

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Rock Robotic Inc v. G O, Phoenix LiDAR Systems
Case No. D2025-3629

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Rock Robotic Inc, United States of America (“United States”), internally represented.

The Respondent is G O, Phoenix LiDAR Systems, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

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

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 8, 2025. On September 9, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 10, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 11, 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 amended Complaint on September 11, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended 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 12, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 2, 2025. The Response was filed with the Center on September 15, 2025.

The Center appointed Evan D. Brown 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 in the business of providing Lidar apparatus. It owns the trademark ROCK ROBOTIC, for which it enjoys the benefits of registration (United States Reg. No. 7059676, registered on May 23, 2023, alleging a date of first use in commerce of August 1, 2020).

According to the Whois records, the disputed domain name was registered on July 27, 2017. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has set the disputed domain name to redirect to the Respondent's website. The Respondent is also in the business of providing Lidar apparatus.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark; that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent has asserted, amid various communications with the Center from both parties, that it is not the proper Respondent to these proceedings because it transferred the disputed domain name prior to the initiation of these proceedings.

Though this appears to be a matter of controversy between the Parties, the Panel notes that the Registrar has confirmed the Respondent is the current registrant of the disputed domain name and finds that the Complaint should be denied in any event, given the lack of proper showing under the third UDRP element, as discussed below.

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied: (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 respect of the disputed domain name, and (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. The Panel finds that the third of these elements has not been met in this case.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

This first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7. 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. Id. This element requires the Panel to consider two issues: first, whether the Complainant has rights in a relevant mark; and second, whether the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to that mark.

A registered trademark provides a clear indication that the rights in the mark shown on the trademark certificate belong to its respective owner. See *Advance Magazine Publishers Inc., Les Publications Conde Nast S.A. v. Voguechen*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-0657](#). The Complainant has demonstrated its rights in the ROCK ROBOTIC mark by providing evidence of its trademark registration. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name incorporates the ROCK ROBOTIC mark in its entirety. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8. The ROCK ROBOTIC mark remains recognizable for a showing of confusing similarity under the Policy.

It is standard practice when comparing a disputed domain name to a complainant's trademarks to not take the Top-Level Domain into account. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) at 1.11.1.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established this first element under the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Because of the Panel's findings under the third Policy element, it is unnecessary to address this second element.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Policy requires a complainant to establish that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant asserts that by using the disputed domain name to divert Internet users searching for the Complainant to the website of the Respondent, a direct competitor, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's ROCK ROBOTIC mark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement.

Where a respondent registers a domain name before the complainant's trademark rights accrue, panels will not normally find bad faith on the part of the respondent. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.8.1.

The Complainant seems to anticipate the problem posed by the fact that the disputed domain name was registered in 2017, while the Complainant's trademark rights in the ROCK ROBOTIC mark did not accrue until at least 2020. The Complainant states that "[t]o the extent that the domain name was initially registered or subsequently transferred after [the] Complainant's trademark rights accrued through use beginning in 2020, such timing further evidences bad-faith registration." The Complainant also suggested it would amend the Complaint, if necessary, to confirm the chronology. However, the record does not indicate that any such amendment was filed.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 27, 2017. This registration predates the issuance of the Complainant's trademark registration (issued on May 23, 2023) by almost six years. Nor does the record contain any evidence that the Complainant acquired any common law rights in the mark prior to the alleged date of first use of August 1, 2020. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has not demonstrated that it had trademark rights in the ROCK ROBOTIC mark at the time the disputed domain name was registered.

For these reasons, the Panel cannot find that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Complainant has not prevailed on this third element.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Evan D. Brown/

Evan D. Brown

Sole Panelist

Date: October 22, 2025