ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Lightricks Ltd. v. Steven Ho
Case No. D2025-3539

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Lightricks Ltd., Israel, represented by Gornitzky & Co., Israel.

The Respondent is Steven Ho, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ltxvideoai.com> (the "Domain Name") is registered with Porkbun LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 2, 2025. On September 2, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On September 3, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Whois Privacy, Private by Design, LLC / Redacted for privacy - Identity unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 3, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on September 3, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 September 8, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 28, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 3, 2025.

The Center appointed Ian Lowe as the sole panelist in this matter on October 8, 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 an Israeli Artificial Intelligence (AI) based software company founded in 2013. It develops and markets various AI-based software products – among which is LTXV, an AI photo and video generation model that powers its apps and platforms ("LTXV"). LTXV is integral to the Complainant's services, powering all of the Complainant's applications and platforms. The Complainant operates a website at "www.ltx.video" giving information about its LTXV product and offering API access to its video model. According to the Complainant's website at "www.lightricks.com," the Complainant has over 6.6 million monthly subscribers and more than 15 million monthly users.

The Complainant is the proprietor of a number of registered trademarks for LTX, including Israel trademark number 371159 registered on May 2, 2024, and International trademark number 1802319 registered on May 21, 2024, designating a number of territories including China.

The Domain Name was registered on May 19, 2025. It does not currently resolve to an active website, but at the time of preparation of the Complaint it resolved to a website (the "Respondent's Website") featuring LTX VIDEO in the banner of the home page which was headed "Introducing LTX Video: Professional Video Creation made Simple".

The website provided information about the Complainant's LTXV product (referred to as LTX Video) and its features and offered Internet users the opportunity to try a "LTX Video Live Demo" using "LTX Video 0.9.8 13B Distilled" which is a version of the Complainant's video generation model. The Respondent's Website used the term "our AI powered tools".

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to its LTX trademark (the "Mark"), that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name and that the Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

For this Complaint to succeed in relation to the Domain Name the Complainant must prove that:

(i) the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and

(ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name; and

(iii) the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.2.1.

Ignoring the generic Top-Level Domain ".com", the Domain Name comprises the entirety of the Mark with the addition of the word "video", and the letters "ai". The Panel finds that these additions do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the Mark. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.8. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights, and 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. Accordingly, 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.

The Complainant has made out a prima facie case that the Respondent could have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name. The Respondent has used the Domain Name not in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, but for a website that features the Complainant's LTX trademark and gives every appearance of being a website operated by the Complainant, particularly by the use of the expression "our AI powered tools". There is no suggestion that the Respondent has ever been known by the Domain Name and the Respondent is not authorised by the Complainant to use the Mark. The Respondent has chosen not to respond to the Complainant or to take any steps to counter the prima facie case established by the Complainant. In the circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name.

In addition, the nature of the Domain Name together with the Respondent's Website create a strong risk of Internet user confusion.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

In the present case, the Domain Name comprises the entirety of the Mark with the addition of the word "video" and the letters "ai". LTXV (a clear indication of LTX Video) is a product of the Complainant that uses AI. Further, the Panel notes that the Respondent has used the Domain Name for a website featuring the

Mark and the Complainant's software product. Accordingly, the Panel is in no doubt that the Respondent had the Complainant and its rights in the LTX mark in mind when it registered the Domain Name.

The Panel considers on balance that the Respondent has registered and used the Domain Name to imitate the Complainant and to deceive Internet users into believing that the Domain Name is operated or authorized by the Complainant, attracting Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Mark. In the Panel's view, the use of a domain name for such activity, presumably with a view to commercial gain, amounts to paradigm bad faith registration and use for the purposes of the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Domain Name has been registered and is being 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 Domain Name <ltxvideoai.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ian Lowe/
Ian Lowe
Sole Panelist
Date: October 22, 2025