ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Hyundai Motor Company, Hyundai Motor America, Genesis Motor America LLC v. Venn Vincent
Case No. D2026-4020

1. The Parties

The Complainants are 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 Venn Vincent, Indonesia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <glendalehyundai.com> is registered with Gname.com Pte. Ltd. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 7, 2026. On September 8, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 9, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that 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 September 9, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 29, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 30, 2026.

The Center appointed Luca Barbero as the sole panelist in this matter on October 8, 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 Complainants Hyundai Motor Company ("the first Complainant"), Hyundai Motor America ("the second Complainant") and Genesis Motor America LLC ("the third Complainant") belong to the same corporate group, known as the Hyundai Motor Group, which sells the motor vehicles it manufactures as a car line-make under the HYUNDAI mark, being currently one of the largest car manufacturers of the Republic of Korea and one of the most known car manufactures worldwide.

The Hyundai Motor Group has 432 production bases and offices in 49 countries, with research and development centers in 12 countries and sales offices in 65 countries, employing over 292,000 individuals. In 2023, its total revenues exceeded USD 123 billion.

The second and third Complainants are wholly owned subsidiaries of the first Complainant.

The first and the second Complainants are the owners of trademark registrations for HYUNDAI and GENESIS, used by each and/or Genesis Motor America LLC, respectively, in the operation of their world-renowned automotive production and distribution business.

Particularly, in the United States, HYUNDAI vehicles are distributed by the second Complainant, while the Complainants' luxury line, branded as GENESIS, is distributed by the third Complainant. The GENESIS line debuted as part of the HYUNDAI car line-make in 2008 and became a standalone luxury brand in 2015, with the first vehicles - GENESIS G80 and G90 - launched in 2016.

The first Complainant is the owner of several trademark registrations for HYUNDAI, including the following:

- United States trademark registration No. 1104727 for HYUNDAI (word mark), filed on March 20, 1978, and registered on October 24, 1978, in international class 12;

- European Union trademark registration No. 012312518 for HYUNDAI (word mark), filed on November 14, 2013, and registered on April 14, 2014, in classes 11, 12 and 14;

- Korean trademark registration No. 4001783910000 for HYUNDAI (stylized mark), filed on July 30, 1999, and registered on September 25, 2000, in international classes 11, 12 and 14; and

- International trademark registration No. 1046531 for HYUNDAI (stylized mark), registered on February 23, 2010, in classes 7 and 12.

The first Complainant is also the owner of the following trademark registrations for GENESIS:

- International trademark registration No. 939229 for GENESIS (word mark), registered on September 6, 2007, in class 12; and

- Korean trademark registration No. 4007437370000 for GENESIS (word mark), filed on March 28, 2007, and registered on April 15, 2008, in international class 12.

The second Complainant is the owner of the following trademark registration for GENESIS:

- United States trademark registration No. 3531628 for GENESIS (word mark), filed on January 22, 2007, and registered on November 11, 2008, in international class 12.

The first Complainant also owns numerous domain names incorporating the HYUNDAI and/or GENESIS marks, including <hyundai.com>, registered on June 24, 1998, and used in connection with the Complainants' main website dedicated to the promotion of the HYUNDAI mark and products, and <genesis.com> registered on March 17, 1992, used to promote GENESIS car models.

The disputed domain name <glendalehyundai.com> was registered on August 16, 2025, and at the time of this Decision does not resolve to an active website. However, according to the evidence provided by the Complainant – which has not been contested by the Respondent – prior to the present proceeding, the disputed domain name resolved to a website that mimicked the website previously operated by a former authorized HYUNDAI operation in Glendale, publishing the trademarks HYUNDAI and GENESIS and images and content related to the Complainants' vehicles. The disputed domain name was then redirected to an inactive website for a short period and, subsequently, to an Indonesian-language online gambling and sports-betting website.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainants

The Complainants contend that they have satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainants contend that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark HYUNDAI in which they have rights as it reproduces the trademark in its entirety with the mere addition of the geographic term "Glendale", referring to the California city in which Complainant has an authorized Hyundai dealership, and the generic Top-Level domain ("gTLD") ".com".

The Complainants state that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name since: i) the Respondent is not related in any way, does not carry out any activity for, and has no business relationship with the Complainants; ii) the Complainants have not granted the Respondent any license, permission, or authorization to use the HYUNDAI mark or to register a domain name incorporating that mark; iii) the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services since it was originally used in connection with a dealership-style website displaying the Complainants' marks and subsequently redirected to a website in Indonesian language displaying gambling and sports-betting content, in both cases capitalizing on the goodwill of the HYUNDAI mark; and iv) the disputed domain name has not been used for a legitimate noncommercial or fair use considering the disputed domain name reflects a naming pattern exclusively associated with an authorized Hyundai dealership in Glendale and the diversion to gambling and sports-betting content is commercial in character and does not constitute fair use but exploits instead the implied affiliation created by the disputed domain name.

