

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Rolls-Royce Plc v. ranhonghong  
Case No. D2025-4587

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Rolls-Royce Plc, United Kingdom ("UK"), represented by Cleveland Scott York LLP, UK.

The Respondent is ranhonghong, China.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <roll-royce.com> is registered with OwnRegistrar, Inc. (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on November 6, 2025. On November 6, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY, WhoisSecure) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 11, 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 November 14, 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 19, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 9, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on December 12, 2025.

The Center appointed Rachel Tan as the sole panelist in this matter on December 19, 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**

Founded in 1906, the Complainant is a company based in the UK with presence in 48 countries. The Complainant specialises in offering engineering services and products in the fields of aerospace, defence, marine, and energy. Today, the Complainant is one of the world's largest civil aero engine companies, one of the world's largest defence aero engine companies, and a global leader in marine propulsion and a leading supplier of energy solutions. The Complainant also operates its official website at "www.rolls-royce.com".

The Complainant is the owner of the ROLLS-ROYCE mark. For example, UK Registration No. UK00000302443 for ROLLS-ROYCE registered on April 22, 1908, in Class 7; and UK Registration No. UK00003030703 for ROLLS-ROYCE registered on February 28, 2014, in Classes 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16, 18, 21, 25, 26, 28, 36, 37, 39, 41, and 42.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 9, 2024. At the time of the Complaint and this Decision, the disputed domain name resolved to an active website featuring a gambling advertisement for J9 AG Asia Gambling. When clicking on various sections of the page, an Internet user is redirected to "[www.j98836.com/index](http://www.j98836.com/index)" featuring gambling content.

#### **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 is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's ROLLS-ROYCE mark as it incorporates the entirety of the mark with only the letter "s" removed from the word "rolls".

The Complainant further alleges that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not licensed or authorized by the Complainant to use the ROLLS-ROYCE mark or variation thereof. There is also no evidence that the Respondent is known by the disputed domain name or holds any registered rights for "rolls-royce". In addition, the disputed domain name resolves to a website displaying gambling content in Chinese. This illustrates that the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name with a bona fide offering of goods and services nor is he making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is likely generating commercial gain through misleadingly diverting Internet users with the disputed domain name.

Finally, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Given the extremely high level of global recognition of the ROLLS-ROYCE mark, the Respondent should have known of the Complainant's mark when registering the disputed domain name. The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to direct Internet users intending to land on the Complainant's website to a third-party website with gambling content illustrates the Respondent's attempt to generate commercial profits through the disputed domain name.

##### **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **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 disputed domain name, with only the letter "s" removed from the word "rolls". Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Lastly, it is permissible for the Panel to disregard the applicable generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") in the disputed domain name, i.e., ".com". [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

Based on the available information, 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 Respondent has not provided evidence of a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name or reasons to justify his or her choice of the disputed domain name that is confusingly similar to the Complainant's ROLLS-ROYCE mark. The Complainant has not granted the Respondent a license or authorisation to use the Complainant's ROLLS-ROYCE mark or register the disputed domain name. There is no indication to show that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or otherwise has rights or legitimate interests in any of them. In addition, the Complainant has submitted evidence showing that the disputed domain name directs to a website hosting gambling content. There is no bona fide offering of goods or services or legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c) of the Policy are present in this case.

For these reasons, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Based on the available information, 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name was registered long after the registration of the Complainant's ROLLS-ROYCE mark. Through extensive use and advertising, the Complainant's ROLLS-ROYCE mark is well-known in many jurisdictions. Search results using the key word "Rolls-Royce" on popular Internet search engines direct Internet users to the Complainant and its business, which indicates that an exclusive connection between the ROLLS-ROYCE mark and the Complainant has been established. As such, the Respondent either knew or should have known of the Complainant's ROLLS-ROYCE mark when registering the disputed domain name and has exercised "the kind of willful blindness that numerous panels have held support a finding of bad faith". See *Barclays Bank PLC v. Andrew Barnes*, WIPO Case No. [D2011-0874](#).

Furthermore, the Panel considers the mere registration of a domain name that is confusingly similar to a well-known trademark by an unaffiliated person can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4. In this case, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the widely known ROLLS-ROYCE mark with only the letter "s" removed from the word "rolls" and was registered by the Respondent who has no relationship with the Complainant, which means that a presumption of bad faith can be created.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name is being used by the Respondent to direct to a website featuring online gambling content, which demonstrates the Respondent's intention to make commercial gain from the website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark and attracting Internet users. Such use constitutes evidence of bad faith registration and use, as contemplated under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Respondent has kept silent in the face of the Complainant's allegations of bad faith. Taking into account these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent must have known of the Complainant before registering the disputed domain name and, considering the Respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests, and by registering and using the disputed domain name as discussed above, the Panel is led to conclude that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Based on the available information, 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 <roll-royce.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Rachel Tan/

**Rachel Tan**

Sole Panelist

Date: December 29, 2025