

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

RockAuto LLC v. Lazar Vilotijevic, Rock Auto Parts USA LLC  
Case No. D2026-1653

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is RockAuto LLC, United States of America (“United States” or “US”), internally represented.

The Respondent is Lazar Vilotijevic, Rock Auto Parts USA LLC, United States.

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

The disputed domain name <rockautofl.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 17, 2026. On April 20, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 20, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the Respondent’s contact details.

The Center verified that 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 21, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 11, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 12, 2026.

The Center appointed Kathryn Lee 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 an online car parts business located in Wisconsin, United States. The Complainant has used the ROCKAUTO mark in commerce since 2000, and owns trademark registrations to ROCKAUTO (U.S. Trademark Registration Number 5339980, registered on November 21, 2017), and RA ROCKAUTO.COM (design) (U.S. Trademark Registration Number 2866795, registered on July 27, 2004). The Complainant's online business is operated through its official website at the domain name <rockauto.com> according to which the Complainant "ships thousands of auto parts from hundreds of manufacturers to millions of customers worldwide." The Complainant has approximately 5,000 followers on LinkedIn and 71,900 subscribers on YouTube.

Based on information from the Registrar, the Respondent is an individual affiliated with Rock Auto Parts USA LLC which has an address in Florida, United States.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 18, 2025, and resolves to a website operated by an entity selling auto parts called Rock Auto Parts USA LLC located in Florida, United States.

#### **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 has rights in the ROCKAUTO and RA ROCKAUTO.COM marks, and that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the marks given that it just adds generic letters "fl" to the ROCKAUTO portion.

The Complainant also contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and confirms that it has not authorized or licensed rights to the Respondent in any respect.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Specifically, the Complainant contends that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name for services directly competing with those of the Complainant, which comprises registration and use in bad faith. The Complainant also contends that the Respondent is intentionally attempting to attract web traffic to the website linked to the disputed domain name by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's marks.

##### **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 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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms – here, “fl” – 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 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.

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.

Meanwhile, the Panel has found through independent online searches that an entity by the name of Rock Auto Parts USA LLC was registered in the state of Florida, United States on January 11, 2022 with Lazar Vilotijevic, the Respondent, as registered agent. The entity filed for a reinstatement of its limited liability company status on April 9, 2025, less than two weeks before the registration of the disputed domain name. As of the date of the Decision, the business status is “active.” However, none of the links to products on the Respondent’s website appear to be functional, and customers are instructed to write to or call the Respondent to make a purchase. Further, the address provided for the business corresponds to a residential property. These facts suggest that rather than making a bona fide offering of goods or services, the Respondent may be attempting to divert consumers from the Complainant’s official website for the Respondent’s own commercial gain and even for a fraudulent/phishing purpose. Indeed, the inclusion of the “fl” to the Complainant’s mark in the disputed domain name may mislead visitors to believe that the website at the disputed domain name is operated by the Complainant’s Florida division, contrary to the fact. And without any evidence from the Respondent otherwise, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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 first notes that the ROCKAUTO mark is distinctive and has acquired a degree of recognition in connection with the sale of auto parts. The Panel also notes that, although there appears to be a business registered under the name “Rock Auto Parts USA LLC”, there is no evidence in the record to indicate that it is actually conducting a bona fide business under that name. Given also the confusing

similarity of the disputed domain name to the Complainant's marks and the Respondent's failure to submit any explanation, the Panel finds that more likely than not the Respondent targeted the Complainant when registering and using the disputed domain name. It is also likely that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, and endorsement of the Respondent's website or of services on the Respondent's website.

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 <rockautofl.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Kathryn Lee/*

**Kathryn Lee**

Sole Panelist

Date: May 22, 2026