ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Hyundai Motor Company, Hyundai Motor America, Genesis Motor America LLC v. Ed Glazer, US Auto Trust, Matt Kaiser, US Auto Trust
Case No. D2026-3758

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Hyundai Motor Company, Republic of Korea, Hyundai Motor America, and Genesis Motor America LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by VLP Law Group LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Ed Glazer, US Auto Trust, United States, and Matt Kaiser, US Auto Trust, United States, represented by Scali Rasmussen, United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <genesisofglendale.com>, <genesisofpasadena.com>, <glendalegenesis.com>, <hyundaiglendale.com>, and <hyundaiofglendale.com> are registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 21, 2026. On August 24, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On August 25, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on August 28, 2026, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainants to either file separate complaints 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 original Complaint concerned six domain names. Following the Registrar's disclosure of registrant information identifying a different underlying registrant for <glendalehyundai.com>, the Complainants withdrew that domain name from this proceeding, without prejudice to pursuing it separately. The Complainants filed an amended Complaint on September 3, 2026, concerning the five remaining disputed domain names.

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 September 9, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 29, 2026. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on September 17, 2026, requesting an automatic four-day extension to file the Response. The extension was granted by the Center, and the new due date for Response was October 3, 2026. The Respondent requested a further extension to file the Response, to which the Complainant agreed by email on September 25, 2026. Accordingly, the Center granted a further extension, and the new due date for Response was October 9, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on October 9, 2026.

The Center appointed Evan D. Brown as the sole panelist in this matter on October 21, 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 October 27, 2026, the Complainant submitted a supplemental filing, together with four annexes, requesting leave to respond to certain matters raised in the Response, including the pending California litigation, the Respondents' asserted authorization to register and use the disputed domain names, and the circumstances surrounding the registration and transfer of the disputed domain names. The Panel addresses the admissibility of this supplemental filing below.

4. Factual Background

The Complainants are members of the Hyundai Motor Group, a multinational automotive manufacturer and distributor headquartered in the Republic of Korea. The Complainants manufacture and distribute motor vehicles under the HYUNDAI trademark and luxury motor vehicles under the GENESIS trademark. Hyundai Motor America distributes HYUNDAI vehicles in the United States, while Genesis Motor America LLC distributes GENESIS vehicles in the United States.

The Complainants own numerous trademark registrations, including United States Trademark Registration No. 1104727 for HYUNDAI, registered on October 24, 1978, and United States Trademark Registration No. 3531628 for GENESIS, registered on November 11, 2008.

The Complainants distribute their vehicles through a network of authorized dealerships. Many of these dealerships operate under business names and corresponding domain names combining the HYUNDAI or GENESIS trademark with a geographic designation, such as the city in which a dealership is located. The Complainants' dealership agreements and related dealer policies contain provisions governing the use of their trademarks in business names, trade names, and domain names.

The Respondents are associated with US Auto Trust, which, through affiliated entities, owns and operates automotive dealerships in the United States. These entities include Hyund Glendale LLC and Gen Glendale LLC. Ed Glazer serves as Manager and President of both entities, and Matt Kaiser serves as Vice President. Beginning in approximately July 2022, Hyund Glendale LLC operated an authorized Hyundai dealership in Glendale, California, under the name Hyundai of Glendale, while Gen Glendale LLC operated an authorized Genesis dealership initially located in Glendale, California, under the name Genesis of Glendale.

On May 9, 2022, Hyund Glendale LLC entered into an asset purchase agreement with Hyundai of Glendale LLC, the prior dealership owner, concerning the acquisition of the Hyundai and Genesis dealership businesses. The agreement addressed the acquisition of various tangible and intangible business assets, including dealership names and domain names. In connection with the transaction, the relevant parties entered into dealership sales and service agreements for the Hyundai and Genesis dealerships in June and

July 2022, respectively. The Complainants also approved the use of the dealership business names Hyundai of Glendale and Genesis of Glendale.

The disputed domain names were originally registered on the following dates: <genesisofglendale.com> on April 16, 2010; <hyundaiofglendale.com> on September 24, 2013; <hyundaiglendale.com> on June 18, 2022; <glendalegenesis.com> on July 11, 2022; and <genesisofpasadena.com> on February 28, 2024. Accordingly, two of the disputed domain names predate the Respondents' operation of the dealerships, while the remaining three were registered near the period in which the Respondents' affiliated entities began operating the dealerships.

During 2024, arrangements were made to relocate the Genesis dealership from Glendale to Pasadena, California. The disputed domain name <genesisofpasadena.com> was registered on February 28, 2024. In March 2024, the Complainants approved the use of the business name Genesis of Pasadena. The parties subsequently executed an amended facility addendum in July 2024 addressing the dealership's relocation, which occurred in approximately August 2024.

