

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Rolls-Royce Plc v. Name Redacted and Name Redacted Case No. D2026-3227

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Rolls-Royce Plc, United Kingdom, represented by Cleveland Scott York LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondents are Name Redacted and Name Redacted¹.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <rolls-royce.com> and <rolls-royse.com> are registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 22, 2026. On July 22, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On July 22, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 23, 2026, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar(s), requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all disputed domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on July 24, 2026.

¹ The Respondents appear to have used the names of the Complainant’s employees to register the disputed domain names. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted Respondents’ names from this Decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this Decision an instruction to the Registrar regarding transfer of the disputed domain names, which includes the names of Respondents. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in this proceeding, and has indicated Annex 1 to this Decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST-12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1788](#).

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 27, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 16, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 17, 2026.

The Center appointed Fabrizio Bedarida as the sole panelist in this matter on August 17, 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 in this administrative proceeding is Rolls-Royce Plc, a public limited company incorporated under the laws of England and Wales. The Complainant has a presence in 48 countries and employs over 40,000 people. The Complainant’s revenue was GBP 20,059,000,000 in 2025 and GBP 17,848,000,000 in 2024.

In 2025, Rolls-Royce (Aerospace & Defence) was recognized as one of the strongest brands in the United Kingdom.

The Complainant is, inter alia, the owner of:

United States of America Trademark registration number 5126188, for the ROLLS-ROYCE trademark registered on January 24, 2017;

United Kingdom trademark registration number UK00003030703, for the ROLLS-ROYCE trademark registered on February 28, 2014; and

International trademark registration number 1215839, for the ROLLS-ROYCE trademark registered on January 17, 2014.

The Complainant is one of the world’s largest civil and defence aero-engine companies, one of the global leaders in marine propulsion, and supplier of energy solutions.

The Complainant’s official website can be found at “www.rolls-royce.com”.

The disputed domain names <rolls-royse.com> and <rolls-roycs.com> were registered on July 7, 2026, and July 8, 2026, respectively, and resolve to inactive pages.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain names with full knowledge of the Complainant's prior rights in the ROLLS-ROYCE trademark, specifically to send deceptive emails in an effort to defraud the Complainant's suppliers and business partners. In fact, the Complainant has documented that the disputed domain names have been utilized to send emails impersonating actual employees of the Complainant. Consequently, the Complainant argues that such impersonation and deception of business partners cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor a fair use of the disputed domain names. On the contrary, this passing off is definitive evidence of both bad faith registration and use.

On the subject of common control, the Complainant notes that the disputed domain names:

- were created within one day of each other;
- share the same registrar;
- share the same reseller;
- resolve to the same IP address;
- share the same Autonomous System Number (ASN);
- share the same name servers;
- display similar typosquatting and soundsquatting characteristics; and
- have been utilized in the exact same fraudulent manner to send deceptive emails.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Procedural Issue – Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel particularly notes that: (i) the disputed domain names were registered through the same Registrar and reseller, and share the same name servers; (ii) the disputed domain names were utilized in the exact same fraudulent manner to send deceptive emails featuring substantially similar texts; and (iii) the Registrants did not object to the Complainant's assertion that the disputed domain names are under common control.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as “the Respondent”) in a single proceeding.

6.2. Substantive Issues

In order for the Complainant to obtain the transfer of the disputed domain names, paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that the Complainant must demonstrate to the Panel that:

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

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.

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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The disputed domain names contain the Complainant’s ROLLS-ROYCE trademark with the sole substitution of the letter “e” with the letter “s” in one of the disputed domain names and the substitution of the letter “c” with the letter “s” in the other disputed domain name. In this sense, [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9 states: “A domain name which consists of a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of a trademark is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element.”

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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here claimed to be used for impersonating employees of the Complainant for the purposes of fraud, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark.

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.

The disputed domain names were registered many years after the Complainant's trademark registration. In addition, owing to the substantial presence established worldwide and on the Internet by the Complainant, and the Respondent's use of the disputed domain names to send deceptive emails, it is at the least very unlikely that the Respondent was not aware of the existence of the Complainant's trademarks and domain names when registering the disputed domain names.

Therefore, it is more likely than not that the Respondent, when registering the disputed domain names, had knowledge of the Complainant's earlier rights to the ROLLS-ROYCE trademark and trade name.

Another factor supporting the conclusion of bad faith registration and use is that the Respondent deliberately chose to conceal its identity. In fact, the Respondent registered the disputed domain names by misappropriating the names of two of the Complainant's employees.

In fact, as previously discussed, the disputed domain names have been utilized in the same fraudulent manner to send deceptive emails impersonating actual employees of the Complainant.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here claimed to be used for impersonating employees of the Complainant for the purposes of fraud, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

Previous panels have also consistently held that the registration of domain names targeting well-known trademarks constitutes strong evidence of bad faith registration and use under paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain names are also affirmed by the fact that the Respondent did not respond to nor has denied the assertions of bad faith made by the Complainant in this proceeding.

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 names <rolls-roycs.com> and <rolls-royse.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Fabrizio Bedarida/

Fabrizio Bedarida

Sole Panelist

Date: August 17, 2026