

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Proctor.io Incorporated v. 任艺伟 (Yi Wei Ren)

Case No. D2025-4566

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Proctor.io Incorporated, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Dorsey & Whitney, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is 任艺伟 (Yi Wei Ren), China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <proctorio.cloud>, and <proctorio.life> are registered with Chengdu West Dimension Digital Technology Co., Ltd.; the disputed domain names <proctorio.club>, <proctorio.fun>, <proctorio.shop>, <proctorio.site>, <proctorio.space>, <proctorio.store>, <proctorio.tech>, <proctorio.top>, and <proctorio.website> are registered with West263 International Limited (the “Registrars”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 4, 2025. On November 5, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On November 6, 2025, and November 7, 2025, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 7, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrars, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint in English, and an amendment to the Complaint in English on November 7, 2025, and November 17, 2025, respectively.

On November 7, 2025, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain names is Chinese. On November 7, 2025, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant’s submission.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint, and 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 in English and Chinese of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on November 18, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 8, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on December 17, 2025.

The Center appointed Tao Sun as the sole panelist in this matter on December 24, 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 technology company located in Arizona in the United States. It offers a software platform used to proctor the administration of tests and exams remotely. It has used the PROCTORIO mark in connection with its business and software products and services since at least as early as 2013, and currently sells and markets its products and services in the United States, the European Union and the United Kingdom.

The Complainant owns the following registered trademarks:

- (i) The United States registration No. 5722338 for PROCTORIO in international class 42, registered on April 9, 2019;
- (ii) The European Union registration No. 018034721 for PROCTORIO in international class 42, registered on July 31, 2019; and
- (iii) The United Kingdom registration No. UK00918034721 for PROCTORIO in international class 42, registered on July 31, 2019.

The Complainant also promotes and advertises its business and software products on its website at <proctorio.com>, which shows prominent use of the PROCTORIO mark in connection with the Complainant's business and software products.

All eleven disputed domain names were registered on June 26, 2025. According to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, all of the disputed domain names were redirected to nearly identical websites, each of which offers the disputed domain name for sale with the price of USD 1,450.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that:

- (i) The disputed domain names are nearly identical and confusingly similar to the Complainant's PROCTORIO mark. Each of the disputed domain names only differ from the PROCTORIO mark by the

addition of generic Top-Level Domains (“gTLDs”) consisting of three to six letters after the entirety of Complainant’s PROCTORIO mark.

(ii) The Respondent is not a franchisee, affiliated business, or licensee of the Complainant, nor has the Complainant otherwise authorized the Respondent to register the disputed domain names or otherwise use the Complainant’s mark. The Respondent cannot show use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. As such, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and

(iii) The Respondent registered each of the disputed domain names: (1) with the specific intent to cause consumer confusion and to free ride on the vast goodwill associated with the Complainant’s PROCTORIO mark, in which the Complainant enjoys exclusive rights; and/or (2) for the purpose of inducing the purchase of the disputed domain names or misleading consumers into thinking they are associated with the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Preliminary Issue: Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain names is Chinese. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including the facts that the websites that each of the disputed domain names redirects to are entirely in English, and the trademarks upon which the Respondent is infringing are also all in English, suggesting that the Respondent has demonstrated a clear grasp of the English language.

The Respondent did not make any submissions with respect to the language of the proceeding.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties’ ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ([“WIPO Overview 3.0”](#)), section 4.5.1).

Having considered all the matters above, and noting that the Center sent the emails in both Chinese and English regarding the notification of the Complaint which includes information on the language of the proceeding, the Respondent did not make any comments on the language of the proceeding, and did not file any response, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

6.2. Substantive Issues

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 names. [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 disputed domain names contain the Complainant's PROCTORIO mark in its entirety with the only difference of different gTLDs. The Complainant's marks can be easily recognized within the disputed domain names. Therefore, the disputed domain names should be considered identical to the Complainant's trademarks for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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 names. The Complainant has asserted that the Respondent is not a franchisee, affiliated business, or licensee of the Complainant, nor has the Complainant otherwise authorized the Respondent to register the disputed domain names or otherwise use the Complainant's mark. The disputed domain names are neither the translation nor transliteration of the Respondent's name. According to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the disputed domain names redirected to the websites where the disputed domain names were offered for sale. Considering that PROCTORIO is not a dictionary word or a common phrase and had been used by the Complainant for a long term, such use does not represent a bona fide offering of goods or services. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel therefore 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 Complainant's PROCTORIO mark is inherently distinctive and has been publicly used by the Complainant since 2013. The disputed domain names contain the entirety of the Complainant's trademark. Therefore, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's famous marks and were registered by the Respondent who has no relationship with the Complainant, which can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

Furthermore, the fact that all of the disputed domain names redirect to the websites where the disputed domain names are offered for sale with the price of USD 1,450 proves that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain names primarily for the purpose of selling the domain names to the Complainant or to the third parties, for valuable consideration in excess of its reasonable expenses, therefore violates paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.1.

Additionally, the Respondent's registration of eleven disputed domain names simultaneously containing the distinctive PROCTORIO mark also demonstrates a pattern of bad faith conduct of preventing the Complainant from reflecting its mark in a domain name, which also constitutes bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.2.

The facts that the Respondent adopts the privacy service to hide his identity, and his failure to respond to this Complaint also support a finding of 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 names <proctorio.cloud>, <proctorio.life>, <proctorio.club>, <proctorio.fun>, <proctorio.shop>, <proctorio.site>, <proctorio.space>, <proctorio.store>, <proctorio.tech>, <proctorio.top>, and <proctorio.website> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Tao Sun/

Tao Sun

Sole Panelist

Date: January 7, 2026