

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Rockwell Automation Inc v. Igor Gorbov
Case No. D2025-3392

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Igor Gorbov, Russian Federation.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <allenbradleyruss.com> is registered with Registrar of Domain Names REG.RU LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 22, 2025. On August 25, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 26, 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 (Personal data, cannot be publicly disclosed according to applicable laws) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 26 and September 1, 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 amended Complaints on August 29 and September 1, 2025.

On August 26, 2025, the Center informed the parties in Russian and English, that the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain name is Russian. On August 29, 2025, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant's submission but sent a communication in Russian claiming that it does not understand English on August 29, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaints 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 in Russian and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 2, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 22, 2025. The Respondent sent email communication to the Center on August 29, 2025. Accordingly, the Center notified the Parties of commencement of panel appointment process on September 23, 2025.

The Center appointed William A. Van Caenegem as the sole panelist in this matter on September 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 a global corporation active in industrial automation and digital transformation. The brand Allen-Bradley was started in 1903 and was acquired by the Complainant in 1985. At present Allen-Bradley products are sold and distributed worldwide, the Complainant having clients in over 80 countries. The Complainant itself serves customers across a wide range of industries, including automotive, food, beverage, oil and gas, life sciences, and more.

The Complainant is the owner of relevant trademark registrations, including ALLEN-BRADLEY registered with the USPTO on March 21, 1961 No 0712800; ALLEN-BRADLEY registered with the USPTO on March 21, 1961, No 0712836; ALLEN-BRADLEY registered with the USPTO on October 13, 1981, No 1172994; and ALLEN-BRADLEY registered on October 19, 1962 with the Canadian CIPO No TMA128375.

The Complainant hosts its primary website at the domain name <rockwellautomation.com>, and its domain <allen-bradley.com> redirects to this same site. The Complainant's website received 1.6 million individual visits in the three-month period between March and May 2025.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 27, 2025, and resolves to a website in Russian that presents itself as the Complainant's official representative.

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.

The Complainant says that it enjoys a substantial degree of public recognition in the trademarks as its brand is well-recognized by consumers, industry peers, and the broader global community. This is due to the continuous use of the ALLEN-BRADLEY trademarks, and the significant investments over the years to advertise, promote, and protect these trademarks across numerous regions and various forms of media, including the Internet, according to the Complainant.

The Complainant further contends that the disputed domain name can be considered as capturing, in its entirety, the Complainant's ALLEN-BRADLEY trademark and simply adding the term "russ". The Complainant contends that the mere addition of this term to its trademark does not negate the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the trademark under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, and the disputed domain name must be considered confusingly similar to the Complainant's ALLEN-BRADLEY trademark. The Complainant adds that the omission of the hyphen makes no difference to this contention.

The Complainant maintains that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name contributes to the confusion, as it is used to host a website that directly attempts to imitate the Complainant's official website for ALLEN-BRADLEY. It uses the Complainant's distinctive logo, website layout and colour scheme, which, according to the Complainant, suggests that the Respondent intended the disputed domain name to be confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark as a means of furthering consumer confusion. Although conceding that the content is usually disregarded under the first element of the UDRP, the Complainant points out that Panels have "taken note of the content of the website associated with a domain name to confirm confusing similarity where it appears prima facie that the respondent seeks to target a trademark through the disputed domain name" (referring to WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 1.15.)

The Complainant says that the Respondent is not sponsored by or affiliated with it in any way, and has not given the Respondent permission to use the Complainant's trademarks in any manner, including in domain names. The Complainant also asserts that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, which evinces a lack of rights or legitimate interests. The Respondent's name as identified by the Registrar gives no basis to suggest that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, and the Respondent cannot be regarded as having acquired rights to or legitimate interests in it within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy, the Complainant maintains. The Complainant adds that the Respondent's attempt to pass off the disputed domain name as being affiliated with the Complainant, and in fact as being the Complainant, is in itself evidence of the fact that the Respondent does not have rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy. The Complainant adds that Panels have taken the view that cases of impersonation where the relationship with the Complainant is not properly disclosed cannot be deemed fair use, and in fact "constitute the kind of behavior prohibited by the Policy".

The Complainant further notes that the relevant website invites visitors to divulge their personal information by requesting online users to get in touch by providing email addresses and phone numbers. The said website seeks to take advantage of the reputation of the Complainant's trademarks to illegitimately increase traffic to the Respondent's website for commercial gain, and at worst, "phish" personal information from the Complainant's customers, according to the Complainant.