On or about January 29, 2025, Hyund Glendale LLC and Gen Glendale LLC provided notice of their intention to terminate their respective dealership relationships, effective February 28, 2025. The dealership operations ceased following termination. The disputed domain names had previously been associated with websites used in connection with the dealership businesses. The record contains historical website captures reflecting such use, as well as records of redirection among certain of the GENESIS-formative domain names. The disputed domain names presently resolve to inactive websites.

On July 8, 2025, Hyund Glendale LLC commenced litigation against Hyundai Motor America in the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles, Case No. 25STCV20212. That litigation concerns, among other matters, the proposed sale of the Hyundai dealership following termination of the dealership relationship, the manufacturer's approval of the proposed transaction, and claimed resulting financial losses. The litigation remains pending.

Following termination of the dealership relationships, the parties exchanged correspondence concerning continued ownership and control of certain domain names incorporating the HYUNDAI and GENESIS trademarks. In January and February 2026, the Complainants' representatives requested the transfer of certain domain names, including <hyundaiofglendale.com> and <hyundaiglendale.com>. The Respondents declined to transfer the domain names.

The registration information disclosed by the Registrar identifies Ed Glazer as the individual registrant of <hyundaiofglendale.com>, <hyundaiglendale.com>, <glendalegenesis.com>, and <genesisofglendale.com>, and Matt Kaiser as the individual registrant of <genesisofpasadena.com>. US Auto Trust is identified as the registrant organization for three of the disputed domain names. The registration records also reflect updates on January 10, 2026, for <hyundaiofglendale.com>, <genesisofglendale.com>, and <genesisofpasadena.com>; June 18, 2025, for <hyundaiglendale.com>; and June 13, 2026, for <glendalegenesis.com>.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainants contend that the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to trademarks in which they have rights; 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. Respondent

The Respondents contend that the Complainants have not established the elements required under the Policy for transfer of the disputed domain names. With respect to the first element, the Respondents dispute confusing similarity as to the three GENESIS-formative domain names, arguing that GENESIS has meanings beyond the Complainants' automotive trademarks and that the domain names are no longer being used in connection with automotive services.

The Respondents assert that they have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names because the domain names were acquired or registered in connection with authorized dealership operations. They maintain that they ceased using the domain names following termination of the dealership relationships and that their continued retention of certain domain names is related to pending litigation concerning the value of dealership assets.

The Respondents deny that the disputed domain names were registered or used in bad faith. They maintain that the domain names were acquired or registered for legitimate business purposes during the authorized dealership relationships, rather than to exploit the Complainants' trademarks. They further contend that the domain names are inactive, that they have not attempted to sell them to the Complainants or their competitors, and that their continued retention does not constitute bad faith under the Policy.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Consolidation of Multiple Complainants

The Complaint was filed by three affiliated companies within the Hyundai Motor Group. Under paragraph 10(e) of the Rules and section 4.11.1 of WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), panels considering consolidation of multiple complainants assess whether the complainants have a specific common grievance against the respondent, or have been affected by common conduct, and whether consolidation would be equitable and procedurally efficient.

The Panel finds that the Complainants share a common grievance arising from the Respondents' registration and retention of domain names incorporating the HYUNDAI and GENESIS trademarks in connection with the former dealership relationships. The claims arise from substantially overlapping circumstances, and the Panel finds that consolidation is fair and procedurally efficient. Accordingly, the Panel permits the Complainants to proceed together in this matter.

6.2. Consolidation of Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainants request consolidation of the disputes concerning the five disputed domain names, asserting that the registrants are affiliated and that the disputed domain names are subject to common control. The Respondents expressly agree that consolidation is appropriate.

Paragraph 10(e) of the Rules provides that a panel shall decide a request to consolidate multiple domain name disputes in accordance with the Policy and the Rules. In determining whether consolidation of multiple respondents is appropriate, 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. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 4.11.2.

The record establishes that the disputed domain names are subject to common control. The disclosed registrants are associated with the same automotive dealership businesses, share overlapping contact information, and are represented by the same counsel in this proceeding. Moreover, the Respondents expressly consent to consolidation. The Panel finds that consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties.

Accordingly, the Panel grants the request for consolidation and will refer to the multiple Respondents collectively as the "Respondent" in this Decision.

6.3 Supplemental Filing

On October 27, 2026, the Complainants submitted an unsolicited supplemental filing, together with four annexes, requesting leave to respond to matters raised in the Response.

Paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules provide the Panel with discretion concerning the admissibility of supplemental submissions. As explained in WIPO Overview 3.1, section 4.6, unsolicited supplemental filings are generally discouraged unless the submitting party demonstrates relevant exceptional circumstances warranting their consideration.

The Panel notes that the Response raised substantial factual issues concerning the parties' dealership agreements, the acquisition and registration of the disputed domain names, and related litigation. The supplemental filing responds to those matters, including the circumstances surrounding possible changes in registration and the scope of the parties' contractual authorizations.

In these circumstances, the Panel exercises its discretion to admit and consider the supplemental filing. The Panel will assess its evidentiary weight together with the other materials in the record. Because the Panel does not resolve the disputed factual matters raised in the supplemental filing against the Respondents, the Panel does not consider further submissions necessary to determine the present Complaint.

6.4. Substantive Matters

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

This first element under the Policy functions primarily as a standing requirement. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7. This element requires the Panel to consider two issues: first, whether the Complainants have rights in a relevant trademark; and second, whether the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to that trademark.

The Complainants have demonstrated their rights in the HYUNDAI and GENESIS trademarks by providing evidence of their trademark registrations. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain names each incorporate one of the Complainants' trademarks in its entirety, together with the geographic term "glendale" or "pasadena" and, in certain instances, the word "of". These additional terms do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity because the HYUNDAI and GENESIS trademarks remain recognizable within the respective disputed domain names. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8. The applicable generic Top-Level Domain ".com" is disregarded for purposes of this comparison. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1.

The Respondent argues that the word "genesis" has meanings unrelated to the Complainants' automotive business and that the GENESIS-formative disputed domain names are no longer used in connection with automotive products or services.

These arguments are not only disingenuous given the nature of the Parties' relationship, but are substantively misplaced.

The first element involves a comparison of the trademarks and disputed domain names, rather than an assessment of the Respondent's use of the domain names or whether that use constitutes trademark infringement. The Respondent's arguments are therefore unavailing and the nature of the disputed domain names meets the standard for confusing similarity under the first element.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainants have established the first element under the Policy.

B. Remaining Policy Elements

The Panel considers it appropriate to address the second and third elements of the Policy together because the issues presented under both elements arise from the same underlying circumstances concerning the parties' former dealership relationships and their respective rights in the disputed domain names.

The Policy was adopted to provide a relatively expedited means of resolving disputes involving the abusive registration and use of domain names, commonly referred to as cybersquatting. It is not intended to resolve all disputes concerning the ownership or use of domain names incorporating another party's trademarks. As explained in WIPO Overview 3.1, section 4.14.6, in certain circumstances involving complex business or contractual disputes, panels have declined to resolve a complaint on its merits, finding instead that the dispute exceeds the limited scope of the Policy and is more appropriately addressed by a court of competent jurisdiction.

The Panel recognizes that the existence of a contractual relationship between the parties, or the presence of contested factual issues, does not automatically place a dispute outside the scope of the Policy. Nor does the existence of pending court litigation necessarily preclude a panel from proceeding to a decision. See WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 4.2 and 4.14.2. The question is whether the particular dispute presented can fairly and appropriately be resolved by applying the Policy to the evidence available in this administrative proceeding.

In the present case, the dispute arises from a commercial relationship between the Complainants and the Respondents' affiliated dealership businesses. The disputed domain names were originally registered or acquired in connection with businesses that operated as authorized Hyundai and Genesis dealerships. Two of the disputed domain names predate the Respondents' acquisition of those dealership businesses, while the remaining three were registered during the period surrounding or following the establishment of the authorized dealership relationships. The parties do not dispute that the dealership businesses operated under the Complainants' trademarks for a period of several years.

The parties' disagreement concerns, in substantial part, the legal consequences of those business relationships and their termination. The Respondents maintain that the disputed domain names were legitimately acquired or registered in connection with their dealership operations and that their continued retention is consistent with their rights in certain dealership assets. The Complainants dispute the extent of the Respondents' original authorization and their entitlement to retain the disputed domain names following termination of the dealership relationships.

Resolution of these competing positions would require consideration of several interrelated contractual and factual questions. These include the scope of the assets conveyed under the 2022 asset purchase agreement, the extent of the Complainants' authorization of particular domain names under the dealership agreements and related policies, and the obligations arising upon termination of those agreements. The parties also disagree concerning the nature of the Respondents' continued ownership or control of the disputed domain names and whether that retention constitutes an improper attempt to obtain leverage in their broader commercial dispute.

