

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Arm Limited v. web master, Expired domain caught by auction winner.***Maybe for sale on Dynadot Marketplace***
Case No. D2025-2639

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Arm Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Demys Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is web master, Expired domain caught by auction winner.***Maybe for sale on Dynadot Marketplace***, China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <armizanagi.com>, <armlumex.com>, <armniva.com>, <armorbis.com>, and <armzena.com> are registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 4, 2025. On July 4, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On July 7, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (web master Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 8, 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 July 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 July 14, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 3, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 5, 2025.

The Center appointed Nathalie Dreyfus as the sole panelist in this matter on August 15, 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, Arm Limited, is a company incorporated in November 1990 in the United Kingdom under company number 02557590. Its name is derived from the initial letters of "Advanced RISC Machines", and it was originally structured as a joint-venture between Acorn Computers, Apple Computer and VLSI Technology. It designs electronic products, including computer processors, graphics processors, digital memories, and peripheral hardware, and it also supplies software, development tools for computer hardware, and provides software and consultancy services. Operating through its website at the domain name <arm.com>, the Complainant presents its products and services.

The Complainant owns an extensive global portfolio of registered trademarks for the word mark ARM, including :

- European Union trademark application ARM No. 018140721, filed on October 21, 2019, covering goods and services in classes 9, 35, 38 and 42

In addition, on May 15, 2025, the Complainant filed several new trademark applications in the United Kingdom for its artificial intelligence chip division. These applications, which are still pending, include:

- United Kingdom trademark application ARM IZANAGI No. UK00004203835, filed on May 15, 2025, covering goods and services in classes 9 and 42;
- United Kingdom trademark application ARM ORBIS No. UK00004203842, filed on May 15, 2025, covering goods and services in classes 9 and 42;
- United Kingdom trademark application ARM ZENA No. UK00004203853, filed on May 15, 2025, covering goods and services in classes 9 and 42;
- United Kingdom trademark application ARM LUMEX No. UK00004203857, filed on May 15, 2025, covering goods and services in classes 9 and 42; and
- United Kingdom trademark application ARM NIVA No. UK00004203872, filed on May 15, 2025, covering goods and services in classes 9 and 42.

The Complainant notes that these trademark filings became publicly accessible on the same day and were republished by third-party databases.

The disputed domain names are :

- <armizanagi.com>;
- <armlumex.com>;
- <armniva.com>;
- <armorbis.com>; and
- <armzena.com>,

all registered on May 15, 2025, on the same day as the Complainant filed its new trademark applications. The disputed domain names were registered with the same registrar, Dynadot Inc, and make use of the same Whois privacy service. They also share the same nameserver configuration (CloudFlare Inc.). Each of the disputed domain names resolves to a webpage offering the respective disputed domain name for sale with an asking price of USD 2599.

Upon Registrar disclosure, the Respondent was identified as “web master, Expired domain caught by auction winner. ***Maybe for sale on Dynadot Marketplace***”, reportedly located in China.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that, with respect to the first element, all five disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its well-known ARM trademark. The Complainant owns a large global portfolio of registered ARM trademarks, the earliest of which predates the registration of the disputed domain names by approximately 25 years. The Complainant further observes that on the morning of May 15, 2025, it filed five new trademark applications in the United Kingdom for ARM IZANAGI, ARM ORBIS, ARM ZENA, ARM LUMEX, and ARM NIVA. Each of the disputed domain names incorporates the Complainant’s ARM mark together with one of these new product names, and such additions do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The Complainant relies on section 1.8 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), noting that where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms, whether descriptive, geographical, or otherwise, does not avoid confusing similarity.

With respect to the second element, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Respondent has not been commonly known by the terms ARM IZANAGI, ARM LUMEX, ARM NIVA, ARM ORBIS or ARM ZENA, nor has it received any license or authorization from the Complainant to use its trademarks. The Complainant’s searches reveal no evidence that the Respondent owns any relevant trademarks or has ever traded under such names. Instead, the disputed domain names all resolve to the same website hosted by Spaceship, where they are listed for sale for USD 2599. The Complainant submits that offering domain names incorporating a well-known trademark for sale cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. In addition, the disputed domain names carry a high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant, particularly because they incorporate both its ARM mark and the new product names recently announced by the Complainant. According to section 2.5.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), such terms fall within the Complainant’s field of commerce and naturally indicate services related to its brand.

As to the third element, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. The Complainant notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names on the same day that the Complainant announced a new AI division and filed trademark applications for the associated product names, which received widespread media coverage. The Complainant argues that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names with knowledge of its trademarks and business activities and with the intent to exploit them. The Complainant points to paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy, which provides that registration of a domain name primarily for the purpose of selling it for valuable consideration in excess of out-of-pocket costs constitutes evidence of bad faith. Here, the Registrar’s registration fee was approximately USD 10, while the disputed domain names are listed for USD 2599 each, demonstrating bad faith intent.

