

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Marq Vision Inc. v. alezriv erita  
Case No. D2026-1086

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Marq Vision Inc., United States of America (“United States”), internally represented.

The Respondent is alezriv erita, United States.

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

The disputed domain name <marqvision.org> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 13, 2026. On March 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 16, 2026, 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 March 18, 2026, 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 March 20, 2026.

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 March 30, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 19, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 24, 2026.

The Center appointed Colin T. O’Brien as the sole panelist in this matter on April 29, 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 operates an intellectual property enforcement platform for combatting online counterfeiting and brand infringement. The Complainant received the LVMH 2022 Innovation Award for Data and Artificial Intelligence. The Complainant operates its main website at “www.marqvision.com”.

The Complainant, through its affiliate, owns trademark registrations for MARQVISION in the Republic of Korea, including trademark registration No. 4017306270000, MARQVISION (figurative), filed on March 11, 2020, and registered on May 24, 2021, for goods and services in International classes 9, 38, and 42, and subsequently filed on January 4, 2021, and registered on May 11, 2022, for services in International class 35.<sup>1</sup>

The disputed domain name was registered on December 3, 2025. Currently the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive webpage but the Complainant has provided evidence that it previously redirected Internet users to the Complainant’s official website at “www.marqvision.com”.

#### 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 trademark MARQVISION and merely adds the generic Top-Level Domain (gTLD) “.org”. This disputed domain name is designed to capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the Complainant’s mark and create a false impression of association.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not acquired trademark or service mark right in the disputed domain name. There is no relationship or affiliation between the Complainant and the Respondent that might give rise to any license, permission, or other right by which the Respondent could own or use any domain name incorporating the Complainant’s MARQVISION marks.

The Respondent is not engaged in any bona fide offering of goods or services through the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name was registered in a manner that misleadingly suggests affiliation with the Complainant. Specifically, the disputed domain name redirected Internet users to the Complainant’s official website. It is completely implausible that the Respondent coincidentally selected this exact, distinctive mark and set up a direct redirection to the Complainant’s own website without prior knowledge of the Complainant’s rights. This configuration explicitly proves that the Respondent was fully aware of the Complainant’s trademark and corporate identity at the time of registration, and registered the disputed domain name in bad faith to exploit the Complainant’s goodwill.

---

<sup>1</sup> These registrations are in the name of 주식회사 마크비전코리아 (which may be translated as Marq Vision Korea Co., Ltd.). Noting the panels’ general powers under paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules to undertake independent search, the Panel has reviewed the Complainant’s website, which indicates that it operates through several global offices, including in the United States and the Republic of Korea: “www.marqvision.com/about-us”. On this basis, the Panel concludes that the Complainant and the owner of the Korean registrations are related companies.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

The Complainant has demonstrated it owns registered trademark rights in the MARQVISION mark. The gTLD “.org” is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test.

Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to a mark in which the Complainant has rights.

See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), sections 1.7 and 1.11.1, and *F. Hoffmann-La Roche AG v. Domain Admin, Privacy Protection Service INC d/b/a PrivacyProtect.org / Conan Corrigan*, WIPO Case No. [D2015-2316](#).

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

### **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

The Complainant has presented a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and has not been commonly known by the disputed domain name. The fact, inter alia, that the Respondent obtained the disputed domain name four years after the Complainant established its trademark rights in the MARQVISION mark, indicates in the circumstances of this case that the Respondent sought to piggy back on the MARQVISION mark for illegitimate reasons. That the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's trademark furthers the high risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

After a complainant has made a prima facie case, the burden of production shifts to a respondent to present evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. See, e.g., *Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2003-0455](#); and [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Here, the Respondent has provided no evidence of any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Moreover, the evidence provided by the Complainant shows that the disputed domain name previously redirected to Complainant's website which would inevitably mislead Internet users into believing that the disputed domain name belonged to the Complainant.

In the absence of any evidence rebutting the Complainant's prima facie case indicating the Respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

The disputed domain name was registered at least four years after the Complainant established its trademark rights in the MARQVISION mark. The evidence on the record provided by the Complainant is sufficient to satisfy the Panel that, at the time the disputed domain name was registered, the Respondent undoubtedly knew of the Complainant's MARQVISION mark.

The Panel cannot contemplate any other reason as to why the Respondent would have registered the disputed domain name identical to the MARQVISION trademark, other than to target and unfairly benefit from the reputation and goodwill associated with the Complainant's marks.

Further, the Panel finds the use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent is in bad faith. Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy states that evidence of bad faith may include a respondent's use of a domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the respondent's website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark. The disputed domain name is currently inactive, but the Complainant has shown that it previously redirected to the Complainant's website. Panels have found that given that the use of a domain name for per se illegitimate activity such as impersonation/passing off can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent, such behavior is manifestly considered evidence of bad faith. See section 3.1.4 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#). Moreover, it is clear that the Respondent sought to attract Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark, likely for the Respondent's commercial gain, which is evidence of bad faith registration and use under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

In the absence of any evidence or explanation from the Respondent, the Panel finds that the only plausible basis for registering and using the disputed domain name has been for illegitimate and bad faith purposes.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(iii) 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 <marqvision.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Colin T. O'Brien/*

**Colin T. O'Brien**

Sole Panelist

Date: May 26, 2026