

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Lightricks Ltd. v. qiang ma
Case No. DIO2025-0052

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Lightricks Ltd., Israel, represented Gornitzky & Co., Israel.

The Respondent is qiang ma, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ltx-2.io> is registered with CloudFlare, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 23, 2025. On November 24, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 25, 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 for Privacy - Identity unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 25, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant replied on November 26, 2025, that it did not wish to amend the Complaint.

The Center verified that the Complaint 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 December 3, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 23, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on December 24, 2025.

The Center appointed Anne-Virginie La Spada as the sole panelist in this matter on January 5, 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 is a company based in Israel that develops and markets AI-based software products. Among these is “LTX”, an AI-powered photo and video generation model.

The Complainant is the owner of various LTX trademarks worldwide, including the following:

- International registration no. 1802319 registered on May 21, 2024, in classes 9 and 42 and designating various countries including the European Union, the United Kingdom and China;
- Israeli registration no. 371159, registered on May 2, 2024, in classes 9 and 42.

The Complainant recently launched a new model in the “LTX” series, known as “LTX-2”.

The Complainant operates a website at “www.lightricks.com” where the “LTX” and “LTX-2” products are promoted.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 31, 2025.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website displaying a description of the new “LTX-2” model of the Complainant and purportedly offering access to the Complainant’s model. The website also displays a copyright notice referring to the name of the Complainant.

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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its registered trademark LTX.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not authorised by the Complainant to use the disputed domain name and there is no indication that the Respondent is commonly known by it. According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name is not being used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services. Instead, the Respondent uses the disputed domain name in a way that intentionally mimics the Complainant’s branding.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has used and registered the disputed domain name in bad faith. According to the Complainant, the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name constitutes a wilful attempt to unlawfully benefit from the reputation and goodwill of the Complainant and its trademarks. These actions create a false impression of an affiliation, endorsement, or partnership with the Complainant, misleading consumers and business partners into believing such a relationship exists when, in fact, none does.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, a complainant must assert and prove each of the following:

- (i) the domain name registered by the respondent 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 in respect of the domain name; and
- (iii) the domain name registered by the respondent has been registered or is being used in bad faith.

Given the similarities between the Policy and the Uniform Domain Name Resolution Policy (“UDRP”), the Panel finds it appropriate to refer to WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”).

A. Identity of Respondent

The Complaint identifies “Redacted for Privacy - Identity unknown” as the “Respondent” and the Complainant did not amend the Complaint to reflect the registrant information disclosed by the Registrar, as proposed by the Center. Paragraph 1 of the Rules defines the “Respondent” as “the holder of a domain-name registration against which a complaint is initiated”. Since the Registrar has confirmed that qiang ma is the holder of the registration of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that qiang ma is the proper Respondent in this proceeding.

B. 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 3.0](#), 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 entirety of the mark 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 terms (here, “2” and a hyphen) 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.

C. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Based on the information submitted by the Complainant, the Respondent does not appear to have rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, nor has the Complainant granted to the Respondent an authorization to use the disputed domain name.

Moreover, there is no evidence indicating that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Finally, the Respondent did not file a response to the Complaint. The Panel may draw from the lack of a Response the inferences that it considers appropriate, according to the Rules, paragraph 14(b).

In view of the above, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and that the Respondent's silence corroborates such prima facie case.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and that the Complainant has satisfied the condition set out in paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

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

D. Registered or Used 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 or used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration or use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name well after the Complainant's trademark had been registered. Given the circumstances of the use of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds it implausible that the Respondent chose the disputed domain name without having the Complainant's mark in mind. The Panel therefore accepts that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

In addition, the Respondent used the disputed domain name in connection with a website featuring the Complainant's LTX trademark, displaying a copyright notice referring to the name of Complainant and a description of the new product "LTX-2" of the Complainant and purportedly offering access to the Complainant's products, thus creating the impression of an official website. Such use is apt to create the false impression that the Respondent's website is operated or endorsed by the Complainant. Consequently, by using the disputed domain name in such manner, the Panel finds that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source and affiliation of its website. Such behavior constitutes use in bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

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 <ltx-2.io> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Anne-Virginie La Spada/

Anne-Virginie La Spada

Sole Panelist

Date: January 19, 2026