

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

**Roblox Corporation v. Host Master, 1337 Services LLC**  
**Case No. DIO2025-0009**

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Roblox Corporation, United States of America ("US"), represented Taylor Wessing LLP, United Kingdom ("UK").

The Respondent is Host Master, 1337 Services LLC, Saint Kitts and Nevis.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <rbloxwild.io> is registered with Sarek Oy (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on March 28, 2025. On March 31, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 17, 2025, 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 April 22, 2025, 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 April 24, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the .IO Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Policy"), the Rules for .IO Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Rules"), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for .IO 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 April 25, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 15, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 19, 2025.

The Center appointed Mehmet Polat Kalafatoğlu as the sole panelist in this matter on May 23, 2025. 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, Roblox Corporation, is a publicly traded company incorporated in the US. The Complainant is the creator of the internationally popular ROBLOX platform, an online gaming and experience platform, also referred to by the abbreviation RBLX. As of the end of December 2024, the Complainant recorded USD 988.2 million in revenue, averaged over 85 million daily active users, and hosted 18.7 billion engagement hours. The Complainant has used the shorthand RBLX to promote its online platform and used the same term as its stock symbol on the New York Stock Exchange.

The Complainant asserts that it owns an extensive portfolio of registered trademarks for RBLX and ROBLOX in different jurisdictions, including the following:

- The European Union trademark registration No. 18381764 for RBLX, registered on July 2, 2021, in classes 9, 28, 36, 38, 41, 42, and 45;
- The UK trademark registration No. UK00003582501 for RBLX, registered on August 20, 2021, in classes 9, 28, 36, 38, 41, 42, and 45; and
- the International Trademark Registration No. 1337753 for ROBLOX, registered on July 19, 2016, designating several countries for goods and services in classes 9, 28, 41, and 42.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 28, 2024. At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name was not resolving to an active webpage. However, the Complainant has submitted evidence showing that the disputed domain name was previously resolved to a website offering various online games and displaying references to the RBLX trademark and the Complainant's product named "Robux". The website also displayed various payment methods or currency options for players to make deposits. At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name is inactive.

#### **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.

Firstly, the Complainant submits that as a result of its use and registrations of both RBLX and ROBLOX trademarks, the Complainant established very substantial international rights in the RBLX trademark. The said trademark is inherently distinctive, non-descriptive, and recognized worldwide. The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name is highly and confusingly similar to the RBLX trademark.

Secondly, the Complainant notes that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. In this regard, the Complainant, inter alia, submits that the disputed domain name was registered after the term "RBLX" came into use and after the applications for the RBLX and ROBLOX trademarks were filed. The Complainant also notes that its online platform is free-to-play. Players can buy, sell, and create virtual items. These virtual items can be bought by anyone, but only players with a premium membership can sell them. These in-game purchases on the Roblox platform are available through a virtual currency called "Robux". Accordingly, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent previously used the disputed domain name as a website that allows users to "win" and collect Robux. The Complainant adds that the said website was displaying a reference to earn "free Robux" and the Robux currency symbol was featured. The Complainant notes that the Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant and has not

received any authorization to use the RBLX or ROBLOX trademarks in any manner. The Complainant contends that the Respondent is operating an unauthorized marketplace using the disputed domain name. The Complainant argues that there is no bona fide offering of goods or services through the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name is not used for legitimate purposes. Notably, the Complainant submits a recent press article referring to an investigation into illegal casinos that allow children to gamble. This press article identifies “RBLXWild” as one of the three largest Robux casinos. The Complainant notes that, as a result of this investigation, the website hosted on the disputed domain name is not accessible in the UK and the description of the website states that it has ceased its operations.

Thirdly, the Complainant contends that the Respondent had actual knowledge of the Complainant’s rights when it registered the disputed domain name; the disputed domain name was registered or acquired primarily to target users of the ROBLOX platform to carry on prohibited Robux activity and to exploit the Complainant’s trademarks to conduct illegal activity. The Complainant also notes that the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name demonstrates its intention to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website. Therefore, the Respondent is deliberately taking advantage of the value and goodwill associated with the Complainant’s trademarks. Lastly, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name is disruptive to the Complainant’s business and image.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith.

The Panel notes that given the similarities between the Policy and the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “UDRP”), the Panel will refer to cases decided under the UDRP and the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), if relevant to this proceeding.

### **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, section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Complainant’s RBLX trademark 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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other term here, “wild”, 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 3.0](#), section 1.8.

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 the 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 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 3.0](#), 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 Complainant declared that the Respondent is not authorized to use its trademarks in any manner. No evidence in the available record suggests that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Panel particularly considers the following points. The Complainant sufficiently established that the disputed domain name, which is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademarks, was previously resolved to a website offering competing online games, displaying the RBLX trademark with the addition of the term “wild” at the bottom of the website, and enabling its players to collect the Complainant’s virtual currency product named “Robux”. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation as it suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant and the Respondent acted with the intention to take unfair advantage of the Complainant’s trademark for its commercial gain. Such use cannot give rights or legitimate interests in a domain name under the Policy. The current use of the disputed domain name described above does not alter the Panel’s conclusion.

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.

Accordingly, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

## **C. Registered or Used in Bad Faith**

Although under the Policy, it is sufficient for the complainant to prove either the bad faith registration or use of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and used in bad faith in the present case.

The Panel considers the Complainant’s prior and distinctive trademark rights, the reputation of the Complainant’s trademarks and online platform in the online gaming industry, the registration date, the composition, and the previous use of the disputed domain name described above. The Panel concludes that the Respondent must be aware of the Complainant’s trademarks and its business at the time of registering the disputed domain name. Consequently, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith with the intention of targeting the Complainant’s trademarks and taking unfair advantage of their reputation.

Considering the previous use of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds it clear that the Respondent, by using the disputed domain name, has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the ROBLUX and RBLX trademarks. The current use of the disputed domain name described above does not alter the Panel’s conclusion under the third element.

Based on the available record, 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, <rbloxwild.io> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Mehmet Polat Kalafatoglu/*

**Mehmet Polat Kalafatoglu**

Sole Panelist

Date: June 6, 2025