

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Marq Vision Inc. v. Leland Li
Case No. D2026-1088

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Leland Li, China. Although the Response has been submitted under the Respondent’s signature, it appears it has been prepared with the assistance of unnamed legal counsel or Artificial Intelligence (“AI”).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <marq.vision> is registered with Porkbun LLC (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 14, 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 16, 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 18, 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 having earlier emailed the Center on March 16, 2026, the Response was filed with the Center on March 31, 2026. A non-substantive amendment to the Response was received by the Center on March 31, 2026.

On April 14, 2026, the Complainant emailed the Center an unsolicited supplemental filing. Later that same day, the Respondent submitted a reply to the Complainant's unsolicited supplemental filing.

The Center appointed Warwick A. Rothnie as the sole panelist in this matter on May 11, 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 provides brand and content protection services using, it says, cutting-edge artificial intelligence technology. The Complainant was founded in 2021 and is headquartered in Los Angeles in the United States.

The Complainant generated USD one million in revenues in its first eight months of operations, USD 10 million within three years and USD 20 million after four years of operation. It currently claims 350 customers worldwide in a range of industries including in the fashion, beauty, luxury, gaming, pharmaceuticals, entertainment, automotive and consumer electronics industries.

In June 2022, the Complainant received the LVMH Moët Hennessy Louis Vuitton Innovation Award for Data and Artificial Intelligence in a field of 950 applicants. In March 2025, the G2 Spring Report ranked the Complainant's services as a global leader in brand protection.

The Complainant owns three registered trademarks for MARQ VISION:

- (1) Republic of Korea Registered Trademark No 4017306270000, M MARQVISION, which was registered on May 24, 2021, in respect of computer software in International Class 9 and a range of services in International Classes 38 and 42;
- (2) Republic of Korea Registered Trademark No 4017306270000, M MARQVISION, which was registered on May 11, 2022, in respect of a range of services in International Class 35; and
- (3) United States Registered Trademark No 6085071, MARQ VISION, which was registered in the Principal Register on June 23, 2020 in respect of Computer hardware and recorded computer software for retail inventory management, sold as a unit; Computer hardware and recorded computer software programs sold as a unit for the integration of text, audio, graphics, still images and moving pictures into an interactive delivery for multimedia applications; Downloadable computer software for controlling the operation of audio and video devices; Downloadable computer software for creating searchable databases of information and data in International Class 9 and Software as a service (SAAS) services featuring software for use in database management and storing digital contents; Application service provider (ASP), namely, hosting computer software applications of others; Installation and repair of computer software, including mobile performance of such services on customer premises in International Class 42.

The registered trademark in the United States includes a notation that the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board (TTAB) terminated a cancellation proceeding against the United States Registered Trademark.

According to the Whois record, the disputed domain name was registered on September 20, 2025.

It resolves to a registrar parking page offering the disputed domain name for sale on the Afternic marketplace for USD 23,880.

According to the Response, the Respondent is a domain investor who buys (what are described as) generic and brandable domain names for resale. It appears that the Respondent has 669 domain names in his account.

5. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that in order to divest the Respondent of a disputed domain name, the Complainant must demonstrate each of the following:

- (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.

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules directs the Panel to decide the Complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

A. Unsolicited supplemental filing

Apart from documents requested by the Panel pursuant to paragraph 12 of the Rules, neither the Policy nor the Rules expressly provide for supplemental filings. Their admissibility is therefore in the discretion of the Panel bearing in mind the requirements under paragraph 10 of the Rules to ensure that the proceeding is conducted with due expedition and both parties are treated equally, with each party being given a fair opportunity to present its case.

The Respondent objects to the admission of the supplemental filing, pointing out that much of the material to be included was available before the Complaint was filed and should have been included in the Complaint.

