Sys., Inc. v. Hu*, FA 157321 (Nat. Arb. Forum June 23, 2003) (finding that the respondent’s use of the <saflock.com> domain name to offer goods competing with the complainant’s illustrates the respondent’s bad faith registration and use of the domain name, evidence of bad faith registration and use pursuant to Policy ¶ 4(b)(iv)); *see also Fossil Inc. v. NAS*, FA 92525 (Nat. Arb. Forum Feb. 23, 2000) (finding that the respondent acted in bad faith by registering the <fossilwatch.com> domain name and using it to sell various watch brands where the respondent was not authorized to sell the complainant’s goods).

DECISION

Having established all three elements required under the ICANN Policy, or determined the parties consented to a transfer of the <**uggstore-uk.com**> domain name, the Panel concludes that relief shall be GRANTED IN PART and DENIED IN PART. Accordingly,

It is Ordered that the <**uggstore-uk.com**>, <**uggboots-uk.com**>, <**uggbootsweb.com**>, <**uggaustralia-euro.com**>, <**ugg-euro.com**>, <**uggonline-uk.com**>, and <**uggboots-au.com**> domain names be **TRANSFERRED** from Respondent to Complainant.

It is further Ordered that as to the <**buyituggboots.com**>, <**buyituggboots.net**>, <**buyuggbootsnow.com**>, <**ugg-ca.com**>, <**buyuggbootsnow.net**>, <**ugg-eu.com**>, <**selluggboots.net**>, <**uggeuro.com**>, <**uggaustralia-uk.com**>, and <**uggboots2u.com**> domain names, the Complainant shall be **DISMISSED**.

Bruce E. Meyerson, Panelist
Dated November 30, 2009

[Click Here](#) to return to the main Domain Decisions Page.

[Click Here](#) to return to our Home Page

NATIONAL ARBITRATION FORUM

