

ADMINISTRATIVE Panel DECISION

Rox Motor Tech Co., Ltd., and Rox Motor (Qingdao) Tech Co., Ltd. v. Denis Roibu

Case No. DMD2026-0002

1. The Parties

Complainants are Rox Motor Tech Co., Ltd., China; and Rox Motor (Qingdao) Tech Co., Ltd., China (hereinafter the “Complainant”), represented by Chofn Intellectual Property, China.

Respondent is Denis Roibu, Republic of Moldova (hereinafter “Moldova”), self-represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <rox.md> (hereinafter “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with Information Technology and Cyber Security Service (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 10, 2026. On June 10, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On June 11, 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 (Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on June 12, 2026, 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 in English on June 15, 2026.

On June 12, 2026, the Center informed the Parties in Romanian and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the Disputed Domain Name is Romanian. On June 15, 2026, Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding. In the Response, Respondent indicated that it did not object to English as the language of the proceeding.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended 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 Respondent in English and Romanian of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 18, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 8, 2026. The Response was filed in English with the Center on July 7, 2026.

The Center appointed Lawrence K. Nodine as the sole panelist in this matter on July 16, 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.

On July 9, 2026, Complainant submitted a Supplemental Filing. On July 27, 2026, the Panel issued a Procedural Order advising Respondent that it would consider Complainant's Supplement and invited Respondent to file a response, which it did on July 31, 2026.

4. Factual Background

Complainant is a Chinese manufacturer of hybrid electric cars founded in 2023. It markets its vehicles in the Middle East, Africa and Central Asia using the trademark ROX (hereinafter the "Mark"), for which it owns trademark registrations in several jurisdictions, including:

- China Trademark Registration No. 51752349 (registered August 7, 2022);
- International Registration No. 1772993 (registered December 8, 2023), designating, inter alia, Moldova; and
- European Union ("EU") Registration No. 018651234 (registered August 2, 2022).

Complainant promotes its vehicles via the website associated with its domain name <roxmotor.com>.

Respondent is CEO of Blackfield corp SRL., which is based in Chisinau, Moldova, and primarily serves the Moldovan market in the field of renewable energy, engineering, construction, infrastructure development and real estate.

On March 24, 2025, Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name. The website is currently inactive, but until it was taken down following a complaint letter in April 2026, the website displayed images of Complainant's flagship vehicle - the "ROX 01", a "Luxury All-Terrain SUV".

On March 25, 2025, one day after the Disputed Domain Name was registered, Respondent sent an email to Complainant (at <roxmotor.com>), stating, "I am reaching out to explore potential opportunities for collaboration between Rox Motor and Blackfield corp in Moldova and Romania. Given the growing demand for high-quality automotive solutions in these markets, I believe there is significant potential for synergy in distribution, service partnerships or joint initiatives".

On March 26, 2025, Complainant's representative responded that it could not sell vehicles in Romania without EU certification, but "El Salvador could consider cooperation". Respondent responded the same day, proposing discussion of opportunities in Moldova. Complainant's representative responded that "Since we need a long review period to become a distributor, could you consider starting with trade procurement and purchasing a small amount of our ROX01 to Moldova first, like te[s]t the market? At the same time, in this process, to explore the final cooperation between the two sides".

In subsequent communications, Complainant sent Respondent form applications to evaluate his suitability as a dealer and Respondent responded with information about his company's renewable energy and real estate business and generally promoting his business as a strong candidate for a dealership in Moldova. Complainant also sent Respondent information about ROX vehicles (style options and price) that Respondent said he was interested in buying, although no vehicle was ever purchased by Respondent.

In January 2026, Respondent was contacted by representatives of EREV Motors SRL, which was claiming to be, and later stated it had become Complainant's authorized distributor in Moldova. The representatives expressed interest in acquiring the Disputed Domain Name, but Respondent made no demand and no agreement was reached. On April 16, 2026, representatives of EREV Motors SRL sent Respondent an official notice demanding that Respondent cease using of the Disputed Domain Name.