The Complainant points out that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name on January 27, 2025, which is significantly after the Complainant filed for registration of its ALLEN-BRADLEY trademark with the USPTO and CIPO, and also significantly after the Complainant's first use in commerce of its trademark in 1909. The Complainant adds that the registration of the disputed domain name also occurred significantly after the Complainant's registration of its <allen-bradley.com> domain name on February 25, 1998. The Complainant adds that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to host a website that is clearly intended to mislead interested users into believing it is operated by or officially affiliated with the Complainant, while prominently featuring the Complainant's logo in the masthead of the website is further evidence that the Respondent has chosen to register the disputed domain name to target the Complainant and not for some arbitrary reason. The Complainant contends that the mark ALLEN-BRADLEY is so closely linked and associated with the Complainant says that the Respondent's use of this mark, or any minor variation of it, strongly implies bad faith – where a domain name is "so obviously connected with such a well-known name and products, ...its very use by someone with no connection with the products suggests opportunistic bad faith."

Finally, the Complainant points out that the Respondent, at the time of initial filing of the Complaint, had employed a privacy service to hide its identity, which past Panels have held serves as further evidence of bad faith registration and use.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions but sent one email communication to the Center on August 28, 2025, stating that it does not understand the information provided to it.

6. Discussion and Findings

Language of the Proceeding

Although the registration agreement for the disputed domain name is in Russian, the Complainant requests that the present proceeding is conducted in English. The Complainant asserts that it is unable to communicate in Russian and that translation of the Complaint would unfairly disadvantage and burden it and delay this proceeding; that the additional delay, considering the obviously abusive nature of the disputed domain name and the associated website to offer for sale the Complainant's own goods while claiming to be affiliated with the Complainant through the use of the Complainant's logo and branding poses continuing risk to the Complainant and unsuspecting consumers seeking the Complainant or its products; that the disputed domain name is comprised of Latin characters; that the website found at the disputed domain name features various phrases in English including "Rockwell Automation" (the Complainant's organization), "Plant" and "Distribution Control System". According to the Complainant this suggests the Respondent is, at the very least, competent in English and understands the English language; that the term ALLEN-BRADLEY, which is the dominant portion of the disputed domain name, does not carry any specific meaning in the Russian language; and that pursuant to Paragraph 11(a) of the Rules, the Panel may determine the language of the proceedings having regard to all circumstances, and to help ensure fairness, and maintain an inexpensive and expeditious avenue for resolving domain disputes.

The Complainant also asserts that it would be unduly burdened if it had to arrange and pay for translation where the Respondent has demonstrated behavior that disrupts the Complainant's business and has already required the Complainant to devote significant time and resources to addressing this instance of abuse.

The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center stating that its preferred language is Russian on August 29, 2025, and has not filed a formal response to the Complaint.

The Panel notes that Center has administered the proceedings in both Russian and English languages, including providing all case communications concerning the nature of the case to the Respondent in Russian. Despite being made aware that a legal claim was being put forward concerning its registration of the disputed domain name, in none of the Respondent's communications did it raise any matters that would go to the merits of the case, suggesting an attempt to ignore application of the Policy rather than provide a substantive reaction.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.5.1).

Having considered all the matters advanced by the Complainant, and taking into consideration that the website to which the disputed domain name resolves mirrors the Complainant's website, poses as its official representative, and reflects full knowledge of the nature and detail of its offerings which are originally described in English, implying a level of knowledge of that language on the part of the Respondent, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

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 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 Complainant's registered trademark is recognizable in the disputed domain name, and although the addition of other terms, here "russ", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of the term in the present matter 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 Complainant has not authorized the use of its trademark by the Respondent.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name to create an impression of an official relationship where one does not exist (here the establishment of a website that in pertinent ways mirrors the Complainant's online presence at its official site) would not confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. The disputed domain name clearly uses "russ" in an attempt to create the false impression that it is the official local Russian agent of the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5. The website to which the disputed domain name resolves moreover replicates branding elements of the Complainant – including in the favicon of the web browser, and the general look and feel of its website, although translated into Russian. The website does not make it clear that there is no official affiliation with the Complainant, instead it states that it is the Complainant's official representative.

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 the disputed domain name which reproduces the distinctive registered trademark of the Complainant, with only the very minor difference of the omission of a hyphen but notably with the addition of "russ" to give an impression of an official relationship. This occurred without the license or authority of the Complainant and at a time when the latter's reputation as vested in the ALLEN-BRADLEY trademark was well established and widespread. Given also the composition and design of the website to which the disputed domain name resolves and the favicon, it can legitimately be inferred on the balance of probabilities that the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name in the full knowledge of the rights of the Complainant. The Respondent then engaged in the activity of establishing a website that is made to look like the official Russian presence of the Complainant. Since the

latter never authorized this, and the impugned website does not make it clear that it is unaffiliated with the Complainant, the said website is misleading and aimed at deceiving consumers. In the circumstances both the registration and use of the disputed domain name were in bad faith.

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 <allenbradleyruss.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/William A. Van Caenegem/

William A. Van Caenegem

Sole Panelist

Date: October 10, 2025