

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Rolls-Royce Plc v. Jaime Garcia
Case No. D2024-1138

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Rolls-Royce Plc, United Kingdom (“UK”), represented by Cleveland Scott York LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Jaime Garcia, United States of America (“US”).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <rolls-royce.org> is registered with Porkbun LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 15, 2024. On March 15, 2024, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 15, 2024, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 19, 2024, 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 March 22, 2024.

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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 27, 2024. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 16, 2024. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 23, 2024.

The Center appointed Tobias Zuberbühler as the sole panelist in this matter on May 7, 2024. 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 the United Kingdom in 1906 and is a well-known company in the fields of engineering, aerospace, defence, marine and energy.

The word mark ROLLS-ROYCE has been registered as a trade mark in the UK since April 22, 1908 (Registration No. UK00000302443). Furthermore, the Complainant is the proprietor of many other trade marks in the UK and the US, including the UK Registration No. UK00003030703 ROLLS-ROYCE (registered on February 28, 2014) and the US Designation of International Registration No. 1215839 ROLLS-ROYCE (registered on January 17, 2014).

The disputed domain name has been registered on February 8, 2024, and, at the time of filing of the Complaint, resolved to a parking page offering the disputed domain name for sale.

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.

B. Respondent

The Respondent has not submitted any reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

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 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 identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Moreover, the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".org", is viewed as a standard registration requirement in this case and is disregarded for purposes of the confusing similarity analysis under the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

The Panel finds that 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 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 that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. 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. The Panel also notes that the composition of the disputed domain name incorporating the Complainant’s mark in its entirety carries a high risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

Under the circumstances of this case, including the composition of the disputed domain name and reputation of the Complainant’s trademark, it can be inferred that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant’s trademark when registering the disputed domain name.

The evidence and allegations submitted by the Complainant support a finding that the Respondent was engaged in an attempt to pass itself off as the Complainant by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website and to attract Internet users to its website for its own commercial gain. The Respondent therefore used the disputed domain name in bad faith (see *Claudie Pierlot v. Yinglong Ma*, WIPO Case No. [D2018-2466](#)).

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 <rolls-royce.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Tobias Zuberbühler/

Tobias Zuberbühler

Sole Panelist

Date: May 21, 2024