An Internet Archive capture dated May 14, 2026 shows that the Disputed Domain Name continued to resolve to a page bearing the browser title in Russian "ROX Moldova: Premium Automobile Distributor" and displaying a black button labeled simply "ROX", superimposed over the words "NU LUCREAZA / HE РАБОТАЕТ" ("does not work" in Romanian and Russian respectively).

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Disputed Domain Name. Notably, Complainant contends that:

- Because Respondent falsely claimed to be a "Premium Automobile Distributor" for Complainant's Rox vehicles, Respondent's use of the Disputed Domain Name was not bona fide under paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy.
- The communications between Respondent and Complainant's representatives were not "extensive commercial negotiations".
- Respondent may not rely on the inherent value of short domain names to justify its registration of the Disputed Domain Name because he targeted Complainant's Mark in bad faith.

B. Respondent

Respondent contends that Complainant has not satisfied all three of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Disputed Domain Name.

Notably, Respondent contends that:

- Complainant actively engaged with Respondent over an extended period in pursuit of a potential commercial partnership.
- Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name because of its inherent value as a short three-letter domain name.
- Before receiving any notice of this dispute, Respondent had undertaken extensive and well-documented preparations to use the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services, including negotiations with ROX Motor concerning dealership opportunities, vehicle importation, commercial cooperation, business planning and market development, satisfying paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy.

- Throughout all communications with Complainant's representatives and related parties, Respondent acted transparently under its own name and on behalf of its companies.
- Complainant fails to address the existence of the domain name <roxmotor.md>, registered by a third party on November 19, 2024, several months before the registration of the Disputed Domain Name.
- Respondent did not conceal its identity, did not use anonymous communications and did not seek to exploit the Disputed Domain Name for financial gain. Instead, Respondent openly proposed a long-term commercial relationship based on dealership development, market entry, charging infrastructure, renewable energy integration and after-sales services.
- Respondent did not register the Disputed Domain Name with the intention of impersonating Complainant or misleading consumers.
- EREV Motors SRL, not Respondent, initiated discussions concerning acquisition of the Disputed Domain Name in January 2026, and Respondent never offered the Disputed Domain Name for sale or solicited payment.
- Regarding the statement "ROX Moldova: Premium Automobile Distributor" on its website, Respondent asserts:
 - The website "reflected only a temporary development version of a proposed project intended to evaluate market interest while commercial negotiations with ROX Motor were ongoing".
 - No vehicles were ever sold via the website.
 - No payments were processed.
 - "No dealership was represented as having been formally granted".
 - "Following the interruption of negotiations, the website became inactive".

6. Discussion and Findings

Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the Disputed Domain Name is Romanian. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceedings shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English. Respondent has agreed.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 4.5.1).

Having considered all the matters above, and the Parties' agreement, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

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 Complainant's Mark and the Disputed Domain Name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Mark is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is identical to the Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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 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 that 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 3.1](#), 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.

In response, Respondent contends that it registered the Disputed Domain Name because of its inherent value as a short three-letter domain name. It is widely recognized that a three-character domain name may legitimately be purchased for its inherent value, and that in such cases the registration will usually be for bona fide purposes. See, e.g., *Grupo Nacional Provincial, S.A. v. Privacydotlink Customer 4270030 / Yancy Naughton*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-1136](#) and *Lubricants Americas v. Andrea Sabatini, Webservice Limited*, WIPO Case No. [D2015-1566](#). "Nevertheless, the right to register such domains is not unlimited and will not be bona fide in circumstances where the registrant has deliberately targeted the complainant's trademark. Such targeting may, in appropriate cases, be demonstrated by direct evidence or alternatively inferred from the distinctiveness and fame of the relevant trademark." *Sixsigma Networks Mexico, S.A. DE C.V. v. DYNAMO.COM AUTORENEWAL AND DNS*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-4534](#).

The record here includes direct evidence of targeting. Respondent contacted Complainant immediately—within one day—after registering the Disputed Domain Name. In one of the email exchanges with Complainant, Respondent explained: "Having closely followed ROX's growth and innovation in the EV and SUV segments, we believe your product line is highly aligned with the emerging consumer trends and sustainable mobility goals in our region." Although there may very well be inherent value in the Disputed Domain Name, the Panel finds that it more likely than not that Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name because of its value as Complainant's Mark.