The Complainant further relies on section 3.2 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), which identifies additional bad faith considerations, including the timing of the registration immediately following a product launch or trademark filing. The Complainant argues that the timing of the registrations is opportunistic and strongly evidences bad faith. The Complainant also refers to section 3.8.2 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), which recognizes an exception allowing panels to find bad faith where a respondent registers a domain name to capitalize on a complainant’s nascent but publicly announced trademark rights, for example following significant media attention or the filing of a trademark application. The Complainant submits that this exception applies here,

as the Respondent registered the disputed domain names on the very same day the Complainant filed its trademark applications.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the Respondent's conduct constitutes a pattern of abusive domain name registrations under section 3.1.2 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#). The Respondent registered five domain names incorporating the Complainant's ARM mark on the same day, which goes beyond a single opportunistic registration and supports a finding of bad faith.

For all of these reasons, the Complainant requests that the disputed domain names be transferred to it.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions and is therefore in default.

6. Discussion and Findings

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 names. [WIPO Overview](#), 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 Panel finds the mark ARM is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Furthermore, each of the disputed domain names contains an element of the newly filed trademark terms within its second-level domain name, namely "Izanagi", "Lumex", "Niva", "Orbis", and "Zena". These terms correspond to the Complainant's recent trademark applications, which are still pending and have not yet been registered. In accordance with section 1.1.4 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), a pending trademark application does not, by itself, establish trademark rights within the meaning of UDRP paragraph 4(a)(i). However, the Panel notes that the Complainant owns prior registered trademark rights in the ARM trademark, which is reproduced in its entirety at the beginning of each of the disputed domain names.

The Panel also notes that the Top-Level Domain (TLD) ".com" should be disregarded for the purposes of comparison, in accordance with Section 1.11 of [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), as it does not serve to differentiate the disputed domain names from the Complainant's mark.

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.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

First, as regards paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, there is no evidence that the Respondent has made any use, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. On the contrary, the record shows that each of the disputed domain names resolves to a parking page offering the respective disputed domain name for sale at a significant price likely to be in excess of the Respondent's out-of-pocket costs. Panels have consistently held that such conduct, where a domain name consists of a complainant's trademark and is merely offered for sale, does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services under the Policy.

Second, with respect to paragraph 4(c)(ii), the Respondent cannot claim legitimate use of the disputed domain names that incorporate the Complainant's well-known ARM mark. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant in any way, has not been authorized or licensed to use the Complainant's ARM mark, and there is no evidence that the Respondent has acquired trademark rights in the terms contained in the disputed domain names.

Third, under paragraph 4(c)(iii), the Respondent cannot claim legitimate noncommercial or fair use. The composition of the disputed domain names creates a strong risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. As explained in section 2.5.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), use of a domain name will not be considered "fair" if it suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. In this case, the disputed domain names clearly give such an impression; and their use solely for the purpose of sale removes any possibility of qualifying as fair or noncommercial use.

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 Panel notes that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain names in bad faith.

First, the timing of the registrations of the disputed domain names, coinciding with the public announcement and trademark filings of the Complainant's new products, indicates that the Respondent sought to capitalize on the Complainant's brand and business activities. Furthermore, the disputed domain names incorporate the Complainant's well-known ARM mark, together with the Complainant's newly filed trademark applications for ARM IZANAGI, ARM LUMEX, ARM NIVA, ARM ORBIS, and ARM ZENA. The inclusion of these terms demonstrates knowledge of the Complainant's business activities and suggests an intent to exploit nascent trademark rights for commercial gain. This conduct corresponds to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, which addresses registration with the intent to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating confusion with a complainant's mark.

Second, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain names primarily for the purpose of selling them for profit. Each of the disputed domain names resolves to a parking page with a "for sale" notice, hosted by Spaceship, with an asking price of USD 2599, a sum likely to be in excess

of the out-of-pocket costs for registering the disputed domain names. The combination of registration at a time coinciding with the Complainant's trademark filings, listing the domain names for sale, and directing them to "for sale" parking pages constitutes strong evidence that the Respondent's primary intention was to profit from the sale, in excess of registration costs, and to exploit the Complainant's trademark rights for commercial gain. The inclusion of terms related to the Complainant's products increases the likelihood of confusion and suggests an intention to mislead consumers into believing there is an affiliation with the Complainant. This conduct corresponds to paragraphs 4(b)(i) and 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, which address registration primarily for profit and registration intended to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating confusion with a complainant's mark.

Third, the Respondent's conduct constitutes a pattern of bad faith registration with respect to the Complainant's well-established ARM trademark. The Respondent has been involved in numerous previous UDRP proceedings, all resulting in findings of bad faith. This repeated pattern of registering domain names corresponding to third-party trademarks, often shortly after the filing of trademark applications or product announcements, demonstrates a consistent intent to engage in bad faith registrations. This aligns with paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy, which addresses a pattern of bad faith conduct.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

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 names <armizanagi.com>, <armlumex.com>, <armniva.com>, <armorbis.com>, and <armzena.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nathalie Dreyfus/

Nathalie Dreyfus

Sole Panelist

Date: August 29, 2025