

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Zoox, Inc. v. Privacy Protection / Solitary Web
Case No. D2026-2080

1. The Parties

Complainant is Zoox, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Lee & Hayes, PC, United States.

Respondent is Privacy Protection / Solitary Web, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <zoox.taxi> is registered with Porkbun LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 14, 2026. On May 15, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 15, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on May 18, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on the same day.

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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 22, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 11. Respondent requested an extension pursuant to paragraph 5(e) of the Rules, and the due date was extended to June 29, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on June 29, 2026. Complainant filed a supplemental filing on July 7, 2026.

The Center appointed Marina Perraki as the sole panelist in this matter on July 13, 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 15, 2026, the Respondent sent an email to the Center requesting 24 hours to reply to Complainant's supplemental filing. The Center acknowledged receipt on July 17, 2026, and indicated that it would forward any supplemental filing received to the Panel. No further communication was received from the Respondent.

4. Factual Background

Complainant was founded in 2014 and is active in the field of autonomous, battery electric vehicles used for ride-hailing services. In 2020, Complainant was acquired by Amazon. Since at least as early as 2016, Complainant has used, advertised, and promoted its goods and services under the ZOOX trademark throughout the United States and worldwide. Complainant's acquisition by Amazon attracted significant unsolicited media coverage throughout the United States and worldwide.

Complainant owns trademark registrations for ZOOX worldwide, including: a) the French trademark registration No. 4792286, ZOOX (word), filed on August 26, 2016, and registered on December 31, 2021, for goods and services in International Classes 7, 9, 12 and 39; and b) the New Zealand trademark registration No. 989627, ZOOX (word), filed on November 13, 2013, and registered on May 14, 2014, for goods in International Class 12.

Complainant also owns the domain name registration <zoox.com>, where it operates its main website.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 4, 2019, and redirects to Complainant's website. Furthermore, the disputed domain name was being offered for sale to the public for a one-time fee of USD 99,999.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

Respondent contends that Complainant has not satisfied all three of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name. Per the Response, Complainant bought the domain name <zoox.com> for USD 70,000 on February 8, 2015, from a domain market place known as Uniregistry.com. Respondent confirms that on August 2, 2021, he sent an email communication to Complainant, "to inform the complainant that buyers were offering sums of money to buy zoox.taxi". Furthermore, per the Response, Respondent "is not the one offering zoox.taxi for sale on godaddy.com". Respondent also states that the disputed domain name no longer appears for sale on GoDaddy. Respondent further claimed that at the time of registering the disputed domain name, Respondent was not aware of Complainant, "except that the domain zoox.com was already registered and not available for me to register". Respondent provided a list of certain domain names that were registered before 2014 containing the word "zoox" claiming that "zoox" was not exclusive to Complainant. Furthermore, Respondent noted that Complainant "has always declared that they are not a Taxi company and they don't want to be referred to as a taxi company". Respondent claims that for this reason the claim that the disputed domain name is identical should fail and Reverse Domain Name Hijacking should be found. As regards legitimate interests, Respondent states that since 2015, Respondent had interests in opening up an Uber type taxi business. In 2016, he purchased two domain names to open up such a taxi business. The domain names purchased were <KenyaTaxi.com> and <KenyaTaxis.com>. Respondent had also purchased "an Uber type taxi software to operate this taxi

business from a software company known as 'Smart Waka'. And the software is known as Uber Wakataxi. The software now operates the website known as rides.wakanow.com The respondent also has as proof of Whatsapp app discussions in 2017 when he sought feasibility consultations from Individuals in Kenya on the viability of the Uber Type Taxi business in Kenya for the two domain names". As regards bad faith Respondent claimed that he was looking for 3 letter domain names with the ".taxi" extension for his purported taxi business but were unavailable therefore he chose a 4 letter one, the disputed domain name, that was available. Per Respondent the disputed domain name was "never registered with the intent to start an Uber type taxi or limo business in Canada or Europe as the Kenyan Market seemed unsuitable". Respondent claims he was unaware that the disputed domain name redirects to Complainant's website, he only saw it "now" and in any case this was not done by him. At the same time, Respondent claims that "he was in the process of using the website for a taxi business. During the time of testing, the website software kept getting technical difficulties as the software was having trouble working well with the server configuration of my VPS. Also a proper feasibility study for the viability of the Uber type business had not been completed, as the respondent was unsure to try emerging markets in Africa or more matured markets in Canada or Europe". Respondent claims that he "discovered in April of 2026 that CWP7 and Centos 7 had developed a severe software insecurity as my domain names seemed to be hijacked and misdirected elsewhere to rogue websites as a result DNS Injection hacks". Respondent provided Wayback Machine screen shots to show that "zoox.taxi had never been forwarded to zoox.com and also to show that previously the home page of zoox.taxi was a default installation page for Centos 7 installation".

