

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Autodesk, Inc. v. Fidelia Salsabila
Case No. D2026-1484

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Autodesk, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Donahue Fitzgerald, United States.

The Respondent is Fidelia Salsabila, Indonesia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <autocadtutorials.net> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 8, 2026. On April 8, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On April 9, 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 (Redacted for Privacy Purposes / Privacy Service Provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 13, 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 April 13, 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 April 17, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 7, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 8, 2026.

The Center appointed Yuzo Wada as the sole panelist in this matter on May 18, 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 incorporated in California, United States. Founded in 1982, the Complainant is an American multinational software corporation that develops software services for the architecture, engineering, construction, manufacturing, media, education, and entertainment industries.

The Complainant owns AUTOCAD trademarks registered in many countries around the world, including for instance in the United States, such as United States Registration No. 1,316,773, registered on January 29, 1985; and United States Registration No. 4,208,936, registered on September 18, 2012). From the evidence in the case file, there are over 200 million users of the Complainant's products, and to accommodate this enormous user base, the Complainant works with approximately 1,700 channel partners, 3,300 development partners, and 2,000 authorized training centers to assist its customers with their worldwide use of its products that incorporate its trademark into their names.

Since 1998, the Complainant has owned the domain name <autocad.com> and has used it as an online portal through which Internet users can find information about its AUTOCAD software products.

The Disputed Domain Name <autocadtutorials.net> was registered on April 4, 2025. According to evidence provided by the Complainant, the Respondent has used the Disputed Domain Name to resolve to a commercial landing page displaying pornographic content.

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 is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's AUTOCAD trademark.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent lacks any rights to or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that the complainant prove each of the following three elements to obtain a decision that a domain name should be either cancelled or transferred:

(i) the domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; and

(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.

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 further finds that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to this mark, since the Disputed Domain Name incorporates the entirety of the Complainant's trademark. Although the addition of other terms, (here, "tutorials"), may bear on the assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such descriptive terms do 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 Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Under the second element of the Policy, the Complainant must show that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the Disputed Domain Name. The Respondent may establish a right or legitimate interest in the Disputed Domain Name by demonstrating any of the following non-exhaustive circumstances listed in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy:

(a) that the Respondent has used, or made 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 prior to any notice of the dispute; or

(b) that the Respondent has been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name, even if the Respondent has not acquired any trademark rights; or

(c) that 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.

The Complainant's trademark registrations for AUTOCAD predate the Respondent's registration of the Disputed Domain Name which is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks. The Respondent has been using the Disputed Domain Name on a website featuring pornographic content. The Complainant has not licensed or otherwise consented to the Respondent's use of the trademarks in connection with the Disputed Domain Name.

In these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent's use of the Disputed Domain Name cannot be regarded as use in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

In addition, the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers to the Respondent's website.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. The burden of production therefore shifts to the Respondent to demonstrate otherwise.

The Respondent has not submitted any evidence to demonstrate that the Respondent holds any trademark rights corresponding to the Disputed Domain Name or that the Respondent is or has been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name.

Thus, there is no evidence in the case record that refutes the Complainant's submissions, and the Panel concludes that the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Based on the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered decades after the Complainant first acquired rights in the AUTOCAD trademark. Without authorization from the Complainant, the Disputed Domain Name resolves to a website displaying pornographic content.

The Panel accepts the Complainant's contention that the Complainant's trademark AUTOCAD is distinctive and well known (*Autodesk, Inc. v. Shao Juan Huang*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-2156](#); and *Autodesk, Inc. v. Elaine Oneal*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-2364](#)). The incorporation of a well-known trademark into a domain name by a registrant having no plausible explanation for doing so may be, in and of itself, an indication of bad faith (*Veuve Clicquot Ponsardin, Maison Fondée en 1772 v. The Polygenix Group Co.*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0163](#); *General Electric Company v. CPIC NET and Hussain Syed*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0087](#); *Microsoft Corporation v. Montrose Corporation*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-1568](#); and *Intel Corporation v. The Pentium Group*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-0273](#)).

In addition, the Disputed Domain Name resolved to a website featuring pornographic content, which demonstrates that the Respondent is making commercial gain from the website by attracting Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark. See paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. Further, the pornographic materials on the website at the disputed domain name has been found by previous UDRP panels to constitute evidence of registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

The Respondent has not provided any evidence of good faith use. Taking into account these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent must have known of the Complainant before registering the Disputed Domain Name, and by registering and using the Disputed Domain Name as discussed above, the Panel concludes that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel therefore finds that the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy are also fulfilled in this case, and 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 <autocadtutorials.net> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Yuzo Wada/

Yuzo Wada

Sole Panelist

Date: June 1, 2026