

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

AIBY Inc. v. hh1 zz and hh zz

Case No. D2026-2780

1. The Parties

The Complainant is AIBY Inc., United States of America (“United States”), internally represented.

The Respondents are hh1 zz, United States, and hh zz, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain names <marschaton.com>, <narschaton.com>, and <chatonsn.com> are registered with Dynadot Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 25, 2026 as regards the disputed domain names <marschaton.com>, and <narschaton.com>. On June 26, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On June 29, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Unknown / Registrar Privacy Service) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 29, 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 the same date.

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 July 1, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 21, 2026. On July 17, 2026, the Complainant requested the inclusion in the proceeding of the domain name <chatonsn.com>. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 24, 2026.

The Center appointed Evan D. Brown as the sole panelist in this matter on July 27, 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 August 5, 2026, the Panel informed the Center that it was inclined to allow the addition of <chatonsn.com> to the proceeding and instructed the Center to request registrar verification concerning that domain name. On August 6, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the additional disputed domain name <chatonsn.com>. On August 7, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for disputed domain name <chatonsn.com>.

On August 13, 2026, the Panel issued Administrative Panel Procedural Order No. 1. The Panel directed the Complainant to submit an amended Complaint by August 18, 2026, adding the disputed domain name <chatonsn.com> and the registrant information disclosed by the Registrar, and permitted the Complainant to provide further arguments, including a request for consolidation of the Respondents. The Panel also invited the Complainant to confirm the remedy sought. The Respondents were given until August 25, 2026 to make any submissions regarding consolidation and, as to the Respondent associated with the disputed domain name <chatonsn.com>, to file a Response in respect of that domain name.

On August 14, 2026, the Complainant submitted a further amended Complaint adding the disputed domain name <chatonsn.com>, requesting consolidation of the Respondents, and requesting transfer of all three disputed domain names.

The Respondents did not make any submission by the August 25, 2026 deadline.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a technology company that develops and distributes mobile software applications. One of its products is an artificial intelligence application offered under the name “ChatOn”. According to evidence submitted by the Complainant, the ChatOn application was released in January 2023 and has been made available through, among other channels, the Apple App Store and Google Play. The Complainant’s website is available at “www.chaton.ai”.

The Complainant owns United States trademark registration No. 7,385,192 for the word mark CHATON, registered on May 14, 2024, for downloadable computer software in International Class 9. The Complainant also owns International Registration No. 1,862,167 for the CHATON mark, registered on May 24, 2025, designating a number of jurisdictions.

The disputed domain names were registered on the following dates:

- <marschaton.com> on April 8, 2026;
- <narschaton.com> on April 13, 2026; and
- <chatonsn.com> on June 30, 2026.

The Complainant asserts, and has submitted evidence in support of its assertion, that the Respondent has used the disputed domain names to operate websites displaying the CHATON mark and the Complainant’s logo as part of what the Complainant characterizes as a fraudulent employment or task-based scheme, in connection with which users were offered purported work opportunities and some reported being asked to make payments.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark; that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied: (i) the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights, (ii) the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names, and (iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith. The Panel finds that all three of these elements have been met in this case.

A. Procedural Issue: Addition of Domain Name and Consolidation of Multiple Respondents

The Complainant requested the addition of disputed domain name <chatonsn.com> to this proceeding after filing the Complaint. As set forth above, the Panel issued Administrative Panel Procedural Order No. 1, permitting the Complainant to amend the Complaint to add disputed domain name <chatonsn.com> and providing the Respondents with an opportunity to make submissions concerning the addition and consolidation, and providing the Respondent associated with disputed domain name <chatonsn.com> with an opportunity to respond to the Complaint as it related to that disputed domain name. The Complainant complied with the Procedural Order, and the Respondents made no submission.

In the circumstances of this case, the Panel finds it appropriate to include the additional disputed domain name <chatonsn.com> in this proceeding. This disputed domain name was registered after the Complaint was filed, and the evidence shows that it was used for a website substantially similar to those associated with the other disputed domain names. The procedural steps taken through Administrative Panel Procedural Order No. 1 afforded the Respondents a fair opportunity to address the addition. Accordingly, the Panel confirms the addition of disputed domain name <chatonsn.com> to this proceeding.

