

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Alrovi ApS v. Athanasios Kokoras

Case No. D2025-4052

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Alrovi ApS, Denmark, internally represented.

The Respondent is Athanasios Kokoras, United States of America ("United States")

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ro.gold> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on October 3, 2025. On October 6, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 6, 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 and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 7, 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 October 7, 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 October 14, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 3, 2025. The Response was filed with the Center on October 14, 2025.

The Center appointed Steven A. Maier as the sole panelist in this matter on October 21, 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 company incorporated in Denmark. It offers a cross-platform browser extension named RoGold, relating to a third-party proprietary gaming product, Roblox, which enables players and developers to customize various aspects of the Roblox gaming experience.

Based on the Panel's own enquiries,¹ Roblox is a free-to-play game creation platform and social universe operated by Roblox Corporation, Inc. Roblox offers a virtual currency, Robux, which enables users buy in-game items including clothing, accessories, avatar upgrades, game passes, and developer products in games created by other users.

It does not appear to the Panel that either the Complainant or the Respondent has any official affiliation to Roblox, or any licence or authorization in respect of any of its products or services.

The Complainant is the owner of European Union trademark registration number 019198144 for the word mark ROGOLD, registered on September 21, 2025 in International Classes 9 and 42. It filed an application for a similar United States trademark on August 14, 2025.

The Complainant operated a website at "www.rogold.me" from 2021 until November 2022, when it migrated its service to "www.rogold.live".

The disputed domain name was registered on November 4, 2023.

The disputed domain name has resolved to a website at "www.ro.gold". The website appears at all material times to have offered users the opportunity to earn free Robux by competing a variety of quizzes and surveys.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has, since 2021, developed a user base exceeding 800,000 users. It exhibits developer analytics which appear to show a steady growth in weekly users over time, with 200,000 users in mid-2022, increasing to approximately 800,000 in October 2025. It also exhibits publicity on the Chrome Web Store and third-party videos on YouTube referencing its RoGold product.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to its ROGOLD trademark, differing from that trademark only by the presence of a dot between "ro" and "gold".

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. It states that it has never licensed or authorized the Respondent to use its ROGOLD trademark, and that the Respondent has not commonly been known by that name. It asserts that the Respondent's offering of Robux currency is deceptive, does not constitute a genuine offering of goods or services, and is intended only to divert Internet users by impersonating the Complainant. It adds that the Respondent has displayed a copyright notice "© Copyright 2025 – RoGold" on its website, which further demonstrates that the Respondent is passing itself off as the Complainant.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. It states that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name, being virtually identical to its ROGOLD trademark, long after the Complainant had started using that mark and had built up a substantial user base. It contends in particular that, by using the disputed domain name the Respondent has intentionally attempted

¹ As discussed in section 4.8 of WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record if it would consider such information useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision.

to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of that website.

The Complainant adds that the Respondent's activities risk harming Internet users and thereby damaging the reputation of the Complainant.

The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

The Respondent submits that the disputed domain name forms part of its legitimate digital rewards brand, Robux Gold, which it has operated since 2023. It states that it provides a survey- and quiz-based rewards site at "www.ro.gold" from which users are able to earn from shared revenue.

The Respondent states that it registered various domain names in 2023 in connection with its Robux Gold offering, namely <robuxgold.com> in March 2023, <robuxgld.com> and <rogld.com> in June 2023 and the disputed domain name in November 2023. It submits that all of these registrations predate the Complainant's trademark, and asserts that it had no knowledge of the Complainant at the date it registered the disputed domain name.

The Respondent contends that its rewards-based website has no business overlap with the Complainant's product, which is a browser extension for user customization.

The Respondent refers to statistics shown on its website homepage, claiming 45,718 total users, 159,115 total withdrawals and 16,629 total stock. It exhibits pages relating to "RO GLD" profiles with both X and YouTube, the latter claiming 3.14k subscribers. It also submits that it has worked with various influencers to promote its website, and provides a list of affiliate links and integration ads on YouTube, together with the number of views (generally in the tens of thousands) in each case.