That is a fair criticism and provides a strong basis for rejecting the unsolicited supplemental filing. On the other hand, the information in question is directly relevant to the issues in dispute. Panels will often issue an order under paragraph 12 of the Rules requiring a party which makes assertions about the extent of its use, for example, to provide some corroboration for such claims. In addition, the Respondent has taken the opportunity to submit a reply to the unsolicited supplemental filing.

In these circumstances, the Panel considers it is appropriate to admit the supplemental filing and the Respondent's reply into the record.

B. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The first element that the Complainant must establish is that the disputed domain name is identical with, or confusingly similar to, the Complainant's trademark rights.

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 Select UDRP Questions, ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has proven ownership of a registered trademark for MARQ VISION and other, fancy registrations for M MARQVISION.

In undertaking the comparison between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark, the Top Level Domain (TLD) component is typically disregarded as a functional aspect of the domain name system. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1. Where the second-level portion of the domain and the applicable TLD in combination contain the relevant trademark, panels are prepared to treat the disputed domain name in its entirety for the purposes of comparison. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.3.

That approach is appropriate in the present case as the disputed domain name considered in its entirety is identical to the Complainant's United States registered trademark. The Panel also finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks registered in the Republic of Korea as the word MARQVISION is an important and distinctive element of those registrations and can be clearly seen in the disputed domain name.

The Respondent contends that the Complainant does not have exclusive rights in the term "Marq" pointing to a large number of filings for trademarks including "Marq" on the United States Trademarks Register and results for a Google search. The Panel accepts that the existence of other trademarks or usages similar to an asserted trademark may in some circumstances affect the comparison to be made. In the present case, however, the disputed domain name is identical to at least one of the Complainant's registered trademarks. Given the limited nature of the inquiry at this stage, it is preferable to address those contentions in the context of the other elements of the Policy given the trademark registrations the Complainant has proved.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established that the first limb of the Policy is satisfied.

C. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The second requirement the Complainant must prove is that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides that the following circumstances can be situations in which the Respondent has rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name:

- (i) before any notice to [the Respondent] of the dispute, [the Respondent's] use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the [disputed] domain name or a name corresponding to the [disputed] domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or
- (ii) [the Respondent] (as an individual, business, or other organization) has been commonly known by the [disputed] domain name, even if [the Respondent] has acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or
- (iii) [the Respondent] is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the [disputed] domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

These are illustrative only and are not an exhaustive listing of the situations in which a respondent can show rights or legitimate interests in a domain name.

While 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 often impossible 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. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

There is no dispute between the Parties that:

- (1) The Respondent registered the disputed domain name after the Complainant began using the trademark and also after the Complainant had registered its trademark;
- (2) The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant;
- (3) The Complainant has not otherwise authorised the Respondent to use the disputed domain name;

(4) The disputed domain name is not derived from the Respondent's name. Nor is there any suggestion of some other name by which the Respondent is commonly known from which the disputed domain name could be derived.

These factors are sufficient to establish a prima case that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

The Respondent contends that he registers domain names for their generic or descriptive value across diverse industries. The Respondent points out that "domain investing" is a legitimate and recognised business under the Policy and references [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1. In support of that contention, the Respondent points out that he holds 669 domain names in his portfolio. The Respondent further contends that "Marq" is a widely-used and stylised variant of the common word "mark". The Respondent provides evidence that there are 103 filings involving "Marq" on the United States Trademarks Register across dozens of industries by entirely unrelated third parties, a LinkedIn search returned 302 different companies using "marq" and a Google search on "marq" returns the top organic search results as "Marq.com", Garmin's "Marq" brand of watches, and Marq logistics.

The Respondent also points out that ".vision" is a TLD:

"connoting sight, foresight, or strategic purpose — and directly relevant to the multi-billion-dollar Computer Vision industry, one of the fastest-growing sectors in artificial intelligence. The combination 'marq.vision' therefore carries the natural descriptive meaning of 'brand vision,' 'visual identity,' or a technology platform serving the computer vision sector — an inherently versatile asset for countless businesses worldwide, entirely independent of Complainant."

