

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Reve AI, Inc. v. zuck dont
Case No. D2026-2625

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Reve AI, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Waterman Legal, United States.

The Respondent is zuck dont, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <reve2ai.com> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 16, 2026, originally regarding the disputed domain name <reve2ai.com> and the domain name <reve2img.com>. On June 17, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name and the domain name <reve2img.com>. On June 18, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name and the domain name <reve2img.com> 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 the same date, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control.

On June 18, 2026, the Respondent sent an email communication to the Center expressing its willingness to transfer the disputed domain name and on June 23, 2026, the registrant of the domain name <reve2img.com> sent an email communication expressing its willingness to transfer that domain name. On June 24, 2026, the Center suspended the proceedings, until July 24, 2026, upon the Complainant's suspension request of the same day. On July 6, 2026, the Complainant informed the Center that the Complainant and the registrant of the domain name <reve2img.com> settled for the transfer of that domain name to the Complainant and accordingly, the Center issued Notice of Partial Settlement to the Parties and the Registrar on July 9, 2026, and Notification of Partial Dismissal and reinstitution of the proceedings for the

disputed domain name on July 23, 2026 upon the Complainant's confirmation of settlement implementation. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint regarding the disputed domain name on July 30, 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 August 3, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 23, 2026. The Respondent sent further email communications to the Center on July 23, 2026. The Center notified the Parties of Commencement of Panel Appointment Process on August 24, 2026.

The Center appointed Tobias Zuberbühler as the sole panelist in this matter on August 28, 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 United States software company that provides AI-powered tools allowing users to create and edit high-quality images from text prompts and image-to-image generation. The Complainant's products have been available to consumers since February 2025, and the Complainant released "Reve 2.0" on June 3, 2026. The Complainant's official website can be found at "www.reve.com".

The Complainant owns numerous REVE trademarks, including International Trademark No. 1883716 registered on September 19, 2025.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 4, 2026, and according to the Complaint evidence, it resolved to a website purporting to mirror the Complainant's official website and offering the Complainant's products using "Reve2AI" designation and the heading "AI images with editable layout logic".

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.

B. Respondent

The Respondent has not submitted any response to the Complainant's contentions. However, in email communications dated June 18 and July 23, 2026, the Respondent indicated that it did not wish to contest the proceeding and consented to the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

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 trademark REVE 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 "2" and "ai") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms 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 that 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 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 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 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.

The Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name incorporating the Complainant's trademark together with the terms "2" and "ai" (registered one day after the launch of the Complainant's AI product "Reve 2.0"), coupled with the use of the disputed domain name to resolve to a website purporting to offer Complainant's goods without any indication that it is not affiliated with the Complainant, and generally copying the look and feel of the Complainant's official site, using the Complainant's mark, does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant.

The Panel finds that the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Under the circumstances of this case, it can be inferred that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's mark when registering the disputed domain name, considering the disputed domain name is composed of the Complainant's REVE mark in its entirety together with additional terms referring to the Complainant's "Reve 2.0" AI product and was registered the day after the Complainant's product launch as mentioned above.

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, 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.

Having reviewed the available record and noting the composition of the disputed domain name and the use made thereof, under the circumstances of this case, the Panel finds that the use of the disputed domain name creates a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. In particular, the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to purportedly offer and promote the Complainant's goods, while using the Complainant's trademarks without any indication that it is not affiliated with the Complainant, demonstrates an intention to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks. Therefore, the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 <reve2ai.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Tobias Zuberbühler/

Tobias Zuberbühler

Sole Panelist

Date: September 11, 2026