ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Tenstorrent AI ULC v. Rachel Busse, tenstorrents.com
Case No. D2026-4550

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Tenstorrent AI ULC, Canada, represented by Fish & Richardson P.C., United States of America ("United States").

The Respondent is Rachel Busse, tenstorrents.com, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <tenstorrents.com> is registered with Squarespace Domains II LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on October 7, 2026. On October 8, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 8, 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 and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 9, 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 October 13, 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 October 14, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 3, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on November 4, 2026.

The Center appointed Gonçalo M. C. da Cunha Ferreira as the sole panelist in this matter on November 5, 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 Canadian technology company that designs and manufactures artificial intelligence processors, computer architecture technologies, and related software. According to the Complaint, it was founded in 2016 and operates in North America, Europe, and Asia.

The Complainant is the owner of, inter alia, the following trade mark registrations for the mark TENSTORRENT (the "TENSTORRENT Trade Mark"):

- United States Trade Mark Registration No. 7270401, registered on January 9, 2024, in class 9;
- Canadian Trade Mark Registration No. TMA1223058, registered on February 26, 2024, in class 9; and
- Taiwan Province of China Trade Mark Registration No. 02268257, registered on December 16, 2022, in class 9.

The Complainant operates its official website at the domain name <tenstorrent.com>, registered on March 27, 2016.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 30, 2026. According to the information provided by the Registrar, the Respondent is Rachel Busse, located in the United States, and the organization field of the Respondent's data reproduces the disputed domain name.

At the time of filing of the Complaint and of this Decision, the disputed domain name redirects Internet users to the Complainant's official website at <tenstorrent.com>.

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:

(1) it was founded in 2016 and designs and manufactures artificial intelligence processors, computer architecture technologies, and related software;
(2) it has used the TENSTORRENT Trade Mark since at least 2016 and owns registrations for the mark in several jurisdictions;
(3) it owns and uses the domain name <tenstorrent.com> for its official website;
(4) the disputed domain name, registered on March 30, 2026, incorporates the TENSTORRENT Trade Mark in its entirety, followed only by the letter "s", and is nearly identical to it;
(5) "tenstorrents" is a misspelling of the TENSTORRENT Trade Mark and a clear instance of typosquatting, which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity;
(6) the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is irrelevant in determining confusing similarity;
(7) the Complainant has not authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the TENSTORRENT Trade Mark or to register or use any domain name incorporating it;
(8) nothing in the record, including the WhoIs data, indicates that the Respondent is or has been commonly known by the disputed domain name;

(9) the disputed domain name redirects Internet users to the Complainant's official website;
(10) that redirection is neither a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use;
(11) "tenstorrent" is a coined term with no meaning independent of the Complainant's TENSTORRENT Trade Mark;
(12) the redirection of the disputed domain name to the Complainant's official website demonstrates that the Respondent had actual knowledge of the Complainant and its TENSTORRENT Trade Mark and specifically targeted the Complainant;
(13) even in the absence of direct evidence of phishing or fraud, there is no legitimate reason for such redirection by an unaffiliated party, which is strong evidence of bad faith registration and use;
(14) the Respondent retains complete technical control over the disputed domain name and may alter the destination of the redirection at any time; and
(15) the disputed domain name should be transferred to the Complainant.

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 Selected UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 1.7.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has shown rights in respect of the TENSTORRENT Trade Mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name reproduces the TENSTORRENT Trade Mark in its entirety and adds only the letter "s". Whether perceived as a plural form or as an obvious misspelling, the addition of this single letter does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the TENSTORRENT Trade Mark which remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 1.7 and 1.9.

The gTLD ".com" is a standard registration requirement and, as such, is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1.

The disputed domain name is therefore confusingly similar to the TENSTORRENT Trade Mark for the purposes of the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that 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 a 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 that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant has not authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the TENSTORRENT Trade Mark or to register a domain name incorporating it.

The Registrar-provided registration data identifies the Respondent as "Rachel Busse" and lists "tenstorrents.com" as the organization. The Respondent's name bears no resemblance to the disputed domain name, and the mere reproduction of the disputed domain name in the organization field, without any independent supporting evidence, does not show that the Respondent has been commonly known by it. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.3.

The redirection of the disputed domain name to the Complainant's official website is not used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Nor is it a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. The disputed domain name, which consists of the TENSTORRENT Trade Mark with the mere addition of the letter "s", carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant, while the Respondent retains control over the redirection. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.1.

The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name under the Policy or otherwise.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that 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.

The disputed domain name was registered in 2026, years after the registration of the TENSTORRENT Trade Mark and of the Complainant's official domain name <tenstorrent.com>. The term "tenstorrent" is a coined and distinctive term, and the disputed domain name differs from it only by the addition of the letter "s". The composition of the disputed domain name is therefore indicative of deliberate targeting rather than coincidence. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.2.

The Respondent's actual knowledge and targeting are confirmed by the redirection of the disputed domain name to the Complainant's official website. Panels have found that redirecting a disputed domain name to the complainant's own website may support a finding of bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.4.

The fact that the destination is the Complainant's legitimate website does not make the use benign. The Respondent registered a domain name confusingly similar to the TENSTORRENT Trade Mark and uses it to redirect Internet users who enter the pluralized or mistyped form of the Complainant's name. This creates a false impression that the disputed domain name is owned or authorized by the Complainant, and the Respondent remains able to change the destination of the redirection.

In the absence of any response or evidence of a plausible good-faith reason for the registration and use of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant and its TENSTORRENT Trade Mark and has used it to take unfair advantage of the TENSTORRENT Trade Mark by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Trade Mark.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 <tenstorrents.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Gonçalo M. C. da Cunha Ferreira/
Gonçalo M. C. da Cunha Ferreira
Sole Panelist
Date: November 10, 2026