There are two named Respondents. The Complainant requests that they be consolidated into this matter. Paragraph 10(e) of the Rules provides that the Panel shall decide a request to consolidate multiple domain name disputes in accordance with the Policy and the Rules. Section 4.11.2 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)") provides that, where a complaint is filed against multiple respondents, panels consider whether the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control and whether consolidation would be fair and equitable to all parties.

The record indicates that the disputed domain names are more likely than not under common control. They are registered with the same Registrar and behind the same privacy service, the disclosed registrant names "hh1 zz" and "hh zz" are highly similar, the disclosed email addresses follow the same pattern and use the same domain name, and the disputed domain names have been used for substantially similar websites displaying the same CHATON branding. The Respondents have not presented any argument as to why consolidation would be unfair or inequitable.

Accordingly, the conditions for consolidation are present, and the Complainant's request for consolidation is granted.

B. Identical or Confusingly Similar

This first element under the Policy functions primarily as a standing requirement. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

A registered trademark provides a clear indication that the rights in the mark shown on the trademark certificate belong to its respective owner. See *Advance Magazine Publishers Inc., Les Publications Conde Nast S.A. v. Voguechen*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-0657](#). The Complainant has demonstrated its rights in the CHATON mark by providing evidence of its trademark registrations.

The disputed domain names incorporate the CHATON mark in its entirety with the addition of the terms “mars”, “nars”, and “sn”, respectively. The addition of these terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the Complainant’s CHATON mark. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8. The CHATON mark remains sufficiently recognizable for a showing of confusing similarity under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established this first element under the Policy.

C. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Panel evaluates this element of the Policy by first looking to see whether the Complainant has made a prima facie showing that the Respondents lack rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. If the Complainant makes that showing, the burden of production of demonstrating rights or legitimate interests shifts to the Respondents, with the burden of proof always remaining with the Complainant. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1; *AXA SA v. Huade Wang*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-1289](#).

The Complainant has made a prima facie showing that the Respondents lack rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondents to use the CHATON mark, there is no evidence that the Respondents are commonly known by the disputed domain names, and the Respondents have used the disputed domain names for websites displaying the Complainant’s CHATON mark and logo and presenting themselves as associated with the Complainant.

Use of a domain name for passing off or phishing does not confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1. The [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) expressly treats passing off and phishing as conduct incapable of giving rise to rights or legitimate interests.

The Respondents have not presented evidence to overcome the Complainant’s prima facie showing. And nothing in the record otherwise tilts the balance in the Respondents’ favor.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established this second element under the Policy.

D. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Policy requires the Complainant to establish that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets forth a non-exhaustive list of circumstances that may demonstrate bad faith registration and use.

The Panel finds that the Respondents registered the disputed domain names in bad faith. All three disputed domain names were registered after the Complainant had obtained registered rights in the CHATON mark. More significantly, the Respondents used the disputed domain names for substantially similar websites displaying the Complainant’s CHATON mark and logo. This use is strong evidence that the Respondents were aware of the Complainant and its mark and that they targeted the Complainant when registering the disputed domain names. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1; *K2 Trophies and Awards, LLC v. Theresa W Chavez*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-1869](#).

The Panel also finds that the disputed domain names are being used in bad faith. Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy provides that bad faith may be found where a respondent intentionally attempts to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with a complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website or of a product or service on the website.

Here, the Respondents have used the disputed domain names to operate websites displaying the Complainant's CHATON mark and logo and presenting themselves as associated with the Complainant. The Complainant has submitted evidence of inquiries from Internet users concerning purported work or task-based opportunities associated with those websites, including reports from users that they were asked to make payments. The Complainant has also submitted copies of a purported company presentation certificate displaying the CHATON branding and identifying the Complainant by its corporate name and address, which the Complainant states it received from users of its ChatOn application. The Complainant characterizes this activity as fraudulent. The record supports the finding under the Policy that the Respondents used the disputed domain names to pass it off as the Complainant and to attract Internet users for commercial gain through confusion with the CHATON mark. The Panel finds that such conduct falls within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 3.1.4 and 3.4; *K2 Trophies and Awards, LLC v. Theresa W Chavez*, supra.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established this third element under 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 names <marschaton.com>, <narschaton.com>, and <chatonsn.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Evan D. Brown/

Evan D. Brown

Sole Panelist

Date: August 26, 2026