

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Rotational Molding Technologies, Inc. v. Yang Kyung Won
Case No. D2026-1884

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Rotational Molding Technologies, Inc., United States of America (“United States” or “U.S.”), represented by Emerson Thomson Bennett, LLC, United States.

The Respondent is Yang Kyung Won, Republic of Korea.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <romotech.com> is registered with Megazone Corp., dba HOSTING.KR (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 30, 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 4, 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 May 18, 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 in English an amended Complaint on May 20, 2026.

On May 18, 2026, the Center informed the parties in Korean and English, that the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain name is Korean. On May 20, 2026, the Complainant confirmed its request that English be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant’s submission.

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 in English and Korean of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 5, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 25, 2026. The Response was filed in English with the Center on June 24, 2026.

The Center appointed Moonchul Chang as the sole panelist in this matter on July 14, 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. On July 28, 2026, the Panel issued Panel Order No. 1 to the Parties. Thereafter, the Respondent filed a supplemental Response on July 31, 2026. The Complainant submitted its Response on August 3, 2026, followed by a supplementary Response on August 5, 2026.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant, Rotational Molding Technologies, Inc., a rotational molding enterprise established in 1981 in New Paris, Indiana, has continuously engaged in design, production, and finishing services.

The Complainant is the owner of the United States Trademark ROMOTECH, Registration No. 5684617, filed on June 22, 2018, and registered on February 26, 2019, in International Classes 12, 19, 20, 40, and 42, with first use in commerce recorded on October 31, 2003. The Complainant operates the domain names <romotek.com> and <romotechplastics.com>.

The disputed domain name, <romotech.com>, was registered on May 8, 2008. Although it previously resolved to a landing page offering the disputed domain name for sale at a minimum price of USD 9,860, in practice it remained unused for eighteen years following its registration.

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 names.

The Complainant contends that:

(a) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the trademark ROMOTECH in which the Complainant has rights, as the disputed domain name incorporates the ROMOTECH trademark in its entirety.

(b) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant has continuously used the ROMOTECH mark since October 31, 2003. The disputed domain name was registered on May 8, 2008, five years subsequent to the Complainant's first use in commerce. The disputed domain name has linked to a landing page soliciting offers with a minimum price of USD 9,860 for the sale of the disputed domain name. The Respondent has neither used nor made demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

(c) the disputed domain name was registered and has been used in bad faith. The disputed domain name was registered on May 8, 2008, five years after the Complainant's first commercial use of the ROMOTECH mark. The Complainant's registered trademark is distinctive. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the intent to exploit the Complainant's trademark rights and goodwill, or to prevent the Complainant from registering the corresponding domain name. Furthermore, the Respondent has deliberately concealed its identity.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that:

(a) the Respondent registered the disputed domain name <romotech.com> prior to the Complainant's registration of its own trademark ROMOTECH. At the time of registration in May 2008, the Respondent, domiciled in Republic of Korea, had no knowledge of the Complainant, a localized industrial container manufacturer based in Indiana, United States.

(b) the Respondent has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The combination "romo" and "tech" constitutes a generic and descriptive word of abbreviations. The disputed domain name was registered well before the Complainant's trademark rights came into existence and has been listed on standard domain name marketplaces, such as Sedo.com, for generic sale.

(c) the disputed domain name was neither registered nor used in bad faith. The registration of the disputed domain name predates the Complainant's acquisition of trademark rights by approximately ten years. Accordingly, the Respondent could not have targeted the Complainant at the time of registration. The Respondent did not register the disputed domain name with the intent to sell it to the Complainant or others. Under the UDRP, the mere listing of a domain name for sale does not, in itself, constitute evidence of bad faith registration.

(d) the Respondent further contends that the Complaint was brought in bad faith, amounting to an attempt at Reverse Domain Name Hijacking.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must demonstrate that the three elements enumerated in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied. These elements are that: (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark or service mark; (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.

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 fact that a domain name may have been registered does not by itself preclude a complainant's standing to file a UDRP case, nor a panel's finding of identity or confusing similarity under the first element. This may however bear on a panel's further substantive determination under the second and third element.

In this case, the disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's ROMOTECH trademark in its entirety. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7. Furthermore, the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") suffix ".com" is disregarded under the first element test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Therefore, 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. Under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, the overall burden of proof is on the Complainant. However, once the Complainant presents a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, 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.

