

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

HEX-RAYS NV v. Jeonghyun Joo

Case No. D2025-3602

1. The Parties

The Complainant is HEX-RAYS NV, Belgium, represented by Cresco Advocaten, Belgium.

The Respondent is Jeonghyun Joo, Republic of Korea.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <hex-ray.com> is registered with CloudFlare, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 5, 2025. On September 5, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 8, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that 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 16, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 6, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 7, 2025.

The Center appointed Marina Perraki as the sole panelist in this matter on October 14, 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 Belgian company active in the field of cybersecurity and software reverse-engineering. In particular, the Complainant offers advanced reverse-engineering and disassembler tools, used in cybersecurity research, software vulnerability analysis and malware investigation. Founded in 2005, the Complainant has achieved international recognition for its products. The Complainant maintains its official website at “www.hex-rays.com”. Per Complaint, the Complainant is followed on alternative platforms such as “infosec.exchange” and maintains presence in the social media, as well as a YouTube channel with content about its products, certain videos receiving tens of thousands of views.

The Complainant is the owner of the European Union trademark registration No. 018770847, HEX-RAYS (figurative) (“Mark”), filed on October 3, 2022 and registered on January 14, 2023 for services in international class 42.

The Domain Name was registered on December 3, 2023 and redirects to the Complainant’s competitor website, namely “www.binary.ninja”.

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 Domain Name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists the three elements which the 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 the 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 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 Mark is reproduced within the Domain Name with the sole omission of the final letter “s” in the “ray” portion of the Domain Name. Accordingly, the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9.

The generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.com” is disregarded, as gTLDs typically do not form part of the comparison on the grounds that they are required for technical reasons (*Rexel Developpements SAS v. Zhan Yequn*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-0275](#)).

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 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 Domain Name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

On the contrary, as Complainant demonstrated, the Domain Name redirects to the website of a third party, which is a direct competitor of the Complainant, offering competing products.

The Panel finds that these circumstances do not confer upon the Respondent any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name.

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.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent’s registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

The Panel concludes that Respondent has registered and used the Domain Name in bad faith. Because the HEX-RAYS mark was registered prior to the Domain Name registration, the Panel finds it more likely than not that Respondent had the Complainant’s Mark in mind when registering the Domain Name (*Tudor Games, Inc. v. Domain Hostmaster, Customer ID No. 09382953107339 dba Whois Privacy Services Pty Ltd / Domain Administrator, Vertical Axis Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-1754](#)). The Panel further notes that the Complainant’s website is “www.hex-rays.com” which was also operated before the Domain Name registration, and the only difference between the Domain Name and the Complainant’s website is the omission of the “s” in the Domain Name.

The Respondent could have conducted a trademark search and would have found the Complainant's prior registration in respect of HEX-RAYS (*Citrix Online LLC v. Ramalinga Reddy Sanikommu Venkata*, WIPO Case No. [D2012-1338](#)).

As regards use, the Domain Name redirects to a competitor third party website, which offers competing products to those of the Complainant. The Domain Name operates therefore by intentionally creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark and business as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the website it resolves to. This supports the finding of bad faith use (*Aktiebolaget Electrolux v. Priscilla Quaiotti Passos*, WIPO Case No. [D2011-0388](#) and [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4).

Under these circumstances and on this record, the Panel finds that the Respondent has registered and is using the Domain Name 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 Domain Name <hex-ray.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Marina Perraki/

Marina Perraki

Sole Panelist

Date: October 28, 2025