

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Reve AI, Inc. v. Kevin Dv
Case No. DCC2026-0001

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Reve AI, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Waterman Legal, United States.

The Respondent is Kevin Dv, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <reveimage.cc> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 8, 2026. On January 9, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On January 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 January 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 12, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Mathias Lilleengen as the sole panelist in this matter on February 20, 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 to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant offers computer software and AI tools, available to consumers from February 5, 2025, when the products were launched to consumers. It has been recognized as “the new best AI image generation model”. The Complainant was already known in the software industry before the products were launched. The Complainant documents several pending trademark applications, such as WIPO international registration, European Union, United States of America. The Complainant owns the United States trademark registration No. 7994787 for REVE registered on October 21, 2025, in class 42 for software as a service (SAAS) services featuring software for generating images from text, and with a date of first use in commerce on.

The Complainant’s official website can be found at “www.reve.com” and “www.reve.art” where it offers its software and AI tools and services.

The Respondent registered the Domain Name on March 25, 2025. The Complainant documents that the Domain Name has resolved to a website that uses the Complainant’s REVE mark to advertise AI software for images.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant argues common law trademark rights and documents use of the mark and pending trademark applications. The Complainant points to that the Domain Name combines the Complainant’s trademark with the term “image” which directly relates to the Complainant’s software and tools that are used to generate and edit images. The added term increases the similarity between the Complainant’s trademark and the Respondent’s Domain Name.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name. The Respondent’s does not use the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services. The Respondent aims to exploit the goodwill of the REVE trademark in order to drive consumers to its website under the guise that the software advertised on the offending website is associated or approved by the Complainant. Such illegal activity can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. The Respondent is not commonly known by the Domain Name.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent’s website. As a further indication of bad faith, the Respondent registered the Domain Names a month and a half after the Complainant’s first use of its trademark.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant’s trademark and the Domain Name. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), section 1.7.

The Complainant has sufficiently documented acquired distinctiveness and trademark rights in the REVE mark by virtue of its trademark registration and use. The fact that the Respondent has targeted the Complainant's mark, see below, supports the Complainant's assertion and evidence that its mark has achieved significance as a source identifier for the purposes of the Policy.

The Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's mark with the addition of the term "image". The addition does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7. and 1.8.

For the purpose of assessing the confusing similarity under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Panel may ignore the country-code Top-Level Domain ("ccTLD"). See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

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 the respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name. While the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the often impossible task of "proving a negative", requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, here 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. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interest in the Domain Name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. The Respondent is not affiliated or related to the Complainant. There is no evidence that the Respondent has registered the Domain Name as a trademark or acquired trademark rights. There is no evidence of the Respondent's use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Domain Name or names corresponding to the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. On the contrary, the Respondent has used the Domain Name for a website that purports to be associated to the Complainant.

Based on the available record, 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.

The composition of the Domain Name, the timing of the registration, and the use of the Complainant's trademark on the Respondent's website, prove that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its prior rights when the Respondent registered the Domain Name. The use of the Domain Names is clear evidence of bad faith use. The Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website.

For the reasons set out above, the Panel concludes that the Domain Names were registered and are being used in bad faith, within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy. 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 the Domain Name <reveimage.cc> transferred to the Complainant.

/Mathias Lilleengen/

Mathias Lilleengen

Sole Panelist

Date: February 24, 2026