ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Reve AI, Inc. v. ricen Li
Case No. D2026-2827

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is ricen Li, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <reve2ai.org> (the "Domain Name") 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 29, 2026. On June 30, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On July 1, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Whois Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 2, 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 amendment to the Complaint on the same date.

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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 8, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 28, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 30, 2026.

The Center appointed Nicholas Smith as the sole panelist in this matter on August 4, 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 company that on February 5, 2025, launched an AI-powered tool that allowed users to create images from text prompts which it offers under the word mark REVE ("REVE Mark") and from its website at "www.reve.com". On June 3, 2026, shortly before the Domain Name was registered, it released its Reve 2.0 version which contained a number of major advancements and was the subject of considerable publicity, with various third party articles being published about the new software.

The Complainant has held a trademark registration for the REVE Mark in numerous jurisdictions, including the United States, since 2025 (Registration No. 7,994,787, registered October 21, 2025, for "software as a service (SAAS) services featuring software for generating images from text" in class 42).

The Domain Name was registered on June 7, 2026. The Domain Name resolves to a website (the "Respondent's Website") that, under the REVE Mark, purports to offer AI image-generating software described as Reve 2.0 in direct competition with the Complainant.

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 Domain Name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that:

a) It is the owner of the REVE Mark, having registered the REVE Mark in the United States and other jurisdictions. The Domain Name is confusingly similar to the REVE Mark as it merely adds the terms "2" and "ai" and the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".org" to the mark.

b) There are no rights or legitimate interests held by the Respondent in respect of the Domain Name. The Complainant has not granted any license or authorization for the Respondent to use the REVE Mark. The Respondent is not commonly known by the REVE Mark, nor does it use the Domain Name for a bona fide purpose or legitimate noncommercial purpose. Rather the Respondent is using the Domain Name to pass off as the Complainant for commercial gain by reproducing the Complainant's mark and purporting to offer competing AI image-generation software under the Complainant's name. Such use is not a legitimate use of the Domain Name.

c) The Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent is using the Domain Name to divert Internet users searching for the Complainant to the Respondent's Website to disrupt the Complainant's business and for commercial gain. Such conduct amounts to registration and use of the Domain Name in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

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 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 is reproduced within the Domain Name. Accordingly, the 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 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 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 Domain Name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel considers that the record of this case reflects that:

- before any notice to the Respondent of the dispute, the Respondent did not use, nor has it made demonstrable preparations to use, the Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, and WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.2.

- the Respondent (as an individual, business, or other organization) has not been commonly known by the Domain Name. Paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy, and WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.3.

- the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue. Paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy, and WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.4.

- the record contains no other factors demonstrating rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in the Domain Name.

The Respondent has used the Domain Name to redirect visitors to a website that, under the Complainant's coined REVE Mark (and absent a disclaimer), purports to offer competing AI image-generation software (and indeed the Complainant's Reve 2.0 software). Such conduct, involving the misleading suggestion that the Respondent (and the Respondent's Website) is in some way connected to the Complainant, does not, on its face, amount to the use of the Domain Name for a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

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.

The Panel finds that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its reputation in the REVE Mark at the time the Respondent registered the Domain Name. The Respondent has provided no explanation, and neither is it immediately obvious, why an entity would register a domain name that wholly incorporates the coined REVE Mark and direct it to a website purportedly offering AI image generation software (indeed the Complainant's Reve 2.0 software) under the Complainant's REVE Mark unless there was an awareness of and an intention to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant and its REVE Mark.

Furthermore, in the absence of an explanation from the Respondent (none being provided), the timing of the registration, a matter of days after the Complainant launched its Reve 2.0 software, is unlikely to be coincidental. The registration of the Domain Name in awareness of the REVE Mark and in the absence of rights or legitimate interests amounts under these circumstances to registration in bad faith.

The Respondent has used the Domain Name, being confusingly similar to the REVE Mark, to attract visitors to its website where it misleadingly suggests a connection to or an association with the Complainant, likely for commercial gain in some form. Such an action satisfies the requirements of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

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.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nicholas Smith/
Nicholas Smith
Sole Panelist
Date: August 7, 2026