

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Lightricks Ltd. v. Xun Cai
Case No. D2025-3111

1. The Parties

Complainant is Lightricks Ltd., Israel, represented by CHRO & CLO, Israel.

Respondent is Xun Cai, Australia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ltx-video.org> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 5, 2025. On August 6, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On August 6, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email to Complainant on August 7, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on August 10, 2025.

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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 12, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 1, 2025. Respondent sent a communication to the Center via the online Response form on August 31, 2025. The Center informed the Parties that it would proceed with Panel Appointment on September 2, 2025.

The Center appointed Robert A. Badgley as the sole panelist in this matter on September 11, 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

According to the Complaint:

“The Complainant is a leading AI-based software company that develops and markets various AI-based software products – among which are LTXV, an AI photo and video generation model that powers its apps and platforms (‘LTXV’). LTXV is integral to the Complainant’s services, powering all of Complainant’s applications and platforms including, Facetune, Photoleap, Videoleap, and LTX Studio. As a result, consumers have come to closely associate LTXV with the Complainant.”

Complainant holds trademark registrations for LTX and its variations, including LTX Studio, in multiple jurisdictions, including Brazil, China, the European Union, the United Kingdom, Japan, the Republic of Korea, Mexico, the United States, and the Russian Federation. Annexed to the Complaint are various trademark registration certificates for LTX and LTX STUDIO, including International Reg. No. 1802319 for the word mark LTX, registered on May 21, 2024 in connection with, among other things, “Downloadable and recorded computer software for the creation of commercials, movies, clips, videos, AI-generated images and videos” (Class 9) and “Software as a service (SAAS) services, namely, providing non-downloadable software for the creation of commercials, movies, clips, videos, AI-generated images and videos” (Class 42).

Complainant asserts:

“In addition to its registered trademarks, the Complainant uses LTXV as a name both internally and publicly to refer to its proprietary video generation technology – standing for LTX Video.”

Annexed to the Complaint are examples of Complainant using LTXV with reference to its video generation technology. Complainant has recently filed a trademark application in Israel for the LTXV mark.

Complainant owns the domain name <lightricks.com> and uses that domain name for a commercial website featuring its LTX and LTXV products and services.

The Domain Name was registered on May 18, 2025. The Domain Name resolves to a website stating, among other things:

“Discover LTX Video, a revolutionary AI-powered tool for real-time video generation.”

“Empowering Your vision with LTX Video”

“Unlock Your Creative Potential with LTX Video”

According to Complainant, “Respondent’s website advertises LTXV-13B, an AI video generation model developed by the Complainant, while falsely representing itself as the Complainant.”

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Name.

B. Respondent

The entirety of Respondent's substantive response is as follows:

"This project is a demo of an open-source video model named LTX [website redacted]. It's different from the website LTX Studio. We didn't pretend to be RTX [sic] Studio in any ways. So I don't think it's the same 'LTX'."

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists the three elements which Complainant must satisfy with respect to the Domain Name:

- (i) the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name; and
- (iii) the 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 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 Panel finds that Complainant has rights in the trademark LTX through registration and use demonstrated in the record. The Panel also finds that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to that mark. The Domain Name incorporates the LTX mark in its entirety and adds a hyphen and the word "video." The LTX mark remains recognizable within the Domain Name, despite these differences.

Complainant has established Policy paragraph 4(a)(i).

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Pursuant to paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, Respondent may establish its rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name, among other circumstances, by showing any of the following elements:

- (i) before any notice to you [Respondent] of the dispute, your use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or
- (ii) you [Respondent] (as an individual, business, or other organization) have been commonly known by the Domain Name, even if you have acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or
- (iii) you [Respondent] are making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

The Panel concludes that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name. Notwithstanding Respondent's brief comment regarding its registration of the Domain Name, it appears more likely than not that Respondent registered the Domain Name with Complainant's LTX mark in mind. As noted above, Respondent's website makes reference to an AI video generation model developed by Complainant. Respondent's website presents itself as commercial in nature. Respondent did not provide a reasonable explanation for the selection of LTX as part of the Domain Name, and none is available to the Panel, particularly noting that the Domain Name resolves to a website related to Complainant's business field. Based on this record, the Panel finds that Respondent registered the Domain Name to impersonate

Complainant and derive commercial gain by misleading consumers who were seeking Complainant's website. Such conduct does not give rise to rights or legitimate interests vis-à-vis the Domain Name.

Complainant has established Policy paragraph 4(a)(ii).

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides that the following circumstances, "in particular but without limitation," are evidence of the registration and use of the Domain Name in "bad faith":

- (i) circumstances indicating that Respondent has registered or has acquired the Domain Name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the Domain Name registration to Complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of its documented out of pocket costs directly related to the Domain Name; or
- (ii) that Respondent has registered the Domain Name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that Respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) that Respondent has registered the Domain Name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) that by using the Domain Name, Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to Respondent's website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of Respondent's website or location or of a product or service on Respondent's website or location.

The Panel concludes, on the record provided here, that Respondent has registered and used the Domain Name in bad faith. The Panel incorporates its discussion above in the "Rights or Legitimate Interests" section. On the record presented here, the Panel concludes that Respondent registered the Domain Name in order to target Complainant and its LTX trademark. The Panel concludes from this record that Respondent has sought to divert Internet traffic to its website for commercial gain by means of generating consumer confusion, in violation of the above-quoted Policy paragraph 4(b)(iv).

Complainant has established Policy paragraph 4(a)(iii).

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 Domain Name <ltx-video.org> be transferred to Complainant.

/Robert A. Badgley/

Robert A. Badgley

Sole Panelist

Date: September 20, 2025