ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Future Motion, Inc. v. kanyarat kangrang
Case No. D2026-3833

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Future Motion, Inc., United States of America, represented by Kolitch Romano Dascenzo Gates, United States of America (or "United States").

The Respondent is kanyarat kangrang, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <anticebike.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 26, 2026. On August 27, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 27, 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 (Privacy Service Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 28, 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 August 28, 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 31, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 20, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 28, 2026.

The Center appointed Juan Lapenne as the sole panelist in this matter on September 30, 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 well-known electric vehicle company that sells electric mini-bikes.

The Complainant is the owner of the following trademarks:

United States trademark registration No. 8169744 for ANTIC, registered on March 10, 2026, in Class 12.

United States trademark registration No. 8169745 for ANTIC (stylized), registered on March 10, 2026, in Class 12.

According to the WhoIs records, the disputed domain name was registered on August 12, 2026.

The disputed domain name currently does not point to any active website. However, according to the documents, printouts and statements submitted by the Complainant – which have not been contested by the Respondent – prior to the present proceeding, the disputed domain name resolved to an active website offering for sale products using the Complainant's ANTIC trademark. The website at the disputed domain name imitates the Complainant by using a stylized version of the Complainant's ANTIC mark and by using the Complainant's photos.

The Complainant's primary domain name is <anticbikes.com>, through which the Complainant promotes and offers for sale its products.

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 the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the trademark ANTIC in which the Complainant has rights, as it entirely reproduces the ANTIC trademark, with the mere addition of the descriptive word "ebike" after the ANTIC mark.

The Complainant submits that the addition of the descriptive word "ebike" (which is an abbreviation of electric bikes) fails to prevent a likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark.

The Complainant contends that the ANTIC trademark is well-known and has become a distinctive identifier which consumers associate with the Complainant.

The Complainant submits that the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is irrelevant to determine the confusing similarity between the trademark and the disputed domain name.

With reference to rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, the Complainant contends that the Respondent is not an authorized reseller of the Complainant, is not affiliated with the Complainant, and has never been licensed, authorized or permitted by the Complainant to use the trademark ANTIC.

The Complainant highlights that to the best of its knowledge the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name or any name that incorporates the word “antic”.

In addition to the above, the Complainant contends that the Respondent impersonates the Complainant by using the disputed domain name to resolve to a website that imitates the Complainant’s branded online shop and offers for sale products corresponding to the Complainant’s genuine product range.

With reference to the circumstances evidencing bad faith, the Complainant submits that given the distinctiveness and reputation of the ANTIC trademark, the Respondent knew or should have known the Complainant and its trademark rights.

The Complainant further argues that the Respondent uses the disputed domain name to operate a website designed to fraudulently suggest affiliation with the Complainant.

Therefore, the Complainant contends that the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, but is instead misleadingly diverting consumers for his own commercial gain.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 15 (a) of the Rules: “A Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable”. Paragraph 4 (a) of the Policy directs that the Complainant must prove each of the following:

(i) that the disputed domain name registered by the Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;

(ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name;

(iii) that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established rights over the trademark ANTIC based on the trademark registrations cited under section 4 above.

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 Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the ANTIC trademark, as it entirely incorporates the ANTIC trademark with the mere addition of the descriptive and generic term “ebike” (meaning electric bikes) and the gTLD “.com”. Indeed, where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of descriptive or meaningless terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8.

The applicable Top-Level Domain (“TLD”) in a domain name is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element of the confusing similarity test. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has proven that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has established rights according to paragraph 4 (a)(i) of the Policy.

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.

In the instant case, the Panel notes that the Respondent is not an authorized reseller of the Complainant. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to incorporate its ANTIC trademark in the disputed domain name. Nor is the Respondent a licensee or otherwise affiliated to the Complainant.

There is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name pursuant to paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

The Respondent used the disputed domain name to resolve to a website displaying the Complainant's trademark and offering for sale the same products of the Complainant. In addition, the website displayed (according to the Complainant's printouts which were not rebutted by the Respondent) misappropriated copyrighted images owned by the Complainant. Besides, the Respondent used on the website another trademark of the Complainant ("ONEWHEEL").

In the absence of any authorization from the Complainant, the Panel finds that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name cannot amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services or to a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is misleading Internet users, inducing them to believe that the Respondent's website belongs to the Complainant or at least is sponsored by or affiliated with the Complainant, hence the Respondent is unduly profiting from the goodwill of the Complainant's well-known trademark.

The use of a domain name for impersonating/passing off, or other types of fraud, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has proven that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name according to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4 (a)(iii) of the Policy requires that the Complainant proves that the disputed domain name was registered and used by the Respondent in bad faith.

As to registration, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name after the Complainant registered its ANTIC trademark and after such a trademark received significant publicity. The

disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's well-known (among the relevant public) ANTIC trademark with the mere addition of the descriptive term "ebike", and is similar to the Complainant's own domain name <anticbikes.com>. Besides, the Respondent used the disputed domain name to resolve to a website on which the same products of the Complainant were offered for sale. Due to this, the Panel finds that the Respondent knew of the Complainant and its trademark rights at the time of registering the disputed domain name.

In addition, the Respondent used on its website copyrighted images of the Complainant, and used another trademark of the Complainant ("ONEWHEEL"), without authorization.

Therefore, by using the disputed domain name in the manner described above, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of its website.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for impersonating/passing off, or other types of fraud, constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4.

Therefore, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 <anticebike.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Juan Lapenne/
Juan Lapenne
Sole Panelist
Date: October 8, 2026