

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Crestron Electronics, Inc. v. Oleksander Tupytskyi
Case No. DAI2026-0055

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Crestron Electronics, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Oleksander Tupytskyi, Austria.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <crestron.ai> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 15, 2026. On June 16, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 16, 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 (Registration Private/Domains by Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 17, 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 amended Complaint on June 17, 2026.

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 June 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 13, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 16, 2026.

The Center appointed Shwetasree Majumder as the sole panelist in this matter on July 23, 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 manufactures and distributes audiovisual, control, automation and unified communication equipment. The Complainant's official business website is "www.crestron.com". The domain name <crestron.com> was registered in 1999.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for the mark CRESTRON in multiple jurisdictions all in International Class 9. These include, among others:

- European Union Trademark Registration No. 006514301 for CRESTRON, registered on September 17, 2008;
- United States Trademark Registration No. 1324244 for CRESTRON, registered on March 12, 1985; and,
- International Registration No. 1074611 for CRESTRON, registered on February 3, 2011.

The disputed domain name <crestron.ai> was registered on September 9, 2025. The disputed domain name resolves to a website comprising pay-per-click ("PPC") links. The registrant of the disputed domain name was concealed behind the privacy service Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC, and the underlying registrant details were disclosed by the Registrar only in the course of these proceedings.

The Complainant sent cease-and-desist notices to the Respondent on April 8, 2026, and April 20, 2026, to which it received no reply.

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.

The Complainant contends that it markets its products under the trademark CRESTRON, which it has used since 1972, and under the CRESTRON swirl logo since 1994. The Complainant further contends that its global subsidiaries have numerous office locations, including Singapore, Hong Kong, China, Canada, Europe, Australia, New Zealand, and India. The Complainant asserts that its technology is installed in boardrooms of the world's largest companies, the lecture halls of prestigious universities, and in luxurious homes, as well as government facilities, major-league sports stadiums, and other high-profile institutions.

The Complainant further submits that the disputed domain name is identical to its CRESTRON trademark, as it wholly incorporates the mark. The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant, the Respondent is not affiliated with or authorized by the Complainant to use the CRESTRON mark, is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and does not own any trademark rights in the term "Crestron".

The Complainant further contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant submits that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant's well-known CRESTRON mark and intentionally seeks to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark. Further, the Complainant also sent cease-and-desist notices to the Respondent on April 8, 2026, and also on April 20, 2026, to put the Respondent on notice of the Complainant's rights. However, the Respondent chose not to respond to either of the notices.

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 identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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 confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1. The Panel notes, however, that the meaning conveyed by the ".ai" TLD may bear on the assessment of the second and third elements.

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.

The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has not been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted to use the Complainant's CRESTRON trademark. There is no evidence in the record that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name or has acquired any trademark rights in the term "Crestron". The Respondent has not used the disputed domain name in connection with any bona fide offering of goods or services. The Panel notes that the Complainant's mark CRESTRON is a coined and invented mark, and hence there is no plausible justification for the Respondent to register or use the disputed domain name wholly incorporating the mark CRESTRON. The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's trademark and carries a high risk of implied affiliation, effectively suggesting sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant; such composition cannot constitute fair use. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's CRESTRON trademark, which has been used by the Complainant for over five decades and is protected by trademark registrations in multiple jurisdictions predating the registration of the disputed domain name. The Panel further notes that the Complainant owns and operates its website via the domain name <crestron.com>, which is almost identical to the disputed domain name. Having regard to the reputation of the Complainant's trademark and the composition of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds it unlikely that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark rights. Further, the Complainant sent two cease-and-desist notices and gave an opportunity to the Respondent to provide evidence of any actual good faith use. However, the Respondent chose not to respond to either of the notices, which is probative of bad faith on the Respondent's part.

The Panel also notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in the ".ai" country code Top-Level Domain ("ccTLD"). Although ".ai" is the ccTLD assigned to Anguilla, United Kingdom, it is widely adopted by, and commonly understood to signify, technology and artificial intelligence offerings. In the circumstances of this case, where the Complainant operates in the field of technology and artificial intelligence-enabled products and services, and where the Respondent has offered no explanation for its selection, the choice of the ".ai" ccTLD further supports an inference that the Respondent sought to target the Complainant and its business.

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.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that the registration of the disputed domain name and use of it in connection with a website with PPC links constitute bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. In reaching this conclusion, the Panel has had regard to the following: (i) the Complainant's CRESTRON trademark has been used extensively for several decades and enjoys a strong reputation in the field of audiovisual, automation, and unified communications technology; (ii) the disputed domain name resolves to a website with PPC links; and (iii) the Respondent has concealed its identity behind a privacy service and has failed to respond either to the Complainant's cease-and-desist notices or to the Complaint in these proceedings ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.6).

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

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 <crestron.ai> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Shwetasree Majumder/

Shwetasree Majumder

Sole Panelist

Date: August 5, 2026