ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
VEED Limited v. f z
Case No. D2025-5257

1. The Parties

The Complainant is VEED Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Josh Goldman, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is f z, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <veedai.org> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on December 16, 2025. On December 17, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 17, 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 (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 18, 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 19, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 8, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on January 12, 2026.

The Center appointed Áron László as the sole panelist in this matter on January 19, 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 is a company based in the United Kingdom that offers online video editing and creation services, including AI-powered video editing and creation. The Complainant claims to have over 36 million signed up users worldwide.

The Complainant is the owner of the following registered trademarks:

United States of America trademark VEED (word) Reg. No. 7232789 registered on December 5, 2023;
United States of America trademark VEED.IO (word) Reg. No. 7369667 registered on April 30, 2024;
United Kingdom trademark VEED (word) Reg. No. 3723028 registered on February 18, 2022;
United Kingdom trademark VEED.IO (word) Reg. No. 3837847 registered on March 10, 2023;
European Union trademark VEED (word) Reg. No. 1707118 registered on February 3, 2022.

The Complainant's main website is available under the domain name <veed.io>.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 20, 2025, and relates to a website offering video editing services under the trade name "Veed AI Video Generator".

The Respondent appears to be a private individual who resides in China, as indicated by the information disclosed by the Registrar.

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 it is the owner of several trademarks for the signs VEED and VEED.IO. The disputed domain name incorporates the VEED trademark in full, therefore it is identical to, or at least confusingly similar to the trademark.

Regarding the second element, the Respondent has no rights in or to the disputed domain name, given the Complainant's prior rights regarding the trademark. The Respondent uses the sign VEED without the Complainant's permission extensively throughout the website accessible via the disputed domain name, which use infringes the Complainant's trademarks.

Regarding the third element, the Complainant claims that the Respondent is diverting search traffic from the Complainant's website by targeting brand queries such as "VEED AI" through aggressive SEO tactics. The Respondent's website employs excessive keyword repetition — with 77 instances of "VEED AI video generator" on the homepage alone — and builds links from third-party websites using variations of the "VEED" brand name combined with core product terms such as "AI video generator" and "audio generator". This causes the Respondent's domain name to appear in search results where users are specifically looking for the Complainant's website, thereby intercepting potential customers before they reach it. The Respondent has not answered to the Complainant's cease and desist letters. Material portions of the homepage of the disputed domain name appear to have been copied from another website. No contact details are provided on the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to decide a complaint based on the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable. Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that a complainant must prove each of the following three elements to obtain an order that a domain name should be cancelled or transferred:

i. the domain name registered by the respondent 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 domain name; and
iii. the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

In view of the Respondent's failure to submit a Response, the Panel shall decide this administrative proceeding based on the Complainant's undisputed representations pursuant to paragraphs 5(f), 14(a), and 15(a) of the Rules and draw such inferences as it considers appropriate pursuant to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules.

The Panel may accept all reasonable allegations set forth in a complaint. However, the Panel may deny relief where a complaint wholly contains mere conclusory or unsubstantiated arguments. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("WIPO Overview 3.0"), section 4.3.

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 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. 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 "ai", 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, impersonation/passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 2.13.1.

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 this case, the Panel believes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the intention of attracting Internet users for commercial gain, thereby creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark. The disputed domain name appears to be a combination of the made-up word VEED and AI, which appears to stand for artificial intelligence. The disputed domain name relates to a website using the name 'VEED AI' that offers the same services as the Complainant, namely online video editing. Some of Complainant's services offered under the sign VEED involve the use of AI, adding to the confusion due to the inclusion of the term AI in the disputed domain name. This does not seem to be a coincidence given the fanciful nature of the term VEED, the identity of the services, and the fact that the Complainant's trademarks predate the disputed domain name by three years. Based on the above, the Panel believes that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in order to impersonate the Complainant.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, 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.

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 <veedai.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Áron László/
Áron László
Sole Panelist
Date: February 2, 2026