

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Lightricks Ltd. v. yiling data, yilingdata
Case No. D2025-3952

1. The Parties

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

Respondent is yiling data, yilingdata, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ltx-ai.org> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 28, 2025. On September 29, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 29, 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, Privacy Service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf”) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on September 30, 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 September 30, 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 October 1, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 21, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on October 27, 2025.

The Center appointed Stephanie G. Hartung as the sole panelist in this matter on November 4, 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

Complainant is a company organized under the laws of Israel that is active in the AI-based software industry.

Complainant has provided evidence that it is the registered owner of various trademarks relating to its LTX brand, including, but not limited to, the following:

- word trademark LTX, International registration with protection e.g. for China (WIPO), registration number: 1802319, registration date: May 21, 2024, status: active;
- word trademark LTX, International registration with protection e.g. for China (WIPO), registration number: 1851399, registration date: March 17, 2025, status: active.

Moreover, Complainant has demonstrated that it owns the domain name <lightricks.com> which resolves to Complainant's main website at "www.lightricks.com", used to promote Complainant's services in the video industry; this website, inter alia, refers to Complainant's open-source video model "LTXV".

Respondent, according to the Registrar verification, is located in China. The disputed domain name was registered on May 8, 2025; it resolves to a website at "www.ltx-ai.org" which offers a free online AI generator named "LTX" and prominently refers to Complainant's LTX trademark as well as to Complainant's LTXV open-source video model, thereby impersonating Complainant.

On September 9, 2025, Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the email address "[...]@ltx-ai.org" which remained unanswered.

Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to 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 disputed domain name. Notably, Complainant contends to be a leading AI-based software company, and its consumers closely associate the LTXV video model and brand with Complainant.

Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's LTX trademark, as it contains the latter (which is not an arbitrary combination of letters but rather serves as an abbreviation and nickname for "Lightricks") and the further use of the term "ai" in the disputed domain name is descriptive of Complainant's services (e.g. AI video generation). Moreover, Complainant asserts that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name since (1) there is no indication of any license, authorization, or other legitimate relationship that would entitle Respondent to use Complainant's LTX trademark in the disputed domain name or on the associated website, and (2) Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in an educational, critical, or informational context. Finally, Complainant argues that Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith since Respondent uses the disputed domain name in a way that intentionally mimics Complainant's branding and falsely suggests an official connection between the Parties by operating a website that actively misleads the public and impersonates Complainant.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, Complainant carries the burden of proving:

- (i) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Respondent's default in the case at hand does not automatically result in a decision in favor of Complainant, however, paragraph 5(f) of the Rules provides that if Respondent does not submit a response, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel shall decide the dispute solely based upon the Complaint. Further, according to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, the Panel may draw such inferences from Respondent's failure to submit a Response as it considers appropriate.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

First, 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 LTX 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.

Complainant has shown rights in respect of its LTX trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1. The entirety of such trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name, simply added by the term "ai" and a hyphen. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's LTX trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. Although the addition of other terms (here, the term "ai") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and Complainant's LTX trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The Panel, therefore, holds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Second, paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which 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 Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent has not rebutted 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.

In particular, Respondent has not been authorized to use Complainant's LTX trademark, either as a domain name or in any other way. Also, there is no reason to believe that Respondent's name somehow corresponds with the disputed domain name and Respondent does not appear to have any trademark rights associated with the term "ltx" on its own, whereby such term is not an arbitrary combination of letters but obviously rather serves as an abbreviation and nickname for Complainant's company name "Lightricks". Rather, the disputed domain name resolves to a website at "www.ltx-ai.org" which offers a free online AI generator named "LTX" and prominently refers to Complainant's LTX trademark as well as to Complainant's LTXV open source video model. Such use of the disputed domain name, therefore, neither qualifies as bona fide nor as legitimate noncommercial or fair within the meaning of the Policy. Finally, panels have long held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, Complainant's impersonation) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Third, 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.

The circumstances of this case leave no doubt that Respondent was fully aware of Complainant's rights in its LTX trademark when registering the disputed domain name and that the latter is clearly directed thereto. Moreover, using the disputed domain name, which is at least confusingly similar to Complainant's LTX trademark, to run a website at "www.ltx-ai.org" which offers a free online AI generator named "LTX" and prominently refers to Complainant's LTX trademark as well as to Complainant's LTXV open source video model, is a clear indication that Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its own website by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's LTX trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of Respondent's website. Such circumstances are evidence of registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. Finally, panels have long held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, Complainant's impersonation) constitutes bad faith, too. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

In this context, it also carries weight in the eyes of the Panel that Respondent obviously provided false or incomplete contact information in the Whois register for the disputed domain name (e.g. an incomplete address in Beijing, China). This fact at least throws a light on Respondent's behavior which supports the Panel's bad faith finding.

The Panel, therefore, holds that Complainant has established the third element of the Policy, too.

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, <ltx-ai.org>, be transferred to Complainant.

/Stephanie G. Hartung/

Stephanie G. Hartung

Sole Panelist

Date: November 18, 2025