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists the three elements which Complainant must satisfy with respect to the disputed domain name:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) 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.

6.1. Procedural Issues

A. Supplemental Filing

Complainant filed on July 7, 2026, a Supplemental Filing in reply to Respondent's Response.

Neither the Rules nor the Supplemental Rules make provision for supplemental filings, except at the request of the UDRP panel (see Rules, paragraph 12). Paragraph 10 of the Rules enjoins the UDRP panel to conduct the proceeding "with due expedition". Therefore, UDRP panels are typically reluctant to countenance delay through additional rounds of pleading and normally accept supplemental filings only to consider material new evidence or provide a fair opportunity to respond to arguments that could not reasonably have been anticipated (WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)", section 4.6).

The Panel notes that Complainant's supplemental filing replies to Respondent's Response and to facts and claims mentioned therein. In this case, after consideration of Complainant's supplemental submission the Panel has decided to accept it for the sake of completeness, in particular noting that it does not address topics that Complainant could have addressed in its Complaint given that such facts and claims were made by Respondent in reply to the Complaint (*Delikomat Betriebsverpflegung Gesellschaft m.b.H. v. Alexander Lehner*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-1447](#); *AutoNation Holding Corp. v. Rabea Alawneh*, WIPO Case No. [D2002-0058](#); and *Avaya Inc. v. Ali Parsa / Ali Parsa, AVAYeRASA / Ali Parsa Koosha*, WIPO Case No. [D2018-1472](#)).

B. Identity of Respondent

On June 9, 2026, Respondent sent an email to the Center via an email address that was different to the email address provided in the Whols, claiming that it is the owner of the disputed domain name, confirming that it had reached out to Complainant in the past and asking for an extension to file a response. Respondent substantiated its claims with the submission of a formal Response and corresponding evidence, wherein it identified itself as “Solitary Web”.

Paragraph 1 of the Rules defines a “respondent” as the holder of the disputed domain name registration. Given the Registrar confirmed registrant details identify a privacy service, “Privacy Protection”, and the formal Response explains the connection of “Solitary Web” to the disputed domain name, the Panel considers it appropriate to consider Respondent as both “Privacy Protection / Solitary Web”. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.4.5. Accordingly, the Panel accepts the filing made by the sender of the June 9, 2026, communication, who has also filed the Response, who seems to have an interest in the disputed domain name, and treats himself as Respondent, and the term Respondent below shall also refer to him.

6.2. Substantive Issues

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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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 identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.taxi” is disregarded in the case, as gTLDs typically do not form part of the comparison on the grounds that they are required for technical reasons. [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 Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

As Complainant demonstrated, it did not authorize Respondent to register the disputed domain name. Additionally, prior to the notice of the dispute, there is no evidence that Respondent was using the disputed domain name, or a trademark corresponding to the disputed domain name, in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Respondent has not convincingly rebutted Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with sufficient evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise. Respondent provided some text messages about a potential taxi business in Kenya and to explain for the reason he bought the domain names <kenyataxi.com> and <kenyataxis.com>, and stated that he, unaware of the Complainant, chose the disputed domain name after being unable to find suitable three-letter domain names.

On the contrary, as Complainant demonstrated, the disputed domain name redirects to the website of Complainant. A respondent's use of a complainant's mark to redirect users to Complainant's site would not support a claim to rights or legitimate interests ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.3). The reply of Respondent that he was unaware of and not responsible for this redirection not only is not convincing but also it does not alter the above, while the Panel notes that the disputed domain name still redirects to Complainant's website.

