

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Lightricks Ltd. v. Abel Oliván, Abelo Achante Corp.  
Case No. D2025-3540

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Lightricks Ltd., Israel, represented by Gornitzky & Co., Israel.

The Respondent is Abel Oliván, Abelo Achante Corp., Spain.

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

The disputed domain name <ltxv-ai.com> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with Name.com, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 2, 2025. On September 2, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On September 2, 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, Domain Protection Services, Inc.) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 4, 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 September 4, 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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 10, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 30, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 6, 2025.

The Center appointed Ian Lowe as the sole panelist in this matter on October 7, 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 an Artificial Intelligence (AI) based software company founded in 2013 and based in Israel. It 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 the Complainant's applications and platforms. According to the Complainant's website at [www.lightricks.com](http://www.lightricks.com), the Complainant has over 6.6 million monthly subscribers and more than 15 million monthly users.

The Complainant is the proprietor of a number of registered trademarks for LTX, including Israel trademark number 371159 LTX registered on May 2, 2024, and International trademark number 1802319 LTX registered on May 21, 2024 designating a number of territories including the European Union. It is also the proprietor of a number of registered trademarks in respect of the word mark LIGHTRICKS, including Israel trademark number 325211 registered on October 1, 2020 and International trademark number 1532107 registered on March 10, 2020 also designating territories including the European Union. The Complainant uses in the black banner of its website its LIGHTRICKS trademark and the following logo:



, (the “Lightricks Device”).

The Domain Name was registered on May 12, 2025. It resolves to a website (the “Respondent's Website”) with a black banner featuring the Lightricks Device and the LIGHTRICKS trademark. The home page of the Respondent's Website is headed “Lightricks: LTXV Video Revolution”. The website offers pages of information about “LTXV, Lightricks' revolutionary AI video model”, about its pricing, where the software may be downloaded, and about LTX Studio, the Complainant's “AI-powered visual storytelling platform”. The Respondent's Website does not provide any information about the operator of the website and does not carry any of the usual formalities such as an About Us page or Terms of Use.

#### **5. Parties' Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

The Complainant contends that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to its LTX trademark (the “Mark”), that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name and that the Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

##### **B. Respondent**

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

## 6. Discussion and Findings

For this Complaint to succeed in relation to the Domain Name the Complainant must prove that:

- (i) the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the 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 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.

Ignoring the generic Top-Level Domain ".com", the Domain Name comprises the entirety of the Mark with the addition of the letter "v", a hyphen and the letters "ai". The Panel finds that these additions do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the Mark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights, and 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. Accordingly, 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.

The Complainant has made out a strong prima facie case that the Respondent could have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name. The Respondent has used the Domain Name not in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, but for a website that features the Complainant's LIGHTRICKS trademark and the Lightricks Device and gives every appearance of being a website operated by the Complainant. There is no suggestion that the Respondent has ever been known by the Domain Name and the Respondent is not authorised by the Complainant to use the Mark or the Lightricks Device. The Respondent has chosen not to respond to the Complainant or to take any steps to counter the prima facie case established by the Complainant. In the circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name.

In addition, the nature of the Domain Name together with the Respondent's Website create a strong risk of Internet user confusion.

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 Domain Name comprises the entirety of the Mark with the addition of the letters "v" and "ai". LTXV is a product of the Complainant that uses AI. Further, the Panel notes that the Respondent has used the Domain Name for a website featuring the Mark and the Complainant's software products. Accordingly, the Panel is in no doubt that the Respondent had the Complainant and its rights in the LTX mark in mind when it registered the Domain Name.

The Panel is satisfied that the Respondent has registered and used the Domain Name to imitate the Complainant and to deceive Internet users into believing that the Domain Name is operated or authorized by the Complainant, attracting Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Mark. In the Panel's view, the use of a domain name for such activity, presumably with a view to commercial gain, amounts to paradigm bad faith registration and use for the purposes of the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

### **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 <ltxv-ai.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Ian Lowe/*

**Ian Lowe**

Sole Panelist

Date: October 18, 2025