

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Qorvo US, Inc. v. berhan turkkaynagi, bero
Case No. DIO2025-0044

1. The Parties

Complainant is Qorvo US, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented Cobalt LLP, United States of America.

Respondent is berhan turkkaynagi, bero, United States.

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

The disputed domain name <qorv.io> (“Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with Porkbun LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 30, 2025. On October 30, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On October 30, 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 (REDACTED, Private by Design, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on October 31, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on November 5, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint amended 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on November 7, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 27, 2025. Respondent sent email communication to the Center on November 4, 2025.

The Center appointed Lawrence K. Nodine as the sole panelist in this matter on December 12, 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

Complainant, a manufacturer in the integrated circuit industry, uses the trademark QORVO (the “Mark”) in connection with Radio Frequency components used in advanced wireless devices, defense radar, and communications equipment. Complainant has offices in the United States and in at least fifteen other countries. Complainant asserts its “fiscal 2024 third quarter revenue was nearly \$1 billion.” Complainant promotes its products via its website at <qorvo.com> and its stock trades on the NASDAQ under the symbol “QRVO”.

Complainant has registered the Mark in many jurisdictions, including:

- United States Registration No. 4819165 (registered September 22, 2015)
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 013420757 (registered March 11, 2015)
- China Trademark Registration No. 15669696 (registered December 28, 2025)

The Disputed Domain Name was registered June 6, 2025. It currently resolves to a page that states that the owner has not “put up a site yet.” The MX records for the Domain Name have been configured to send and receive email.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied all elements of the Policy.

Notably, Complainant contends that the letter string “qorvo” is not a word in English. Complainant introduces as evidence the results of Google search for “qorvo.” The first five results pages only show references to Complainant.

Complainant further contends that the Disputed Domain Name reflects bad faith typosquatting; that the Mark is well known, and that Respondent is passively holding the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith, emphasizing that there is no plausible good faith use to which the domain name may be put.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not file a formal response to the Complaint, but he did send an email to the Center stating that:

“For context, I am a long-time data professional and a solo developer/founder building Qorvio, an AI supply chain planning product for medium sized businesses. I’ve acted in good faith throughout and take these matters seriously”.

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the .IO Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.¹

The Panel finds the Mark is recognizable within the Disputed Domain Name. Even though “qorv” is not identical to Complainant’s QORVO trademark, it is confusingly similar to it for the purposes of the .IO Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. The absence of the “o” at the end of the Disputed Domain Name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity with the Mark for standing purposes. Moreover, the missing “o” is supplied by the .IO TLD. The Panel “may consider the domain name in its entirety for purposes of assessing confusing similarity (e.g., for a hypothetical TLD “.mark” and a mark “TRADEMARK”, the domain name <trade.mark> would be confusingly similar for UDRP standing purposes).” See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.3. Respondent himself included the .IO TLD (and omitted the “.”) when he asserted in his November 7, 2025, email to the Center that he was “building Qorvio, an AI supply chain planning product ...” And the intervening “i” does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9. See *Qorvo US, Inc. v. Muhammad Adnan / Addiz Tech I.T Solutions*, Forum Claim No. FA2505002155812 (<qorvio.com> confusingly similar to QORVO).

The Panel finds the first element of the .IO Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the .IO Policy provides a list of circumstances in which 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 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 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.

The Panel finds the second element of the .IO Policy has been established.

C. Registered or Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the .IO Policy, unlike the UDRP, requires that Complainant prove bad faith registration or (not “and”) bad faith use.

¹Given the similarities between the .IO Policy and the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (“UDRP”), the Panel finds UDRP precedent to be relevant to this case. See *LinkedIn Corporation v. DNS Admin, Botflip LLC*, WIPO Case No. [DIO2022-0005](#).

The Panel finds that Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith. The Mark is exceptionally distinctive – “arbitrary” on the spectrum of distinctiveness. The letter string “qorvo” is not a word in English and it is not an acronym for any aspect of Complainant’s history or products. It does not “mean” anything apart from its function as Complainant’s trademark. Complainant’s Google search for “qorvo” only returned references to Complainant. Given this, the only plausible explanation for the near identity of the Mark and the Disputed Domain Name is the simplest one – Respondent was aware of and intending to mimic Complainant’s Mark when he registered the Disputed Domain Name. The Panel accordingly finds that it is more likely than not that Respondent had actual knowledge of Complainant and its rights when he registered the Disputed Domain Name. The Panel finds that it is more likely than not that when Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name, he intended to impersonate Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.1.

The Panel acknowledges, but does not rely on, the finding of prior panels that have found that Complainant is well known.² The Panel does not question those prior decisions, but they do not relieve Complainant of the obligation to offer evidence into this record. The Panel finds that evidence offered here to lack important particulars e.g., about marketing or sales volumes. Complainant relies almost entirely on its extensive portfolio of trademark registrations. Complainant also alleges that its “fiscal 2024 third quarter revenue was nearly \$1 billion” But fails to provide a link to the same.³ Neither does Complainant offer evidence of consumer recognition or awards, even though such evidence was also probably available. The Panel emphasizes that it is not finding that Complainant is not well known but rather a ruling that Complainant has not marshalled evidence to carry its claim on this point.

The Panel finds the third element of the .IO Policy has been established.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the .IO Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the Disputed Domain Name <qorv.io> be transferred to Complainant.

/Lawrence K. Nodine/
Lawrence K. Nodine
Sole Panelist
Date: December 30, 2025

²See *Qorvo US, Inc. v. James Willy*, Forum Claim No. FA2401002080680 (FORUM Feb. 16, 2024 (“Complainant’s [QORVO] trademark is well known. It is difficult to envisage any use of the disputed domain name that would not violate the Policy.”); *Qorvo US, Inc. v. Catherine Jim*, Forum Claim No. FA2502002141192 (Also holding that “Complainant’s trademark is well known” and that it was “difficult to envisage any use of the disputed domain name that would not violate the Policy”);

³Complainant’s “fiscal 2024 third quarter ended December 30, 2023.” <https://www.qorvo.com/newsroom/news/2024/qorvo-announces-fiscal-2024-third-quarter-financial-results>.