

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Arm Limited v. Smith Johnson, JohnsonSmith
Case No. D2026-3711

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Arm Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Com Laude Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Smith Johnson, JohnsonSmith, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <arm-inc.com> is registered with GMO Internet Group, Inc. d/b/a Onamae.com (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 19, 2026. On August 20, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 21, 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 (Whois Privacy Protection Service by onamae.com) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on the same day, 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 August 25, 2026.

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 August 26, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 15, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 21, 2026.

The Center appointed Xu Lin as the sole panelist in this matter on September 25, 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 semiconductor IP company incorporated in November 1990 in the United Kingdom. It designs sophisticated electronic products, including computer processors, graphics processors, digital memories and peripheral hardware and supplies software, development tools for computer hardware, and provides software and consultancy services.

The Complainant has over 1,000 licensed partners and in total, its products power over 225 billion devices, reaching 70% of the global population. It also provides technology for artificial intelligence (“AI”) compute, and its most recent financial results reported record first-quarter revenue of USD 1.29 billion.

The Complainant is the owner of various registered trademarks for ARM, including:

- Trademark Registration Number 2000006 registered in the United Kingdom on January 29, 1999 for Classes 9, 16 and 42,
- Trademark Registration Number 001112986 registered in the European Union on June 8, 2000 for Classes 9 and 42, and
- Trademark Registration Number 2332930 registered in the United States of America on March 21, 2000 for Class 9.

The Complainant operates its primary website at “www.arm.com”.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 3, 2026 by the Respondent. At the time the Complaint was submitted, according to evidence adduced by the Complainant, the disputed domain name resolved to an active website bearing the HTML title-tag “Powering the Future of AI Compute – Arm®”, and requiring the users to sign up or sign in. At the time of this decision, the disputed domain name is inactive and fails to resolve to any website.

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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that:

Firstly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the ARM trademark in which the Complainant has registered rights:

- The Complainant is the owner of a large global portfolio of registered trademarks for the term ARM. The oldest of its example ARM marks predates the registration of the disputed domain name by approximately 32 years.
- The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant’s ARM mark in its entirety, with the addition of the generic term “inc” which does not distinguish the disputed domain name from the Complainant’s ARM mark but increases the likelihood of confusion by suggesting that the disputed domain name refers to the Complainant’s own corporate entity.
- The Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) is required only for technical reasons and can be ignored for the purposes of comparison of the disputed domain name to the Complainant’s ARM trademark. Similarly, the hyphen may also be ignored.

Secondly, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name:

- The Respondent was not commonly known by the disputed domain name. It was not licensed by the Complainant or received permission, consent or acquiescence from the Complainant to use its name or marks to register the disputed domain name. The Complainant has found no evidence that the Respondent owns any trademarks incorporating the term ARM, or has traded legitimately under the business name ARM or ARM INC.
- The nature of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation as it fully incorporates the Complainant's well-known and highly distinctive ARM mark, combined with the term "inc", which suggests that the disputed domain name refers to the Complainant's own corporate entity.
- The disputed domain name resolves to an active website which, by impersonating the Complainant and its website, attempts to mislead Internet users into registering an account and submitting personal details. *Fenix International Limited v. Leandro Vinicius Bau*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-0584](#) found that the collection of credentials whilst impersonating the Complainant cannot be considered a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Finally, the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith:

- The disputed domain name is in and of itself confusing to Internet users as it incorporates the Complainant's well-known and highly distinctive ARM mark, combined with the term "inc", which suggests the Complainant's own corporate entity.
- The Respondent has used the disputed domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark, as the disputed domain name resolves to an active website impersonating the Complainant, attempts to mislead Internet users into registering an account and logging in.
- The Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name will be disruptive to the Complainant's business.

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 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. 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, in this case "inc", 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.

In what concerns the addition of the gTLD ".com" in relation to the disputed domain name, such is viewed as a standard registration requirement, and is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [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.

In the present case, the Respondent fails to demonstrate that it is commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Complainant has proved it holds rights over the trademark ARM, and claims that the Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, nor authorized by the Complainant in any way to register the disputed domain name, or any domain name, service or product in connection with the ARM trademark.

Rather, the disputed domain name contains the Complainant’s ARM trademark in its entirety and an additional generic term “inc” which will easily be understood as an abbreviation for “incorporated”. Such composition of the disputed domain name effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship by the Complainant, and could not be considered as fair use. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

Further, according to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the disputed domain name resolved to a website featuring the Complainant’s “arm” logotype and similar styling and wording to the Complainant’s genuine “www.arm.com” homepage but provides no disclaimer that would clarify the relationship between the Parties. These circumstances beyond the disputed domain name itself further demonstrate no fair use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.2.

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.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name long after the Complainant’s ARM trademark had become well known and acquired a reputation in its trade. The Panel finds it difficult to believe that the Respondent chose to register the disputed domain name randomly with no knowledge of the ARM trademark.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's ARM trademark in its entirety, combined with the generic term "inc", which may create the misleading impression that the website is an official website sponsored, endorsed or operated by the Complainant. Such composition of the disputed domain name can by itself create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's ARM trademark, and supports the finding that the Respondent wanted to create an association between the disputed domain name and the Complainant when he/she registered the disputed domain name.

According to the evidence provided by the Complainant, the disputed domain name resolved to an active website which, by impersonating the Complainant and its website, attempts to mislead Internet users into registering an account and submitting personal details. Considering the above, the Panel finds that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

At the time of this decision, the disputed domain name is inactive and fails to resolve to any website. However, panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, the lack of response, the prior use of the disputed domain name in connection with the above-mentioned website, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under 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 <arm-inc.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Xu Lin/

Xu Lin

Sole Panelist

Date: October 7, 2026