With reference to the circumstances evidencing bad faith, the Complainants submit that considering: i) the Complainants' trademark rights long predate the registration of the disputed domain name by the Respondent; ii) the HYUNDAI mark is internationally well-known; iii) the nature of the disputed domain name, incorporating the well-known HYUNDAI mark preceded by the geographical indicator "Glendale", a geographical reference that corresponds to the location of an authorized HYUNDAI dealership; and iv) the Respondent's prior redirection of the disputed domain name, initially, to a website displaying dealership-style content and, thereafter, to a website with Indonesian-language gambling content, the Respondent was undoubtedly aware of, and intended to target, the Complainants' trademark at the time of registering the disputed domain name.

The Complainants further contend that, given the Complainants' decades-old rights in the HYUNDAI mark, the geographic dealership-formative structure of the disputed domain name, the historical dealership-style use, and the later redirection to Indonesian-language gambling and sports-betting content website, the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name is consistent with an intentional attempt to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainants' HYUNDAI mark, in accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Complainants also state that the Respondent has prevented the Complainants and their authorized dealership in Glendale from reflecting the dealership's business identity in the most natural corresponding gTLD ".com" and from using the disputed domain name for legitimate commercial purposes.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainants' contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Preliminary procedural issue: consolidation of multiple Complainants

Paragraph 10(e) of the UDRP Rules grants a panel the power to consolidate multiple domain name disputes.

Multiple complainants may bring a consolidated complaint against a single respondent if: (i) the complainants have a specific common grievance against the respondent, or the respondent has engaged in common conduct that has affected the complainants in a similar fashion; and (ii) it would be equitable and procedurally efficient to permit the consolidation. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.11.1.

The Panel finds that the three Complainants have a common grievance against the Respondent, considering that:

i) all Complainants belong to the same group of companies, the second and third Complainants being wholly-owned subsidiaries of the first Complainant;

ii) the Complainants have a common interest in the HYUNDAI and GENESIS marks and have been the target of common conduct by the Respondent, since: a) both trademarks were referenced on the website to which the disputed domain name originally resolved; b) the first and second Complainants are the owners of the HYUNDAI and GENESIS registered marks and the third Complainant is using the GENESIS mark in the operation of its automotive production and distribution business; and c) the disputed domain name incorporates the trademark HYUNDAI owned and used by the first and second Complainants.

The Panel also finds that it would be equitable and procedurally efficient to permit consolidation of the Complainants in this case and will now proceed to Decision.

6.2. Substantive Issues

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules: "[a] Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and 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 Complainants must prove each of the following:

(i) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainants have rights;

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

(iii) that 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 Complainants' trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

The Complainants have shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. Indeed, the Complainants have provided evidence of ownership of valid trademark registrations for HYUNDAI. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the HYUNDAI 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, here, "glendale", 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.

As to the gTLD ".com", it is a standard registration requirement and can be disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1.

Therefore, 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 Complainants have established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainants' 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.

According to the Complainant's unrebutted allegations and the evidence on record, there is no relationship between the Complainants and the Respondent, and the Complainants have not authorized the Respondent to register or use its trademark or the disputed domain name. Moreover, there is no element from which the Panel could infer the Respondent's rights over the disputed domain name, or that the Respondent might be commonly known by the disputed domain name.

As highlighted above, the disputed domain name does not currently resolve to an active website. However, according to the evidence provided by the Complainants, which has not been contested by the Respondent, prior to the present proceeding, it originally resolved to a website mimicking the prior website of a former

dealer of the Complainants, publishing the HYUNDAI and GENESIS marks, as well as photos and content related to the Complainants' vehicles, and was subsequently redirected to an online gambling and sports-betting website. The Panel finds that the Respondent has not used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the Complainants' trademarks. Indeed, the Respondent appears to have used the disputed domain name to attract users to the corresponding websites for commercial gain, by capitalizing on the goodwill of the Complainants' mark.

Moreover, the disputed domain name, incorporating the Complainants' trademark in combination with the geographic term "glendale", is inherently misleading as it suggests an affiliation with the Complainants. Even where a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term, UDRP panels have largely held that such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.1.

Therefore, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has also 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 light of the prior registration and use of the Complainants' trademark HYUNDAI, including online via the Complainants' official website "www.hyundai.com", and considering the well-known character and reputation of the HYUNDAI trademark worldwide, the Panel finds that the Respondent knew or should have known the Complainants' trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.2.

Moreover, considering the composition of the disputed domain name and its prior redirection to a dealership-style website publishing the HYUNDAI and GENESIS marks and content related to the Complainant's vehicles, the Panel finds that the Respondent was indeed actually aware of, and intended to target, the Complainants' trademarks through the registration and use of the disputed domain name.

Additionally, in view of the use of the disputed domain name in connection with the websites described above, initially imitating the former website of a prior dealer of the Complainants and subsequently promoting gambling and sport-betting services, the Panel finds that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to the corresponding websites for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainants' mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the websites, according to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

At present the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website. 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 and reputation of the Complainants' trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name and the prior use of the same made by the Respondent, 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.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainants have established the third element of the Policy as well.

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 <glendalehyundai.com> be transferred to the Complainants.

/Luca Barbero/
Luca Barbero
Sole Panelist
Date: October 22, 2026