ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Google LLC v. he junz, hex
Case No. DIO2026-0022

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Google LLC, United States of America, represented Morgan, Lewis & Bockius, LLP, United States of America.

The Respondent is he junz, hex, China, self-represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <antigravityai.io> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 4, 2026. On June 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 5, 2026, 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 June 9, 2026 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 amended Complaint on June 11, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the 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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 12, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 2, 2026. On June 26, 2026, the Respondent sent an email requesting an automatic four-calendar-day extension for Response. On the same day, the Center confirmed that the new Response due was July 6, 2026. On July 3, 2026, the Respondent sent an email communication to the Center. On the same day, the Center sent an email to the Parties regarding possible settlement. The

Parties did not request suspension. Accordingly, the Center informed the Parties of the commencement of the panel appointment process on July 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Knud Wallberg as the sole panelist in this matter on July 21, 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 was established in 1998 and is the operator of one of the most widely used Internet search engines in the world, under the GOOGLE trademark.

On November 18, 2025, the Complainant announced a new AI-powered software under the name and mark ANTIGRAVITY which allows users to deploy agents that autonomously plan, execute and verify complex tasks. The Complainant has filed trademark applications for the mark ANTIGRAVITY for goods and services in classes 9 and 42 in several jurisdictions with the priority date from a Tonga trademark application that was filed on September 29, 2025 – for example, Canadian trademark application no. 2445317, filed on December 19, 2025.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 19, 2025. When the Complaint was filed, the disputed domain name resolved to an active website bearing the headline “Google Antigravity”.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the UDRP Rules for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s ANTIGRAVITY trademark, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not file a formal response, but the Respondent did submit an email to the Center, in which it stated that it was willing to transfer the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

6. Discussion and Findings

In accordance Paragraph 4 (a) of the UDRP Rules, the Complainant, in order to succeed, 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 in respect of the disputed domain name; and

(iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Respondent has confirmed in an email communication to the Center that he consents to transfer the disputed domain name to the Complainant, and the Panel finds that this forms a sufficient basis for an

immediate order to transfer the disputed domain name to the Complainant. See section 4.10 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1")[1]; *Leica Microsystems IR GmbH v. Tong Chuang*, WIPO Case No. D2016-2316; and *Wikimedia Foundation, Inc. v. Domains By Proxy, LLC / Adam Bruce, Mixspace Ltd*, WIPO Case No. D2018-1460.

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, <antigravityai.io> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Knud Wallberg/
Knud Wallberg
Sole Panelist
Date: July 29, 2026

[1] The Panel, noting the similarities between the Policy and the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "UDRP"), has referred to the WIPO Overview 3.1, where appropriate.