Respondent also contends that its communications with Complainant to secure dealership rights in Moldova are evidence that, before notice of any dispute, Respondent made demonstrable preparations to use the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, satisfying paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy.

For three reasons, the Panel is not persuaded.

First, Respondent's communications were not preparations for a "bona fide" use. The purported use first involved a website promoting Complainant's ROX-branded vehicles and using Complainant's ROX trademarks and later displaying a header "ROX Moldova: Premium Automobile Distributor" and a message "does not work", but this use was not bona fide because Respondent was not the trademark owner and had not been granted any authorization to use the ROX Mark. Respondent had no right to use Complainant's trademarks merely because it intended to apply for the dealership. An applicant for dealership contract, or any other trademark license, does not have the right to exploit the trademark owner's rights before an agreement is reached.

Second, Respondent falsely claimed to be a ROX distributor. The content of the website associated with the Disputed Domain Name included the statement in Russian: "ROX Moldova: Premium Automobile Distributor." This statement was false because Respondent never secured rights from Complainant to distribute ROX vehicles in Moldova. Moreover, the webpage displayed photos of ROX branded vehicles. This false claim of affiliation was not a bona fide use of the Disputed Domain Name.

The Panel invited Respondent to file a Supplemental response to specifically address Complainant's arguments based on the Reply Annex 1 submitted by Complainant, which included the above-mentioned false statement. In its response, Respondent did not deny the authenticity of Complainant's evidence — an Internet Archive snapshot of the website associated with the Disputed Domain Name. Instead, Respondent argued that:

- The website "reflected only a temporary development version of a proposed project intended to evaluate market interest while commercial negotiations with ROX Motor were ongoing".
- No vehicles were ever sold via the website.
- No payments were processed.
- "No dealership was represented as having been formally granted".
- "Following the interruption of negotiations, the website became inactive".

These responses are not persuasive. Respondent does not explain what "temporary" means, and it is not a defense that the offending page was later taken down in response to a cease-and-desist letter. Nor does it matter that no payments were processed or vehicles were sold. The statement was false and constitutes impersonation. Likewise, it is irrelevant that Respondent did not expressly state on the website that a dealership had been "formally granted". Respondent nonetheless represented itself as a "Premium Automobile Distributor", a statement that conveyed an official commercial relationship with Complainant despite the absence of any dealership/distribution agreement, or authorization to use Complainant's trademarks.

Third, although Respondent contends it was open and transparent during its communications with Complainant in pursuit of a dealership, there is no evidence on record showing that during these communications Respondent disclosed to Complainant's representatives that it had registered the Disputed Domain Name. The Panel finds that this failure undermines Respondent's claim of candor and transparency.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel finds that Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith. Respondent was plainly aware of Complainant and its Mark when it registered the Disputed Domain Name, as evidenced by the fact that it contacted Complainant one day after the Disputed Domain Name was registered.

Respondent has used the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith by first resolving it to a website displaying images of Complainant's ROX 01 vehicle, described as a "Luxury All-Terrain SUV". After receipt of the official notification, Respondent removed the website content of the website but continued to display a header falsely claiming to be a "Premium Automobile Distributor" of Complainant's ROX branded vehicles. Furthermore, Respondent has not transferred the Disputed Domain Name to Complainant or its chosen dealer. This is bad faith use. *Volkswagen Group of America, Inc. v. Richard Webb*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-1070](#) (the respondent, who had participated in the process for the award of a new Audi dealership, registered several domain names incorporating the AUDI mark before Audi awarded the dealership to another party. The panel found that the respondent's continued holding of the domain names "essentially disrupts the business of a competitor" and "may prevent the owner of the AUDI Mark (or their authorized agent) from registering such Domain Names", and therefore "the [p]anel finds that [the] [r]espondent's conduct amounts to bad faith registration and use").

The Panel finds that 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 <rox.md> be transferred to Complainant Rox Motor Tech Co., Ltd.

/Lawrence K. Nodine/

Lawrence K. Nodine

Sole Panelist

Date: August 6, 2026