First, the Complainant asserts its prior use of the mark ROMOTECH in connection with plastic storage containers and boxes, dating back as early as October 31, 2003. This continuous use is further corroborated by the Complainant's U.S. Trademark Registration No. 5,684,617 for ROMOTECH (registered on February 26, 2019), which officially records a date of first use in commerce of October 31, 2003. Moreover, taking into account information from the Complaint and public resources such as the Wayback Machine, the Panel notes that the Complainant has operate websites at the domain names <romotek.com> and <romotechplastics.com> displaying the ROMOTECH mark, since at least 2004. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.8.

Second, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, as it is not being used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Specifically, the disputed domain name resolved to a landing page offering the domain name itself for sale and, in reality, has remained unused for eighteen years following its registration. Such use attempts to monetize the domain name and does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services where it appears such value is derived from a connection to the Complainant's trademark. In this regard, the Panel also takes note of the identical nature of the disputed domain name to the Complainant's trademark.

Third, there is no evidence in the record to suggest that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Therefore, the Respondent's incorporation of the ROMOTECH mark into the disputed domain name fails to confer any rights or legitimate interests upon the Respondent. Having reviewed the available record, 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 Respondent has failed to rebut the Complainant's prima facie showing and has submitted no relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests under the Policy or otherwise.

Therefore, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy requires that the disputed domain name has "been registered and is being used in bad faith". Thus, for the Complainant to succeed, a UDRP panel must be satisfied that a domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. These requirements are conjunctive; each must be proven, otherwise the Complaint fails. In addition, 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.

As noted above, the Complainant's use of the ROMOTECH mark precedes the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name, a fact corroborated by U.S. Trademark Registration No. 5,684,617 and the Complainant's domain names. The Panel notes the Complainant's prior use of the mark in connection with e.g molding of plastic materials dating back as early as October 31, 2003. Conversely, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name incorporating the ROMOTECH mark, which bears no relation to the

Respondent's trade name or business. In reply to Procedural Order No. 1 requesting the Respondent to explain the selection of the ROMOTECH mark, the Respondent asserted that the term was generic and descriptive because the disputed domain name is "a memorable, double-keyword portmanteau combining 'ROMO' (a widely recognized abbreviation for 'Robotics', 'Rotational', or 'Roman') and 'TECH' ('Technology')". According to the Panel's knowledge, and corroborated with dictionary and Internet searches, "romo" is not a dictionary term. Moreover, the Respondent's explanation for the choice of "romo" does not account for the "mo" portion of the term and there is no evidence to suggest that "romo" is a widely recognized abbreviation for "robotics", "rotational", or "roman". These circumstances raise questions as to the Respondent's credibility and the Panel concludes that the Respondent more likely than not registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant's mark and with the intent to capitalize on its commercial value by selling it to the Complainant or a third party.

Second, as previously noted, the disputed domain name has been held for 18 years, serving only to redirect to a sales landing page. Under the UDRP, the registration of a domain name for resale does not, per se, establish bad faith with the primary purpose of selling it to a trademark owner ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.1). However, noting the identical composition of the disputed domain name and circumstances discussed above, the Panel finds it more likely than not that the Respondent was attempting to profit from or exploit the Complainant's trademark, which supports a finding of bad faith use in this case.

Finally, having examined the Respondent's prior registrations of numerous domain names incorporating third-party trademarks, the Panel finds that these registrations demonstrate a pattern of cybersquatting. (See, e.g., *Total SA v. Yang Kyung Won*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1483](#); *Volvo Trademark Holding AB v. Kyung Won Yang*, WIPO Case No. [D2011-0178](#); *Mysuelly v. Yang Kyung Won*, WIPO Case No. [D2013-1145](#); *LOKEO v. Yang Kyung Won*, WIPO Case No. [D2015-0128](#); and *Pfizer Inc. v. Yang Kyung Won*, WIPO Case No. [D2015-1982](#)).

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has satisfied the third element under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy in the present case.

D. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking

Paragraph 15(e) of the Rules provides that, if after considering the submissions, the Panel finds that the Complaint was brought in bad faith, for example in an attempt at Reverse Domain Name Hijacking or to harass the domain-name holder, the Panel shall declare in its decision that the Complaint was brought in bad faith and constitutes an abuse of the administrative proceeding. However, in the present case, having considered that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith, the Panel is of the opinion that the Complainant has not filed its Complaint in bad faith as an attempt at RDNH.

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 <romotech.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Moonchul Chang/

Moonchul Chang

Sole Panelist

Date: August 21, 2026