

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

X.AI LLC v. andy wang
Case No. D2026-1100

1. The Parties

The Complainant is X.AI LLC, United States of America (or “U.S”), represented internally.

The Respondent is andy wang, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <grokai.build> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 13, 2026. On March 16, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 17, 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 (Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 19, 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 amendments to the Complaint on March 19 and 31, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendments 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 April 1, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 21, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 22, 2026.

The Center appointed R. Eric Gaum as the sole panelist in this matter on April 28, 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 owns trademark registrations for the GROK and XAI marks for AI software, AI chatbots, conversational AI, and related services. See European Union Trade Mark Reg. no. 019209341, registered on October 16, 2025, and International Reg. No. 1886873, registered on October 9, 2025, for GROK. These marks have been used in the U.S. and worldwide since the public launch of Grok in 2023 and identify the Complainant's products and services. The Complainant's brand guidelines expressly reserve all rights in these marks (see them at the Complainant's website at "www.x.ai").

The disputed domain name was registered on January 18, 2026. According to the Complainant, the Respondent is using a website at the disputed domain name for a phishing/impersonation scheme. The <grokai.build> disputed domain name does not currently resolve to a website.

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 the following:

The Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name fraudulently and in bad faith. The website at the disputed domain name unlawfully and without authorization:

- Uses the Complainant's protected marks including "Grok Build | AI-Powered Coding Agent by xAI" and "Coming February 2026 from xAI";
- Falsely states: "Grok Build is xAI's next-generation AI coding agent that transforms how developers create software."
- Operates a fraudulent waitlist form stating: "Grok Build launches February 2026. Join the waitlist to get early access and exclusive updates from xAI."
- Displays fake CLI commands: "~/projects \$ npm install -g grok-build" followed by "Installing Grok Build v1.0.0..." and "Ready for vibe coding."
- Claims in the footer and branding: "by xAI" and "© 2026 xAI Corporation". All rights reserved.

These facts are further established in the Cease-and-Desist letter dated March 13, 2026 that the Complainant already transmitted to the Respondent, which explains that:

"GrokAI.Build is engaged in blatant fraud and trademark infringement, including by (1) prominently and without authorization using xAI's trademarks, including 'Grok' and 'xAI'; (2) operating a fraudulent email signup promising 'early access and exclusive updates from xAI'; (3) falsely stating Grokai.build is affiliated with 'xAI' (4) falsely stating Grokai.build belongs to xAI through a fake website footer '© 2026 xAI Corporation'; and (5) falsely stating xAI's email address is '[...].@grokai.build.'"

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 Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7. The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the GROK mark is 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 3.1](#), 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 3.1](#), section 1.8.

The applicable Top-Level Domain ("TLD") in a domain name, here ".build", is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

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 that 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 3.1](#), 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 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 Respondent is using the disputed domain name to intentionally attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's

CROK marks. The false “© 2026 xAI Corporation” notice and the false claims, “Coming February 2026 from xAI” and “exclusive updates from xAI”, on the website connected to the disputed domain name demonstrate bad faith, and in the Panel’s view, appears to be an impersonation scheme.

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 3.1](#), section 3.2.1. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed as applicable to this case: passing off, or other types of fraud constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 <grokai.build> be transferred to the Complainant.

/R. Eric Gaum/

R. Eric Gaum

Sole Panelist

Date: May 5, 2026