The Complainants' supplemental filing raises a further material question concerning the registration history of the disputed domain names. The Complainants point to the distinction between the dealership entities through which the Respondents claim to have acquired or registered the domain names and the individuals presently identified as registrants, together with subsequent registration-update dates. As explained in WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.9, a transfer of a domain name to a new registrant may constitute a new registration for purposes of assessing bad faith. That section further explains that, where a registration is masked by a privacy or proxy service and a complainant credibly alleges a relevant change in registration, the respondent is expected to provide satisfactory evidence of an unbroken chain of registration. Although the record does not conclusively establish that those particular circumstances are present here, the Panel recognizes the significance of the Respondents' failure to provide a complete account of the relevant registration history and does not presume that the original registrations necessarily remained unchanged.

At the same time, the registration records do not conclusively establish whether the changes constituted new acquisitions by different beneficial owners or administrative changes among closely affiliated entities. Nor would establish a change in registration, standing alone, resolve the circumstances and purpose of the acquisition or the parties' related contractual rights and obligations. The potential significance of the changes therefore reinforces, rather than eliminates, the need for a fuller examination of the underlying transactions. The Panel does not make a definitive finding concerning the nature or legal consequences of those changes in this proceeding.

The supplemental filing also raises questions concerning contractual requirements for prior written approval of domain names and the Respondents' obligations upon termination. Those questions may be important to determining whether the Respondents acted consistently with their dealership agreements. They do not, however, necessarily establish that the acquisition or registration of the disputed domain names constituted abusive registration within the meaning of the Policy. Determining the significance of the parties' agreements, their course of dealing, and any subsequent changes in ownership or control would require a fuller examination of the underlying commercial transactions than is appropriately undertaken in this proceeding.

The Panel recognizes the distinction between the absence of an objection to the registration of the disputed domain names and affirmative authorization to register those domain names, particularly where the applicable dealership agreements or policies required prior written approval. The Panel does not regard the absence of an objection as establishing that such approval was obtained. Nevertheless, even assuming that the Respondents did not obtain the requisite authorization, that circumstance would not, by itself, establish that the disputed domain names were registered in bad faith within the meaning of the Policy. The legal consequences of any failure to obtain authorization, considered in the context of the parties' broader dealership relationships, asset acquisition arrangements, course of dealing, and subsequent termination of those relationships, form part of the underlying contractual dispute.

The pending California litigation provides additional context. Although that litigation does not seek the same relief as this proceeding and does not itself prevent the Panel from deciding a UDRP complaint, it concerns the parties' former dealership relationship and the asserted value of certain dealership assets, including two of the disputed domain names. The domain name dispute is therefore closely connected with unresolved questions arising from the parties' broader commercial relationship.

The Panel recognizes that the pending California litigation principally concerns the Hyundai dealership relationship and does not appear to place the three GENESIS-formative disputed domain names directly at issue. The Panel's conclusion, however, does not rest merely on the existence of that litigation. The GENESIS-formative disputed domain names also arose in the context of authorized dealership operations, including the acquisition of the Genesis dealership business and its subsequent relocation from Glendale to Pasadena. Their registration and retention implicate separate questions concerning the applicable dealership agreement, the extent of the authorization granted, the parties' conduct during the dealership relationship, and the circumstances of any subsequent changes in registration or control. Those questions present substantial factual and contractual issues independently of the pending California litigation.

The Panel finds that these circumstances distinguish the present matter from a conventional case of cybersquatting. The question is not merely whether the Respondents registered domain names incorporating trademarks belonging to another party. Rather, the Panel would be required to resolve substantial disagreements concerning the parties' contractual rights and obligations, the ownership and transfer of business assets, and the circumstances surrounding the continued registration of the disputed domain names following termination of the dealership relationships.

Other panels have recognized that disputes of this character may exceed the limited scope of the Policy. See *Jason Crouch and Virginia McNeill v. Clement Stein*, WIPO Case No. D2005-1201 (declining to resolve a domain name dispute intertwined with broader contractual and business disputes); *Staten Island Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, PC v. Jamie Licznerski*, WIPO Case No. D2024-0961 (recognizing that disputed circumstances surrounding the transfer and ownership of a domain name arising from a prior commercial relationship may provide grounds for denial under the limited scope of the Policy).

Having considered the record, including the Complainants' supplemental filing, the Panel concludes that the present dispute is more appropriately resolved in a forum capable of conducting a fuller examination of the relevant agreements, transactions, and evidence. The Panel does not determine whether the Respondents have continuing contractual or other rights to retain the disputed domain names, whether the Complainants are entitled to their transfer under applicable law, or whether either party has breached obligations arising from the dealership relationships.

Accordingly, the Panel declines to make definitive findings under the second and third elements of the Policy.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Evan D. Brown/
Evan D. Brown
Sole Panelist
Date: November 6, 2026