

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Locus Robotics, Inc. v. Loriu Asans

Case No. D2025-2702

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Locus Robotics, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Sunstein LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Loriu Asans, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <locusroboticscareers.com> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 9, 2025. On July 10, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 10, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that 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 July 16, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 5, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 11, 2025.

The Center appointed Angela Fox as the sole panelist in this matter on August 21, 2025. 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 company based in the United States which specializes in warehouse automation and robotics, including multi-bot warehouse picking systems and platforms for use in warehouses worldwide. The Complainant has carried out its business under the name and trademark LOCUS ROBOTICS since at least as early as 2015.

The Complainant is the owner of various trademark registrations for the marks LOCUS ROBOTICS and LOCUS, including in the United States, where both the Complainant and the Respondent are based. These include United States trademark registration no. 5,387,240 for LOCUS ROBOTICS in Class 9, registered on January 23, 2018, details of which were annexed to the Complaint.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 2, 2025, and is not in use to link to any website. However, the Complainant states that the disputed domain name has been used to create an email account from which emails have been sent to third parties, in which the Respondent has posed as an employee of the Complainant. Annexed to the Complaint was a print-out of an email from the disputed domain name sent on May 2, 2025, the date on which the disputed domain name was registered, purporting to be from a Recruitment Officer, soliciting applications for the role of IT Support Specialist at the Complainant's company and inviting the recipient (name and address redacted) to reply "Interested" if they wished to apply.

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 or confusingly similar to the Complainant's registered trademarks, including specifically to LOCUS ROBOTICS. The Complainant's trademark is clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name and the descriptive term "careers" is insufficient to avoid confusion.

The Complainant further submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not affiliated in any way with the Complainant and does not have the Complainant's permission to use the Complainant's trademark. The Complainant submits that the LOCUS ROBOTICS trademark is highly distinctive in connection with warehouse automation and autonomous mobile robots and related services and that a third party would not choose to use it unless seeking to create the impression of an association with the Complainant.

Finally, the Complainant submits that the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name in bad faith. Specifically, the Complainant argues that the Respondent can be inferred to have registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith because it created an email account using the disputed domain name and has sent job-related emails to third parties posing as an employee of the Complainant, in order to deliberately deceive and defraud members of the public. Consequently, it is evident that the Respondent knew of and was targeting the Complainant when it registered the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions and is in default. No exceptional circumstances explaining the default have been put forward. Therefore, in accordance with paragraphs 14 (a) and (b) of the Rules, the Panel will decide on the Complaint and shall draw such inferences as it considers appropriate from the Respondent's default.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, a complainant can only succeed in an administrative proceeding under the Policy if the panel finds that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights;
- (ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

All three elements must be present before a complainant can succeed in an administrative proceeding under the Policy.

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 of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

In this case, the Complainant has shown rights in the trademark LOCUS ROBOTICS for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Complainant's mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the difficult task of "proving a negative", requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a *prima facie* case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

In this case, the Respondent does not appear to be using the disputed domain name in connection with any website, but the Complainant has shown evidence that it has been used in connection with the sending of a job-related email impersonating the Complainant. As noted in the Factual Background section above, the Complainant has provided evidence that the disputed domain name has been used to send at least one job-related email fraudulently impersonating the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1 states, "Panels have categorically held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (e.g., the sale of counterfeit goods or illegal pharmaceuticals, phishing, distributing malware, unauthorized account access/hacking, impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent".

The Respondent has not attempted to rebut the Complainant's assertions and evidence.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Complainant has shown evidence that the disputed domain name has been used in connection with the sending of an email fraudulently impersonating the Complainant and seeking to deceive a member of the public regarding a job vacancy at the Complainant's company. The inclusion of the Complainant's distinctive trademark in the disputed domain name and its use in connection with the sending of an email impersonating the Complainant demonstrate that the Respondent was targeting the Complainant when it registered and used the disputed domain name.

[WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4, states that "the use of a domain name for per se illegitimate activity such as the sale of counterfeit goods or phishing can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent" and that "such behavior is manifestly considered evidence of bad faith." In addition, [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4, states that "the use of a domain name for purposes other than to host a website may constitute bad faith. Such purposes include sending email, phishing, identity theft, or malware distribution".

Taking all of this into account, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy, and that the disputed domain name was registered and has been used in bad faith.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <locusroboticscareers.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Angela Fox/
Angela Fox
Sole Panelist
Date: September 14, 2025