

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Zoox, Inc. v. Wild West Domains, LLC  
Case No. D2025-2810

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is Wild West Domains, LLC, Poland.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <zooxautomation.com> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) 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 July 16, 2025. On July 17, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On July 18, 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 July 18, 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 July 21, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 10, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 18, 2025.

The Center appointed Michael D. Cover as the sole panelist in this matter on August 26, 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 Zoox, Inc., a Delaware corporation, with its principal place of business in Foster City, California.

The Complainant was founded in 2014 and is building a fleet of autonomous, symmetrical, battery-electric vehicles that will be used for its ride-hailing service, which is designed to increase safety, while reducing congestion and pollution in urban environments. The Complainant joined forces with Amazon in 2020.

Since at least as early as 2016, the Complainant has used, advertised and promoted its goods and services under the trademark ZOOX, throughout the United States and worldwide.

The Complainant is the proprietor of various trademark registrations for ZOOX, including the following:

Brazil trademark No. 911543554 registered on July 24, 2018, in Class 7.

France trademark No. 4792286 registered on August 26, 2016, in Classes 7, 9, 12 and 39.

European Union trademark No. 018263002 registered on December 10, 2020, in Classes 9, 12, 39, 41 and 42.

The domain name <zoox.com> has been registered since September 13, 2001, and, since that time, it has been held by or for the benefit of the Complainant. The Complainant's website features photographs promoting the Complainant's autonomous vehicles and the ZOOX trademarks.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on December 25, 2024. The Disputed Domain Name directs users to a website impersonating the Complainant and that website contains a page where consumers enter their telephone numbers and passwords.

#### **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.

##### **Identical or Confusingly Similar**

Notably, the Complainant contends that the Respondent's use of the Disputed Domain Name is a violation of the Complainant's intellectual property rights and is a violation of the Policy. The Complainant states that the Complainant has not provided the Respondent authority to use its ZOOX trademarks or to own, operate, maintain or register websites in its names or to utilize a web address confusingly similar to its ZOOX trademarks, in which the Complainant has rights.

The Complainant notes that the Disputed Domain Name encompasses the entire portion of the Complainant's ZOOX trademark.

The Complainant submits that the Panel should disregard the descriptive term “automation” in the Disputed Domain Name, as the Panel should disregard the “.com” portion of the Disputed Domain Name as a general registration requirement.

The Complainant submits that the Complainant has satisfied Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy and the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the ZOOX trademark, in which the Complainant has rights.

### **Rights or Legitimate Interests**

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the Disputed Domain Name, because the Respondent cannot meet any of the situations enumerated in the Policy paragraph 4(c) that would indicate that there is a legitimate interest in the Disputed Domain Name.

The Complainant notes that the initial burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the Complainant, where the 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 comes forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. The Complainant then sets out the requirements of Policy paragraph 4(c), whereby a Respondent can demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a domain name.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name and that, to the contrary, the Complainant did not authorize the Respondent to register the Disputed Domain Name. The Complainant continues that, additionally, prior to notice of the dispute, there is no evidence the Respondent is using the Disputed Domain Name or a trademark corresponding to the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Instead, continues the Complainant, the Respondent uses the Disputed Domain Name, as well as images taken directly from the Complainant’s own website, in an attempt to deceive consumers into believing that they have reached a website that is operated or endorsed by or otherwise affiliated with the Complainant.

The Complainant submits that the Complainant has satisfied the Policy, paragraph 4(a)(ii), and that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name.

### **Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

The Complainant submits that the Respondent registered and uses the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith. Namely, by using the Disputed Domain Name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent’s website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of Respondent’s website or location or of a product or service on its website or location. Policy, Paragraph 4(b)(iv).

The Complainant continues that the Respondent should have known of the Complainant’s rights in its ZOOX trademark, which knowledge is readily obtainable through a trademark search. Furthermore, notes the Complainant, as explained above, the Disputed Domain Name resolves to a website made for the purpose of impersonating the Complainant by displaying the Complainant’s images, logos and trademarks for the Respondent’s own commercial gain.

The Complainant submits that it has satisfied Policy, paragraphs 4(a)(iii), 4(b), and Rules, paragraph 3(b)(ix)(3), by alleging and providing evidence that demonstrates that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Remedy requested by the Complainant

The Complainant requests the Panel to decide that the Disputed Domain Name be transferred to the Complainant.

## **B. Respondent**

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

The Complainant must establish on the balance of probabilities that the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name and the Disputed 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 its ZOOX trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the ZOOX trademark of the Complainant is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's ZOOX trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here, "automation", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

It is also well-established in prior UDRP decisions that the applicable generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD"), in this case ".com", is a standard registration requirement and is to be ignored in considering confusing similarity.

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 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.

Previous panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here impersonation/passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

In addition, the Respondent has not demonstrated, before notice of the dispute, use or demonstrable preparations to use the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, that the Respondent has been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name or that the Respondent is making legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the Complainant's trademark.

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 has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's ZOOX trademark.

Previous panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, impersonation/passing off, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name 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 Name <zooxautomation.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Michael D. Cover/*

**Michael D. Cover**

Sole Panelist

Date: August 29, 2025