The Respondent then asserts that he did not register the disputed domain name to target the Complainant or to disrupt the Complainant's business or to sell the disputed domain name specifically to the Complainant.

[WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1 relevantly states:

"generally speaking, panels have accepted that aggregating and holding domain names (usually for resale) consisting e.g., of acronyms, dictionary words, common phrases, or unique/catchy or memorable terms (alone or in combination) can be bona fide and is not per se illegitimate under the UDRP where the respondent can show that the purpose of the registration was not to target a trademark." (italicised text not quoted by Respondent)

The qualifications are significant. The fact that a person is a domain investor does not automatically confer on them rights or legitimate interests under the Policy. The nature of the domain name in dispute is relevant as are the motives of the registrant.

For example, "apple" is a common, dictionary word. Its use in connection with a website relating in some way to the fruit would be one thing, its use in relation to a business manufacturing and supplying computers or smart phone not associated in any way with Apple Inc., the California corporation, would be another thing entirely.

The decisions cited by the Respondent in support of its position are consistent with the summary from the Overview when understood in light of their own facts and do not assist the Respondent in this case. For example, *Bennett, Coleman & Co. Ltd. v. Domain Administrator, Times Media Limited*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-0145](#), dismissed a complaint against the passive holding of the domain name <timesnow.com>. The respondent and its predecessors, however, had been publishing *The Times* newspaper since 1788 and registered the domain name several years before the complainant even began using its own TIMES NOW trademark. That is simply not this case.

While “marq” does sound like “mark” and may, as the Respondent contends, be derived from the French word “marque”, it is not a dictionary word or descriptive. Even in the examples cited by the Respondent, it is being used as a badge of origin or source identifier, albeit by different businesses in different fields.

Further, the Respondent’s evidence is for searches of “marq”, not “marq vision / marqvision”. That makes a significant difference.

First, because the Respondent’s explanation of the significance of the “.vision” TLD relies on the combined effect of <marq.vision> as a composite whole. And secondly, because the Respondent has not identified any other users of “Marq vision” in combination. Indeed, the Panel’s limited inspection of the online United States Trademark Register,¹ while corroborating the Respondent’s claim about a large number of “marq” filings, records only four trademarks for MARQ VISION or MARQVISION – all owned by the Complainant.

Further still, the Respondent does deny targeting the Complainant’s trademark in the Response. It is only in the reply to the supplemental filing, however, that the Respondent specifically denies knowledge of the Complainant’s trademark. In the Response, the Respondent contended only that the Complainant’s trademark had not achieved such widespread public recognition that a domain investor would necessarily or reasonably know of it.

Compounding this ambiguity, the Respondent’s email to the Center on March 16, 2026, offered a different explanation for registration of the disputed domain name. The email did disclose that the Respondent is a domain investor. After contending that “marq” returns 301 results in a search on LinkedIn, the Respondent’s email stated “I just randomly registered a bunch of web3 and crypto-related domain names. I am not violating any rules or using them maliciously”. In the Response, which appears to have been prepared with legal assistance or AI, the Panel is encouraged to disregard the email as prepared under pressure in an unfamiliar language and without the benefit of legal advice.

Even if the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant and its trademark, it appears from the Response that the Respondent was well aware that “marq” is used as a trade mark or brand by a number of businesses. So, for example, on page 7 of the Response seeking to rebut the allegation of registration and use in bad faith, the Respondent stated:

“Garmin’s MARQ brand was the dominant commercial association. At the time of registration, the globally dominant commercial association with the string ‘MARQ’ was Garmin Ltd.’s premium smartwatch line — a product line with billions in annual revenue, years of global advertising, and registered USPTO trademark rights (Reg. No. 5,940,505) A domain investor encountering ‘marq’ would immediately associate it with Garmin’s product, not with Complainant’s niche B2B brand-protection startup.”