The Respondent submits in the circumstances that it has rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, and that the disputed domain name was neither registered nor has been used in bad faith. It seeks a denial of the Complaint accordingly.

6. Discussion and Findings

In order to succeed in the Complaint, the Complainant is required to show that all three of the elements set out under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are present. Those elements are that:

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

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has established that it is the owner of registered trademark rights for the mark ROGOLD. While the disputed domain name was registered prior to the date of the Complainant's trademark registration, that is not material for the purposes of the first element under the Policy, which functions primarily as a standing requirement. The relative registration dates may, however, be relevant to considerations concerning the second and third elements under the Policy.

The disputed domain name, including the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".gold", is identical to the Complainant's trademark ROGOLD, save for the dot which appears between "ro" and "gold" in the disputed domain name. While the Top-Level Domain ("TLD") is typically to be disregarded for the purposes of comparison, there is an exception in "spanning the dot" cases where the applicable TLD and the second-

level portion of the disputed domain name, in combination, contain the relevant trademark, in which cases panels may consider the disputed domain name in its entirety for purposes of assessing confusing similarity (see section 1.11.3 of WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ([“WIPO Overview 3.0”](#))).

On this basis, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

On the evidence available to the Panel, the Respondent appears to be operating a genuine business offering Robux rewards in exchange for website user activity involving surveys and quizzes. It appears to have operated this business since 2023 and exhibits evidence of other complementary domain name registrations and of Internet user engagement with its service.

While the Complainant asserts that the Respondent’s activities are not genuine, are deceptive and risk harming Internet users, it does not provide reasons or evidence in support of these assertions, nor is it obvious from the material available to the Panel that the Respondent’s website is a sham. It should be noted in this regard that the UDRP provides a relatively summary procedure for the resolution of, essentially, cases of cybersquatting, and is not geared to conducting an extensive factual or evidential investigation such as might be the case in a court of law. On that basis, the Complainant has not persuaded the Panel that the Respondent’s website does not represent a bona fide commercial venture.

Nor (for reasons which are discussed in further detail below) does the Panel consider the Complainant’s trademark to be either so distinctive or so widely known that the Respondent should be assumed to have registered the disputed domain name in order to target the Complainant’s trademark, as opposed to for the purposes of an independent business venture.

In the circumstances, the Complainant has failed to meet the burden of demonstrating to the Panel, on balance, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

While the Panel’s finding in respect of the second element, above, is sufficient to dispose of the proceeding, the Panel also notes that it does not find either registration or use of the disputed domain name to have been shown to be in bad faith.

Although the Complainant points to the near identity between its ROGOLD trademark and the disputed domain name, the Panel observes that both the trademark and the disputed domain name comprise the letters “ro”, representing the third-party proprietary product Roblox, and the term “gold”, which is a term of general application in commerce to indicate goods or services of a high standard. In the circumstances, given the derivative and relatively non-distinctive nature of the Complainant’s trademark, the Panel finds it to be entirely plausible that the Respondent decided upon the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant’s trademark rights, or in any event without any intent to impersonate the Complainant, or otherwise to target the goodwill attaching to its trademark.

In the circumstances, the Panel does not agree that the Respondent’s copyright notice indicates an obvious intention to impersonate the Complainant, as opposed to referencing the Respondent’s own business.

In view of the above observations, together with the Panel’s findings in respect of the second element under the Policy, the Complainant has failed to establish that the disputed domain name was registered and has been used in bad faith.

D. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking

Paragraph 15(e) of the Rules provides that, if after considering the submissions, the Panel finds that the Complaint was brought in bad faith, for example in an attempt at Reverse Domain Name Hijacking or to

harass the domain-name holder, the Panel shall declare in its decision that the Complaint was brought in bad faith and constitutes an abuse of the administrative proceeding. The mere lack of success of the complaint is not, on its own, sufficient to constitute reverse domain name hijacking: [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.16.

While the Panel considers that the Complainant's case was misconceived and in some instances overstated, the Panel declines, principally in view of the near identity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark, to make a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking in this case.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Steven A. Maier/

Steven A. Maier

Sole Panelist

Date: November 4, 2025