

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Zoox, Inc. v. Wild West Domains, LLC
Case No. D2025-1097

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Zoox, Inc., United States of America, represented by Lee & Hayes, PC, United States of America.

The Respondent is Wild West Domains, LLC, Poland.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <zooxdriverless.com> is registered with Dominet (HK) Limited (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 17, 2025. On March 18, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 19, 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 and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 19, 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 the same day.

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 March 20, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 9, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 14, 2025.

The Center appointed Eva Fiammenghi as the sole panelist in this matter on April 16, 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 Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in California, United States of America. Founded in 2014, the Complainant operates in the autonomous vehicle industry, developing a fleet of autonomous, symmetrical, battery-electric vehicles intended for use in a proprietary ride-hailing service. The Complainant aims to provide safer, cleaner, and more efficient personal transportation solutions.

In 2020, the Complainant became a wholly owned subsidiary of Amazon.com, Inc., further reinforcing its presence and future in the autonomous mobility sector.

The Complainant holds several trademark registrations for the trademark ZOOX in various jurisdictions, including the following:

- French trademark ZOOX, Reg. No: 4792286, registered on August 26, 2016, in classes including 7, 9, 12 and 39.
- European Union trademark ZOOX, Reg. No: 018263002, registered on December 10, 2020, in classes including 9, 12, 39, 41 and 42.
- German trademark ZOOX, Reg. No: 302021017983, registered on August 26, 2016, in classes including 7, 9, 12 and 39.

The Complainant also operates its principal website under the domain name <zoox.com>, registered since September 13, 2001, and uses it to promote its products and services worldwide. The website displays copyrighted materials, including photographs and logos associated with the ZOOX brand.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 25, 2024. The disputed domain name directed users to a fraudulent website impersonating the Complainant.

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 confusingly similar to its well-known and distinctive ZOOX trademark. The Complainant emphasizes that the disputed domain name incorporates the ZOOX trademark in its entirety, adding only the descriptive term "driverless", which refers directly to the Complainant's core business activities in the autonomous vehicle sector.

The Complainant further asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant has never authorized the Respondent to use its trademark, nor is there any evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. Additionally, the Respondent has not demonstrated any bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial use of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Respondent's website impersonates the Complainant, copying copyrighted materials such as the Complainant's logo and photographs, and falsely presenting itself as affiliated with the Complainant. Moreover, the Respondent's website solicits users to input sensitive personal information under false pretenses, exposing consumers to phishing risks.

Based on these contentions, the Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed the Complainant must prove that:

- (i) the disputed 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 disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

These elements are discussed in turn below. In considering these elements, paragraph 15(a) of the Rules provides that the Panel shall decide the Complaint on the basis of statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any other rules or principles of law that the Panel deems applicable.

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.

The entirety of the Complainant's mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name combines the Complainant's trademark ZOOX with the term "driverless", which relates to autonomous vehicles, a field in which the Complainant is prominently active.

The addition of a term such as "driverless" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8. Furthermore, the applicable generic top-level domain (".com") is disregarded under the confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark.

The Panel finds that 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 under which a respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a 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 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.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that the Complainant has made a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use its trademark. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor is there evidence of any bona fide offering of goods or services, or legitimate noncommercial use.

The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to operate a fraudulent website impersonating the Complainant, soliciting confidential personal information from users, constitutes a fraudulent and unlawful activity. Panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity such as phishing or impersonation can never confer rights or legitimate interests. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel finds that 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 Panel finds that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain names in bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Respondent used the disputed domain name to host a fake website impersonating the Complainant, copying its logos and copyrighted materials, and misleading users into believing they were interacting with the Complainant. The website also solicited users' private information under false pretenses, exposing them to phishing risks.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity such as phishing and impersonation constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. The registration and use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent appears to have been made precisely with the intent to deceive and mislead.

The fact that the Respondent did not respond to the Complaint further supports this finding of bad faith.

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

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 <zooxdriverless.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Eva Fiammenghi/

Eva Fiammenghi

Sole Panelist

Date: April 30, 2025