

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Rockwell Automation Inc v. li zeping, zhangdaren  
Case No. D2025-2923

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Rockwell Automation Inc, United States of America (the “US”), represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is li zeping, zhangdaren, China.

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

The disputed domain name <theallenbradley.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 23, 2025. On July 23, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 24, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY (DT), Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 25, 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 29, 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 August 5, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 25, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 1, 2025.

The Center appointed Luis Miguel Beneyto Garcia-Reyes as the sole panelist in this matter on September 6, 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 one of the leading and reputed companies in the industrial and digital transformation sector.

The Complainant is the owner, inter alia, of the following trademark registrations protecting ALLEN-BRADLEY:

US registration no. 712800 ALLEN-BRADLEY in class 9 registered on March 21, 1961;

US registration no. 712836 ALLEN-BRADLEY in class 9 registered on March 21, 1961; and

US registration no. 1172994 ALLEN-BRADLEY in class 9 registered on October 13, 1981.

The Complainant also owns the domain name <allenbradley.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on February 17, 2025. The Complainant has provided evidence that the disputed domain name resolves to a website that displays the Complainant's trademark, a logo similar to the Complainant's as a website favicon, and advertises the Complainant's goods for sale, but also offers other nonexistent goods giving the appearance that they are being offered by 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 Complainant is a global leader in industrial automation and digital transformation. Its most prominent brand, Allen-Bradley, was founded in 1903 and was already the leading automation manufacturer in North America before it was acquired by the Complainant in 1985.

The Complainant operates in over 100 countries, with approximately 29,000 employees and more than 400 offices and manufacturing facilities globally. The Complainant serves customers across a wide range of industries, including automotive, food, beverage, oil and gas, life sciences and more.

The Complainant's trademark is well known and enjoys a substantial degree of public recognition.

The disputed domain name includes in its entirety, the Complainant's ALLEN-BRADLEY trademark, simply adding the article "the" to the beginning of the trademark, and the omission of the hyphen does not allow to distinguish the disputed domain name from the Complainant's trademarks, so the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name given that the Respondent is not sponsored by or affiliated with the Complainant; is not commonly known by the disputed domain name; is not licensed, authorized, or permitted to register a domain name incorporating the

Complainant's trademark, and is not making a bona fide offering of goods or services or legitimate noncommercial fair use of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent has demonstrated a knowledge of and familiarity with the Complainant's trademarks and business and the composition of the disputed domain name in combination with the Respondent's use indicates that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name constitutes a disruption of the Complainant's business and the Respondent was attempting to cause consumers confusion.

The Respondent confirmed to a previous registrar of the disputed domain name that the content from the disputed domain name had been removed after the cease and desist letter sent by the Complainant but the fact that the disputed domain name was later moved to a new Registrar and the content was reactivated constitutes an evidence of bad faith.

Based on all the above observations, the Complainant requests the disputed domain name to be transferred to the Complainant.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove: i) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and iii) that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name 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.

The entirety of the ALLEN-BRADLEY mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name, save for the hyphen. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the only difference between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name is that the said trademark includes a hyphen between the terms "ALLEN" and "BRADLEY", and the disputed domain name contains the article "the", the Panel finds that this 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.

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.

The Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name, which is almost identical to the Complainant’s trademark and its official domain name, combined with the use of the Complainant’s trademark on the website and a logo similar to the Complainant’s logo as a website favicon, and offering of both the Complainant’s goods and nonexistent goods attributed to the Complainant, affirms the Respondent’s intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant as to the origin or affiliation of the website at the dispute domain name.

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

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

The Panel finds that the Complainant has submitted sufficient evidence to conclude that there is indeed bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name on the part of the Respondent pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

This conclusion is reached based on the Panel’s findings below:

- the Complainant’s priorly used and registered trademark ALLEN-BRADLEY is reputed worldwide in its sector. The disputed domain name includes the Complainant’s trademark in its entirety, and simply omitting the hyphen between the terms “ALLEN” and “BRADLEY” contained in the Complainant’s trademark, and adding the article “the”. The Panel’s conclusion is that the Respondent must have been aware of a reputed mark of the Complainant;
- the Complainant has provided evidence showing that the disputed domain name was used to advertise not only the Complainant’s goods, but other nonexistent goods being presented as if those goods were actually offered for sale by the Complainant. In addition, the website displayed the Complainant’s trademark, a logo similar to the Complainant’s logo as a website favicon and the Complainant’s corporate history.

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 <theallenbradley.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Luis Miguel Beneyto Garcia-Reyes/*

**Luis Miguel Beneyto Garcia-Reyes**

Sole Panelist

Date: September 20, 2025