ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Rockwell Automation Inc v. Lunar Eyelash Pty Ltd
Case No. DAU2025-0058

1. The Parties

Complainant is Rockwell Automation Inc, United States of America ("USA"), represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

Respondent is Lunar Eyelash Pty Ltd, Australia.

2. The Domain Name(s) and Registrar(s)

The disputed domain name <allen-bradley.com.au> is registered with Web Address Registration Pty Ltd.

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on December 24, 2025. On December 24, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to Web Address Registration Pty Ltd a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 26, 2025, Web Address Registration Pty Ltd transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that the Complaint the formal requirements of the .au Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Policy" or ".auDRP"), the Rules for .au Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Rules"), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for .au Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Supplemental Rules").

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2(a) and 4(a), the Center formally notified Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on January 6, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5(a), the due date for Response was January 26, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on February 3, 2026. The Center received an email from an email address associated with the disputed domain name on February 4, 2026.

The Center appointed Yijun Tian as the sole panelist in this matter on February 12, 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

A. Complainant

Complainant, Rockwell Automation Inc., is a company incorporated in the USA. It is a global leader in industrial automation and digital transformation, with operations in over 100 countries, approximately 29,000 employees, and more than 400 offices and manufacturing facilities worldwide. Its ALLEN-BRADLEY brand, founded in 1903 and acquired by Complainant in 1985, is widely recognized and its products are distributed globally.

Complainant has rights in the ALLEN-BRADLEY and ALLEN-BRADLEY related marks. Complainant is the owner of numerous ALLEN-BRADLEY trademarks worldwide, including registrations in Australia (trade mark registration Nos. 163520, registered on November 9, 1960, and 179541, registered on April 2, 1963), the USA (trade mark registration No. 0712800, registered on March 21, 1961), Canada (trade mark registration No. TMA128375, registered on October 19, 1962), the United Kingdom ("UK") (trade mark registration No. UK00000945872, registered on July 21, 1969), and the European Union ("EU") (trade mark registration No. 012864443, registered on October 2, 2014).

Complainant uses the domain name <rockwellautomation.com> for its official website. The domain name <allen-bradley.com> redirects to this website, and Complainant also owns <allenbradley.au> and <allenbradley.com.au>.

B. Respondent

Respondent is Lunar Eyelash Pty Ltd, Australia.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 8, 2011. According to Complaint and the evidence provided by Complainant, the disputed domain name resolved to a website displaying information on Complainant's ALLEN-BRADLEY brand products and displaying sponsored linked unrelated to Complainant's offerings.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical to Complainant's ALLEN-BRADLEY trademark. The disputed domain name incorporates the ALLEN-BRADLEY trademark in its entirety. The applicable domain name extension (e.g., ".com.au") is disregarded for the purpose of comparison and does not provide any distinguishing element. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the ALLEN-BRADLEY trademark.

Complainant contends that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to it.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to 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 Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. Overview of Panel Views on Selected auDRP Questions, Second Edition ("auDRP Overview 2.0"), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds Complainant has shown rights in respect of the ALLEN-BRADLEY trademark for the purposes of the Policy. auDRP Overview 2.0, section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds Complainant's ALLEN-BRADLEY mark is wholly incorporated in the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. auDRP Overview 2.0, section 1.7.

As the applicable domain name extension (e.g., ".com.au") is generally disregarded in the comparison, the Panel finds that such element does not prevent a finding of identity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. auDRP Overview 2.0, section 1.11.

Based on the available record, 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 Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

In accordance with the auDRP Overview 2.0, a complainant is required to make out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. Once a prima facie case is made, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence or plausible assertions demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is generally deemed to have satisfied the second element. auDRP Overview 2.0, section 2.1.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent has not rebutted 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.

More specifically:

(i) there has been no evidence adduced to show that Respondent has used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Respondent has not provided evidence or reasons to justify the choice of the term "allen-bradley", Complainant's ALLEN-BRADLEY trademark, in the disputed domain name. There has been no evidence to show that Complainant has licensed or otherwise permitted Respondent to use the ALLEN-BRADLEY trademark or to apply for or use any domain name incorporating the ALLEN-BRADLEY marks;

(ii) there has been no evidence adduced to show that Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name. There has been no evidence adduced to show that Respondent has any registered trademark rights with respect to the disputed domain name. Respondent registered the disputed domain name on July 8, 2011, after the ALLEN-BRADLEY mark was registered in Australia (since 1960). The disputed domain name is identical to Complainant's ALLEN-BRADLEY marks, and carries a high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant (auDRP Overview 2.0, section 2.5); and

(iii) there has been no evidence adduced to show that Respondent was making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. By contrast, the disputed domain name resolves to a website displaying references to Complainant's ALLEN-BRADLEY products together with sponsored links and third-party services, including links to unrelated websites and advertising opportunities. Therefore, Respondent has attempted to derive commercial gain from Internet traffic attracted to the website under the disputed domain name incorporating Complainant's trademark.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered or 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 Respondent has registered and used the disputed 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. auDRP Overview 2.0, section 3.1.6.

Based on the record, the Panel finds that Complainant has a well-established reputation in the ALLEN-BRADLEY mark, which had been used for many decades prior to the registration of the disputed domain name. It is not conceivable that Respondent would not have had Complainant's trademark in mind at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name. This has been reinforced by the fact that the disputed domain name incorporates Complainant's ALLEN-BRADLEY trademark entirely and is essentially identical to Complainant's domain names <allen-bradley.com>, <allenbradley.au>, and <allenbradley.com.au>, and that the associated website displays information relating to Complainant's trademark and products (Annex 4 to the Complaint).

Respondent has used the website to display Complainant's ALLEN-BRADLEY products together with sponsored links and third-party commercial content, including links to competing or unrelated services (Annex 3 to the Complaint). Thus, the Panel concludes that Respondent is using an identical disputed domain name with the intention to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant. Such use constitutes bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 <allen-bradley.com.au> be transferred to Complainant.

/Yijun Tian/
Yijun Tian
Sole Panelist
Date: March 25, 2026