

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Rohde & Schwarz GmbH & Co. KG v. he jxing
Case No. D2026-3107

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Rohde & Schwarz GmbH & Co. KG, Germany, represented by Bettinger Rechtsanwälte Partnerschaft mbB, Germany.

The Respondent is he jxing, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <rohdeschwarzus.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 15, 2026. On July 16, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 17, 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 (Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 17, 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 July 20, 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 July 20, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 9, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 10, 2026.

The Center appointed Marina Perraki as the sole panelist in this matter on August 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.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a developer and manufacturer of electronics, specialized, in particular, in the fields of electronic test equipment, broadcasting, radio monitoring and radiolocation, and radio communication with a history going back to the early 1930. Its corporate name and trademark reflect its founders' names. The Complainant is based in Germany and maintains regional headquarters in the United States of America ("USA") and in Asia. The Complainant has around 15,000 employees in over 70 countries. The Complainant's product line includes products for the wireless communications, broadcasting and electronics industry, aerospace and defense, homeland security and critical infrastructures.

The Complainant owns trademark registrations for ROHDE & SCHWARZ, including the international trademark registration no. 759770, ROHDE & SCHWARZ (word), registered on April 30, 2001, for goods and services in international classes 9, 37, 38, 41 and 42.

The Complainant is also the owner of domain name registrations comprising "rohde schwarz", including the domain name <rohde-schwarz.com> under which it maintains its main website.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 22, 2026 and at the time of filing of the Complaint resolved to a website with the header "Aurora Precision - Precision Instruments" offering competing goods and services to those of the Complainant, namely test and measurement equipment (the "Website"). The Website represented that it supplied spectrum analysers, signal generators, EMI test receivers, network analysers, power sensors and meters, and oscilloscopes, namely products for which the Complainant is known in the particular field of business. It also claimed to serve industries in which the Complainant is active, including telecommunications, aerospace and defense, automotive testing, semiconductors, and research and education. The Website included links for "Home", "Products", "Services", "Technology", "Industries" and "Contact Us". It also presented various purported indicators of commercial experience and credibility, including claims of certifications and more than "350+ patents worldwide", operations in "95+ countries", "3,200+ engineers & scientists" and "25+ years of innovation". The Panel further notes that the Website included the following copyright notice: "© 2026 Rohde & Schwarz. All rights reserved".

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 did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists 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;
- (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.

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 entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name, minus the ampersand. The Complainant's mark remains recognizable 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, "us", , may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term 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 generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is disregarded under the first element assessment, as gTLDs typically do not form part of the comparison on the grounds that they are required for technical reasons (*Rexel Developpements SAS v. Zhan Yequn*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-0275](#); *Hay & Robertson International Licensing AG v. C. J. Lovik*, WIPO Case No. [D2002-0122](#)); and [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 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.

On the contrary, the Panel notes the composition of the disputed domain name, which carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant, and that the resolving Website was used to promote the Respondent's competing products and services. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 2.5.1. and 2.5.3, the latter states: "Similarly, a respondent's use of a complainant's mark to redirect users (e.g., to a competing site) would not support a claim to rights or legitimate interests."

The Panel finds that these circumstances do not confer upon the 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.

The Panel concludes that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith. Considering the nature of the Complainant's mark which is distinctive, the Panel finds it more likely than not that the Respondent had the Complainant's mark in mind when registering the disputed domain name (*Google LLC v. Bill Johnson, cloudmap, Loong Two*, WIPO Case No. [DIO2025-0055](#); *Google LLC v. cheng xinfang*, WIPO Case No. [DIO2025-0056](#)). The Panel also notes that the disputed domain name incorporates almost the entirety of the Complainant's mark with the sole addition of the term "us", short for USA, where the Complainant maintains presence, and that the Website promoted products and services competing to the Complainant's. These are further indications of bad faith registration.

Additionally, the Panel observes that the Website refers to "Aurora Precision, Precision Instruments" while at the bottom it is possible to see the following copyright notice "© 2026 Rohde & Schwarz. All rights reserved". The Panel finds that this reinforces a finding of registration on bad faith, as this indicates to the Panel that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name aiming to confuse Internet users for commercial gain.

As regards bad faith use of the disputed domain name, the Complainant has demonstrated that the disputed domain name was used to host the Website, which offered and promoted products and services that were competing to the Complainant's products and services. The disputed domain name operated therefore by intentionally creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark and business as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the website it resolved to. This amounts to bad faith registration and use (*Booking.com BV v. Chen Guo Long*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-0311](#); *Ebel International Limited v. Alan Brashear*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-0001](#); *Walgreen Co. v. Muhammad Azeem / Wang Zheng, Nicenic International Group Co., Limited*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-1607](#); *Oculus VR, LLC v. Sean Lin*, WIPO Case No. [DCO2016-0034](#); and [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4).

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 <rohdeschwarzus.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Marina Perraki/

Marina Perraki

Sole Panelist

Date: August 27, 2026