Registering a domain name, not for the purpose of carrying on some business under that domain name, but to take advantage of its resemblance to someone else’s trademark does not qualify as good faith under the Policy. It is precisely that opportunistic behaviour which the Policy was designed to prevent. The fact that there are a number of businesses using the trademark or brand in their respective fields does not change the calculus. It just means the registrant likely has an expectation of leveraging the profits even further through a bidding war.

In these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent has not rebutted the prima facie case established by the Complainant that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the Panel finds the Complainant has established the second requirement under the Policy also.

¹ In the exercise of the Panel’s powers under paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules: [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.8.

D. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Under the third requirement of the Policy, the Complainant must establish that the disputed domain name has been both registered and used in bad faith by the Respondent. These are conjunctive requirements; both must be satisfied for a successful complaint: see e.g. *Group One Holdings Pte Ltd v. Steven Hafto*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-0183](#).

In this connection, the Panel has already noted in Section 5C above, the Respondent's contention that a domain investor would have associated "marq" at the time of registering the disputed domain name with Garmin's premium smartwatch rather than with the Complainant. That does not assist the Respondent.

The Respondent therefore effectively concedes that a domain investor such as the Respondent encountering the string "marq" would immediately recognise it as identifying someone's trademark or brand. The purpose of registering a domain name in the knowledge that it reproduces or closely resembles a trademark — in order to profit from that resemblance — is precisely the opportunistic conduct the Policy is designed to prevent, regardless of which particular trademark holder the registrant had in mind at the time.

Further, the Response is problematic for a number of other reasons. The Panel has already noted that different explanations for the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name were advanced in the Respondent's email to the Center on March 16, 2026, and in the Response. It is not immediately clear to the Panel why the Respondent's own words should not be preferred to those crafted with the benefit of legal assistance or AI, even allowing for asserted language difficulties — which it must be said are not evident in the email itself. The Panel has also noted that it was only in the reply to the supplemental filing that the Respondent expressly denied knowledge of the Complainant's trademark; that is, at the third attempt.

More fundamentally, that framing overlooks the combined effect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent's evidence of third-party uses of "marq" is drawn from searches of that term in isolation. But as the Panel has already found under the first element, when "marq" and ".vision" are read together as a unit, the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's registered trademark MARQ VISION. There is no evidence before the Panel of any other person, entity, or trademark that corresponds to the combined expression "marq vision" or "marqvision."

In circumstances like these, panels have readily found registration in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 3.2.2 and 3.2.3. That conclusion is reinforced by the United States Trademark Register. As the Response annexed only two selective screenshots of the trademark search the Respondent relies on which did not show all 103 results the Respondent relies on, the Panel used the online trademark search function provided by the United States Patent and Trademark Office to search MARQ.² The search did indeed return 103 results. It shows that the 103 results are comprised of 59 live registrations or pending applications and 44 cancelled or abandoned marks. Of the 59 live marks, 35 are registered and the Complainant's Registration No 6085071 is the 14th of those 35. These facts would indicate the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's registration or at the least was wilfully blind to the potential for conflict.

The Respondent points out that four letter domain names are particularly valuable and refers to a prior decision in which the panel stated that "an investor is entitled to set whatever price it likes for its offerings". The Respondent further points out that the price was offered globally and the Complainant was never contacted or solicited. The proposition holds good only where the domain holder, investor or otherwise, has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. That is not the case here.

In these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

² Pursuant to paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules and [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.8.

Accordingly, the Complainant has established all three requirements under the Policy. As the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's trademark and there is no suggestion that any other person has rights in MARQ VISION as opposed to MARQ alone or some other variant, it is appropriate that the disputed domain name be transferred to the Complainant.

E. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking

In view of the Complainant's success, the Respondent's claim for a finding of reverse domain name hijacking does not arise.

6. 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 <marq.vision> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Warwick A. Rothnie/

Warwick A. Rothnie

Sole Panelist

Date: May 26, 2026