Furthermore, as Complainant demonstrated, the disputed domain name was being offered for sale for an amount that seemingly exceeds out-of-pocket expenses and there is no reasonable explanation as to the registration and holding of the disputed domain name that could lead the Panel to a conclusion different to the Respondent targeting the Complainant through the disputed domain name. Respondent's reply that he was not the one offering the disputed domain name for sale is not convincing, when Complainant clearly demonstrated and Respondent did not deny, that Respondent directly approached the Complainant with a view to selling the disputed domain name and the domain name <zoox.limo> invoking alleged examples of domain name sales involving third party trademarks.

The Panel also notes the composition of the disputed domain name which reproduces the Complainant's mark in its entirety under a gTLD directly related to Complainant's field of business, and the fact that the disputed domain name was registered with a privacy service to hide Respondent's identity.

The Panel finds that these circumstances do not confer upon Respondent any rights or legitimate interests in respect of 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.

Because the ZOOX trademark had been used and registered by Complainant before the disputed domain name registration, particularly in relation to ride-hailing and robotaxi services, the Panel finds it more likely than not that Respondent had Complainant's mark in mind when registering the disputed domain name. This also in view of the fact that the disputed domain name incorporates Complainant's mark in total, along with the gTLD "taxi" which coincides with Complainant's field of business. While Respondent does introduce evidence of other domain names containing the term "zoox", and argues that the term is not exclusive to Complainant, from the evidence in the record it appears that the term "zoox" in relation to taxi or ride-sharing services is related to Complainant. In this regard, the Panel notes that "zoox" is not a dictionary term and has no clear connection to taxi or automotive services other than in connection with Complainant, which a simple Internet and/or trademark search would have revealed at the time of registering the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2. In light of this, the Panel finds in the circumstances of this case that Respondent knew or should have known of Complainant's trademark, and thus registered the disputed domain name in bad faith.

As regards bad faith use, panels have held that redirecting the disputed domain name to the complainant's website may support a finding that a respondent has registered a domain name to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4. Respondent contends, and provides some evidence to this effect, that he was not aware of or responsible for the disputed domain name's redirect to Complainant's website. Ultimately, however, panels have held that a respondent cannot disclaim responsibility for content appearing on the website associated with its domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.5. Moreover, there is insufficient evidence in the record to confirm Respondent's claims, and the Panel notes that the disputed domain name continues to redirect to Complainant's website even at the time of this Decision. Thus, the Panel finds on balance that Respondent has also used the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The disputed domain name was also being offered for sale on GoDaddy. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the composition of the disputed domain name, which reproduces Complainant's mark in its entirety and is identical to Complainant's prior trademarks and domain name <zoox.com>, and finds that in the circumstances of this case, it is more likely than not that Respondent meant to register the disputed domain name for the purpose of selling the disputed domain name to Complainant, for valuable consideration driven by its suggestion of a connection with Complainant, rather than any independent or dictionary related value. This is in any case what the Respondent did do, namely contacted the Complainant for such sale. As Complainant demonstrated, Respondent offered to sell the disputed domain name to Complainant, as well as the domain name <zoox.limo>, namely another identical domain name with a gTLD in the field of Complainant's business, in August of 2021. In his email to Complainant, Respondent had alleged he received a USD 65,000 "offer" for each of the domain names. Respondent then also described a situation wherein a third party had paid USD 250,000 each to acquire highly similar domain names (to the third party's trademark) through a broker. Respondent claimed that it preferred to sell the disputed domain name to Complainant rather than to "a competitor" of Complainant or a broker. From the above it follows that Respondent insinuated selling the disputed domain name to third parties if Complainant did not provide favorable terms.

From all the above it follows that Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

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. The mere lack of success of the complaint is not, on its own, sufficient to constitute reverse domain name hijacking. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.16. Respondent claims that the Panel should find for RDNH. However, in the present case the Panel finds that Complainant has not filed the Complaint in bad faith and Complainant is not abusing the administrative proceeding, in view of Complainant's earlier rights and use of the mark ZOOX.

The Panel finds that the Complaint has not been brought in bad faith and does not constitute an attempt at Reverse Domain Name Hijacking.

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 <zoox.taxi> be transferred to Complainant.

/Marina Perraki/

Marina Perraki

Sole Panelist

Date: July 27, 2026