

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Rockwell Automation Inc v. duanqi yan  
Case No. D2026-1882

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Rockwell Automation Inc, United States of America, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is duanqi yan, China.

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

The disputed domain name <allenbradleystore.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 1, 2026. On May 1, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 6, 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 (DT), Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 7, 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 amended Complaint on May 11, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended 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 May 18, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 7, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 10, 2026.

The Center appointed Federica Togo as the sole panelist in this matter on June 17, 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

It results from the Complainant's undisputed allegations that it is a global leader in industrial automation and digital transformation. Its most prominent brand, Allen-Bradley, was founded in 1903 and was already the leading automation manufacturer in North America before it was acquired by the Complainant in 1985. The acquisition formed the foundation of Rockwell's industrial automation business. Today Allen-Bradley's products are sold and distributed worldwide, and Complainant has clients in over 80 countries. Rockwell Automation operates in over 100 countries, with approximately 27,000 employees and more than 400 offices and manufacturing facilities globally. The Complainant serves customers across a wide range of industries, including automotive, food, beverage, oil and gas, life sciences and more.

The Complainant is the registered owner of trademarks containing and/or consisting of ALLEN-BRADLEY, e.g. Canadian trademark registration no. TMA128375 ALLEN-BRADLEY (word), registered on October 19, 1962, for goods in classes 7 and 9.

In addition, it uses the domain name <rockwellautomation.com> for its official website, and also the domain names <ab.com> and <allenbradley.com> which both redirect to the same site.

The disputed domain name <allenbradleystore.com> was registered on September 8, 2025. The undisputed evidence provided by the Complainant proves that the disputed domain name resolves to a website displaying without authorization prominently the Complainant's mark and purportedly advertising the Complainant's products. The section "About us" provides amongst others the following: "*Allen-Bradley stands as a pioneer in industrial automation and control system. Since **our founding**, we've dedicated ourselves to developing cutting-edge technologies (...). **Our comprehensive range of programmable logic controller (...) has established us as a trusted name in factory automation worldwide (...)***" (emphasis added).

#### 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 confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark, because the disputed domain name can be considered as capturing, in its entirety, the Complainant's ALLEN-BRADLEY trademark and simply adding the generic term "store" to the end of the trademark. The mere addition of this generic term to Complainant's trademark does not negate the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant, Respondent is not sponsored by or affiliated with Complainant in any way. The Complainant has not given the Respondent permission to use the Complainant's trademarks in any manner, including in domain names. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Respondent's inclusion of the Complainant's stylized trademark on the disputed domain name's website is a direct effort to take advantage of the fame and goodwill that the Complainant has built in its brand, and the Respondent is not only using the confusingly similar disputed domain name but is also imitating the

Complainant by displaying the Complainant's logo. This imitation is referred to as "passing off," and "Respondent, in [also] using [a] confusingly similar domain name to mislead the Complainant's customers, is not making a bona fide offering of goods and services or a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the domain name. In the present case, the Respondent has failed to include a disclaimer on the website, and the "About Us" section appears to imply a false affiliation. It is clear from the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name that the sole intention is to mislead Internet users as to their affiliation with the Complainant and to trade off the Complainant's rights and reputation by appearing to offer services in connection with the Complainant. Nothing on the website hosted on the disputed domain name indicates to online users that the disputed domain name is not affiliated with the Complainant.

Furthermore, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. According to the Complainant, the Complainant and its ALLEN-BRADLEY trademark are known internationally, with trademark registrations across numerous countries. By registering a domain name that captures the Complainant's ALLEN-BRADLEY trademark in its entirety with the addition of the generic term "store" to the end of the trademark, the Respondent has created a domain name that is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark, as well as its <allenbradley.com> domain name. As such, the Respondent has demonstrated a knowledge of and familiarity with the Complainant's brand and business. Here, the Respondent creates a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant and its trademarks by creating a confusingly similar domain name and using it to pass itself off as an online store affiliated with the Complainant, with the Respondent then attempting to profit from such confusion by offering the Complainant's goods, and those of the Complainant's competitors, for sale without authorization.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to "decide a 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". Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires a complainant to prove each of the following three elements in order to obtain an order that the disputed domain name be transferred or cancelled:

- (i) the disputed 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 disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel will therefore proceed to analyze whether the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are established.

### **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 (but a hyphen) 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 “store”, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term[s] 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.

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.

Moreover, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name is clearly constituted by the Complainant’s registered trademark (but the hyphen) and the term “store”, which has an “inherent Internet connotation”. The nature of this disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation: in fact, terms with an “inherent Internet connotation” (e.g., <e-trademark.com>, <buy-trademark.com>, or <trademark.online>) are typically seen as tending to suggest sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner, see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) at section 2.5.1. This is also confirmed by the content of the website to which the disputed domain name resolves, allegedly advertising and offering for sale products purportedly under the Complainant’s mark and reproducing without authorization the Complainant’s trademark and presenting itself as the Complainant.

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.

One of these circumstances is that the Respondent by using the disputed domain name, has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website or location or of a product or service on its website or location (paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy).

In the present case, the Panel notes that it results from the Complainant's documented allegations that the disputed domain name resolves to a website prominently displaying the Complainant's trademark, and purportedly advertising products under the Complainant's mark and presenting itself as the Complainant. In addition, the Complainant claims that these products on the Respondent's website are not the Complainant's actual products, but rather they appear to be competing products being branded as ALLEN-BRADLEY products. For the Panel, it is therefore evident that the Respondent positively knew of the Complainant's mark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. Consequently, and in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, particularly noting the composition of the disputed domain name, the Panel is convinced that the Respondent also knew that the disputed domain name included the Complainant's trademark when it registered the disputed domain name.

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. In this regard, the further circumstances surrounding the disputed domain name's registration and use confirm the Panel's findings that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith:

(i) the nature of the disputed domain name (incorporating the Complainant's mark plus the addition of the term "store");

(ii) the content of the website to which the disputed domain name directs, prominently displaying the Complainant's trademark, and purportedly advertising products under the Complainant's marks, and presenting itself as the Complainant.

(iii) absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with no response for the Respondent's choice of the disputed domain name.

(iv) the Respondent concealing its identity through a privacy service.

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 <allenbradleystore.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Federica Togo/*

**Federica Togo**

Sole Panelist

Date: July 1, 2026