

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Lightricks Ltd. v. HEWEI ZHU

Case No. D2025-5137

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is HEWEI ZHU, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ltx2.net> is registered with CloudFlare, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 10, 2025. On December 10, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 11, 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 (DATA REDACTED) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 17, 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 December 18, 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 December 18, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 7, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 26, 2026.

The Center appointed Fabrizio Bedarida as the sole panelist in this matter on January 27, 2026. 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, Lightricks Ltd., an Israeli company, is an AI-based software company that develops and markets various software products, including LTX, an AI photo and video generation model that powers the Complainant's applications and platforms ("LTX"). The Complainant officially launched a new model in the LTX series, known as LTX-2, on October 23, 2025. LTX-2 is the next generation of the Complainant's LTX-series AI models.

The Complainant has proven to be the owner of several registrations for the LTX trademark worldwide including in China.

The Complainant is, inter alia, the owner of:

International Registration for LTX, No. 1802319, registered on May 21, 2024;
International Registration for LTX (device), No. 1807758, registered on July 12, 2024;
International Registration for LTX (device), No. 1807759, registered on July 12, 2024.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 26, 2025.

On November 4, 2025, the Complainant attempted to send a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent, requesting the immediate cessation of the unauthorized use of the disputed domain name and the associated trademarks. The letter was sent to the official email address listed on the Respondent's website ([...@ltx2.net]); however, delivery failed. The automated message from the Mail Delivery Subsystem stated: "Address not found. Your message wasn't delivered to [...]@ltx2.net because the address couldn't be found or is unable to receive mail".

At the time of the Complaint and this Decision, the disputed domain name resolves to a website displaying the LTX trademark and purporting to offer the Complainant's LTX 2-branded products.

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 addition of the number "2" in the disputed domain name is not sufficient to prevent the finding of confusing similarity with the Complainant's trademark; that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name for a website displaying the Complainant's LTX 2 branded products, in an apparent attempt to impersonate the Complainant or to suggest an affiliation with the Complainant, does not give rise to rights or legitimate interests; and that bad faith registration and use should be found, as the Respondent registered the disputed domain name and used it while being aware of the Complainant's trademark rights, with the intent to take advantage of and capitalize on the Complainant's well-known trademark.

The Complainant also notes that the disputed domain name was registered immediately after the official launch of its LTX-2 model.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In order for the Complainant to obtain the transfer of the disputed domain name, paragraphs 4(a)(i)-(iii) of the Policy require that the Complainant must demonstrate to the Panel 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

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

Although the addition of other terms here, the number "2", 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 notes that the composition of the disputed domain name, which incorporates the Complainant's trademark together with the number "2" (for a website allegedly offering the Complainant's LTX 2 products at discounted prices) affirms the Respondent's intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant as to the origin or affiliation of the website at the dispute domain name, and as such, the disputed domain name cannot qualify as fair use.

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 Panel notes that the Respondent could not have been unaware of the existence of the Complainant's trademarks when registering the disputed domain name.

The Respondent appears to have registered the disputed domain name only three days after the official launch of the Complainant's LTX-2 model and started offering the related products immediately thereafter. In addition, the Respondent does not appear to be commonly known by the term "LTX" or "LTX2", used to refer to the Complainant's AI photo and video generation technology. It is therefore unlikely that the Respondent chose the disputed domain name without the intention of invoking a misleading association with the Complainant.

Indeed, it is evident from the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name that the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name with the intention to attract Internet users to its website, for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website or location or of a product or service on its website or location, which constitutes registration and use in bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here claimed as impersonation/passing off, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

This Panel thus finds that the above use of the disputed domain name constitutes a disruption of the Complainant's business and qualifies as bad faith registration and use under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Finally, the Respondent has not responded to (nor denied) the assertions made by the Complainant in this proceeding.

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 <ltx2.net> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Fabrizio Bedarida/

Fabrizio Bedarida

Sole Panelist

Date: February 3, 2026