

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Dolby Laboratories Licensing Corporation v. domain admin
Case No. D2025-4372

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Dolby Laboratories Licensing Corporation c/o Eligon IP LLC, United States of America (“United States” or “U.S.”), represented by Eligon IP LLC, United States.

The Respondent is domain admin, Hong Kong, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <dolbyoptiview.com> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 24, 2025. On October 24, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 24, 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 Purposes, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 27, 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 amended Complaint on October 28, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended 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 November 4, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 24, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on November 26, 2025.

The Center appointed Anita Gerewal as the sole panelist in this matter on December 8, 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 well-known global technology company specializing in audio, visual, and voice technologies for movies, television, music, and gaming. Since at least 1969, the Complainant has used the DOLBY mark in connection with technologies that enhance sound clarity, balance volume, and immersive surround sound, as well as high dynamic range visual imaging that delivers improved brightness, contrast, and color accuracy. The Complainant's technologies are widely used in cinemas, home entertainment systems, streaming services, recording equipment, mobile devices, and professional media production and broadcasting environments.

The Complainant operates its official website at the domain name <dolby.com>, including the subdomain name <optiview.dolby.com>, through which it markets its DOLBY Optiview platform. In April 2025, the Complainant introduced DOLBY Optiview at the NAB 2025 Show in Las Vegas. DOLBY Optiview is a suite of streaming solutions designed for sports, film, gaming, music, and entertainment companies, offering immersive audiovisual quality, configurable low latency, server-guided ad insertion, and enhanced viewer engagement and monetization.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous DOLBY trademark registrations internationally, including the following:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 992,985 for the word mark DOLBY in international class 9, registered on September 10, 1974;
- United States Trademark Registration No. 1,702,237 for the word mark DOLBY in international class 42, registered on July 21, 1992; and
- International Trademark Registration No. 1523678 for the mark Dolby in international classes 9, 38, 41 and 42, registered on October 24, 2019 and designating several countries.

The Complainant has filed a trademark application for the word mark DOLBY OPTIVIEW at the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO"), in international classes 9, 35, 38, 41 and 42 (U.S. Serial No. 99/222,916) on June 7, 2025.

On September 10, 2025, the Complainant sent a cease-and desist letter to the Registrar's email address reserved for domain name abuse and requested that it be transmitted to the Respondent.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 7, 2025 and currently resolves to a parking page on which the disputed domain name is being offered for sale for USD 1,999.

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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name wholly incorporates the Complainant's DOLBY OPTIVIEW mark and reproduces the distinctive DOLBY mark in its entirety, rendering it identical to

the former and confusingly similar to the latter. The addition of the generic Top-Level Domain “.com” is disregarded for the purposes of the first element under the Policy, as consistently held in prior UDRP decisions. Accordingly, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademarks.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is neither affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant and has never been commonly known by the DOLBY or DOLBY OPTIVIEW names. The Complainant’s longstanding use of the DOLBY mark since 1969 and its launch of the DOLBY OPTIVIEW platform in April 2025 predate the Respondent’s registration of the disputed domain name on June 7, 2025. The Respondent is not using the disputed domain name for any bona fide offering of goods or services, nor for legitimate noncommercial or fair use; instead, the disputed domain name resolves to a parked page offering it for sale for an amount most likely in excess of the Respondent’s out-of-pocket costs related to the disputed domain name. Despite being notified of the Complainant’s objections, the Respondent failed to respond or attempt an amicable resolution. These circumstances support the inference that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name primarily for resale to profit from the Complainant’s well-known marks, and therefore lacks any rights or legitimate interests.

The Complainant also contends that the totality of the evidence demonstrates that the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Complainant’s DOLBY mark has been globally well known for decades, and the DOLBY OPTIVIEW mark was publicly launched at NAB 2025 shortly before the Respondent’s registration of the disputed domain name. The Respondent registered a domain name that is identical to the Complainant’s DOLBY OPTIVIEW mark and confusingly similar to the Complainant’s famous DOLBY mark on the same day the Complainant filed its USPTO application, strongly supporting the inference that the Respondent had actual knowledge of the Complainant’s rights and intentionally targeted those marks. The Respondent’s bad faith is further confirmed by its use of the disputed domain name to offer it for sale at a “Buy Now” price of USD 1,999 – an amount far exceeding any reasonable out-of-pocket registration costs – thereby evidencing registration primarily for the purpose of selling the disputed domain name to the Complainant or a competitor for valuable consideration in excess of out-of-pocket costs. The Respondent’s failure to respond to the Complainant’s good-faith attempt to resolve the matter amicably reinforces this conclusion. Accordingly, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, in order to succeed, the Complainant must establish each of the following elements:

- (i) The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in respect of the disputed 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 the DOLBY trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

Although the Complainant has filed trademark applications for DOLBY OPTIVIEW, which are currently pending, the Panel finds it unnecessary, in light of the evidence on record, to determine whether the Complainant has established any unregistered or common law rights in that mark under section 1.3 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#). The Complainant has demonstrated registered trademark rights in the mark which is fully incorporated in the disputed domain name. Accordingly, for purposes of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Panel relies on the Complainant's registered mark DOLBY.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the DOLBY mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of the other term here, "optiview" 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 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 Panel observes that the Complainant has no relationship in any way with the Respondent and did not authorize the Respondent's use of the DOLBY trademark. The Panel also notes that there is no evidence showing that the Respondent might be commonly known by the disputed domain name in the sense of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

Further, the Panel observes that the disputed domain name resolves to a parked page offering it for sale for USD 1,999. Noting that the Respondent has not offered any explanation as to its choice of the disputed domain name and considering also the composition of the latter, the Panel is of the opinion that by offering the disputed domain name for sale the Respondent has intended to capitalize on the reputation and goodwill inherent in the Complainant's DOLBY trademark, which does not support a finding of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name on the part of the Respondent.

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.

In the present case, the disputed domain name includes the Complainant's well-known DOLBY trademark in its entirety, with addition of the term "optiview" which directly targets the Complainant's newly launched DOLBY Optiview platform. The disputed domain name was registered long after the Complainant's DOLBY mark had been registered and, notably, on the same date that the Complainant filed its trademark application for "DOLBY OPTIVIEW". These circumstances support the inference that the Respondent likely knew of the Complainant's existing and nascent trademark rights at the time of registration.

Further, the disputed domain name resolves to a webpage offering the domain name for sale. The lack of any credible explanation for the Respondent's choice of the domain name, the timing of registration, and the Respondent's failure to respond to the Complainant's cease-and-desist communications all support a finding that through registration and use of the disputed domain name the Respondent intended to target the Complainant, which is bad faith.

Thus, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used 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 <dolbyoptiview.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Anita Gerewal/
Anita Gerewal
Sole Panelist
Date: December 22, 2025