Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108448

Case number	**CAC-UDRP-108448**
Time of filing	**2026-03-03 07:35:58**
Domain names	**roborockaustralia.com**

Case administrator

Organization	**Iveta Špiclová (Czech Arbitration Court) (Case admin)**

Complainant

Organization	**Beijing Roborock Technology Co., Ltd.**

Complainant representative

Organization	**Chofn Intellectual Property**

Respondent

Organization	**Emilia Weaver**

OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The Panel is not aware of any other legal proceedings which are pending or decided and which relate to the disputed domain name.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant is the owner of several trademarks ROBOROCK such as:

- International Trademark n. 1392428 – ROBOROCK – Nice Cl. 7 as of 27 November 2017;
- International Trademark n. 1488782 – ROBOROCK – Nice Cl. 9 as of 8 August 2019;
- International Trademark 1580853– ROBOROCK – Nice Cl. 37 as of 21 December 2020;
- EUTM n. 017298035 – ROBOROCK – Nice Cl. 7, 9 & 35 as of 24 January 2018;
- EUTM n. 018638288 – ROBOROCK – Nice Cl. 3 as of 18 May 2022.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

FACTS ASSERTED BY THE COMPLAINANT AND NOT CONTESTED BY THE RESPONDENT:

THE COMPLAINANT

Established in 2014, the Complainant is an innovator in home robotics and appliances. The Complainant is committed to innovation in researching, developing, and producing home cleaning devices, particularly robotic, cordless, and wet/ dry vacuum cleaners.

As a global pioneer, the Complainant was among the first to successfully implement LiDAR technology, precision optical vision navigation, and advanced obstacle avoidance algorithms within the intelligent robotic vacuum industry on a commercial scale. To sustain its technological edge, the Complainant operates multiple world-class R&D centers, such as its Product R&D Department, Mechatronics Research Institute, and MIA Laboratory. This robust technical foundation has enabled the Complainant to establish a formidable global footprint, with regional offices in the United States, Japan, the Netherlands, Poland, Germany, and South Korea. To date, ROBOROCK products are distributed across more than 170 countries and regions, serving over 15 million households worldwide. Furthermore, the Complainant maintains a dominant retail presence through official brand stores on major global e-commerce platforms, including Amazon, Home Depot, Target, Best Buy, and Walmart, thereby establishing significant international brand recognition and goodwill.

Since its listing in 2020, the Complainant has maintained a trajectory of robust financial growth. In 2020, the Complainant reported an operating income of RMB 4.53 billion, representing a 7.74% year-on-year increase. Notably, its overseas revenue reached RMB 1.87 billion, a staggering 221.33% increase from the previous year. The upward trend continued in 2021, with total operating income reaching RMB 5.84 billion (up 28.84% YoY). During that year, the Complainant sold approximately 2.82 million units of robotic vacuum cleaners, with international markets contributing RMB 3.36 billion (57.63% of total revenue). In 2022 and 2023, the Complainant's operating income further climbed to RMB 6.63 billion and RMB 8.65 billion respectively, reflecting consistent double-digit growth.

In parallel with its financial success, the Complainant's technological excellence and brand influence have been recognized through numerous prestigious industry awards conferred between 2020 and 2023.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademarks ROBOROCK such as:

- International Trademark n. 1392428 – ROBOROCK – Nice Cl. 7 as of 27 November 2017;
- International Trademark n. 1488782 – ROBOROCK – Nice Cl. 9 as of 8 August 2019;
- International Trademark 1580853– ROBOROCK – Nice Cl. 37 as of 21 December 2020;
- EUTM n. 017298035 – ROBOROCK – Nice Cl. 7, 9 & 35 as of 24 January 2018;
- EUTM n. 018638288 – ROBOROCK – Nice Cl. 3 as of 18 May 20.

The disputed domain name <roborockaustralia.com> (hereinafter, the „Disputed Domain Name") was registered on 25 August 2025 and in accordance with the Complainant, resolve to an unauthorized online store mirroring the Complainant's core business.

According to Complainant's non-contested allegations, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in respect of the Disputed Domain Name and the Complainant is not related in any way to the Complainant's business (neither as authorized distributor nor as a business partner).

For the purpose of this case, the Registrar confirmed that the Respondent is the current registrant of the Disputed Domain Name and that the language of the registration agreement is English.

The facts asserted by the Complainant are not contested by the Respondent.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT:

First element: Similarity

The Complainant disputes the following points:

- The Disputed Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's ROBOROCK trademark in its entirety. The addition of the term "Australia"—a purely geographical and generic descriptor—does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

- The threshold test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned, side-by-side comparison between the textual components of the relevant trademark and the Disputed Domain Name. In this instance, the ROBOROCK trademark is not only recognizable but remains the dominant and distinct feature within the Disputed Domain Name. Consequently, as the Disputed Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's mark in its entirety, the Complainant submits that it is confusingly similar to the Complainant's prior rights.

Second element: Rights or legitimate interest

The Complainant argues the following:

- The Complainant's searches across multiple national and regional trademark databases have yielded no evidence that the Respondent holds any trademark rights in the term ROBOROCK.
- Furthermore, the Respondent is neither an authorized distributor nor a business partner of the Complainant. At no time has the Complainant, directly or indirectly, authorized or licensed the Respondent to use the ROBOROCK trademark, or to register any corresponding Disputed Domain N
- Notably, the Respondent's listed name, "Emilia Weaver", bears no connection to the term ROBOROCK, and there is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent is commonly known by the Disputed Domain N

- The Respondent's website—an unauthorized online store mirroring the Complainant's core business—fails to disclose the absence of an official relationship with the Complainant. By adopting a layout and functionality nearly identical to the Complainant's official channels, the Respondent utilizes the ROBOROCK trademark to deliberately create a false impression of being an authorized Australian affiliate.
- Such deceptive "impersonation" for commercial gain precludes a finding of a bona fide offering of goods or services under paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy. The Respondent is not merely reselling goods; it is leveraging the Complainant's global goodwill to divert consumers to its own commercial platform.
- The Respondent's use of the Disputed Domain Name to host a commercial web store that competes directly with the Complainant's authorized distribution channels demonstrates that the use is neither "fair" nor "non-commercial."
- Given that the ROBOROCK brand had attained significant global recognition long before the registration of the disputed domain name, the Respondent's "copycat" usage is a clear attempt to capitalize on the Complainant's established reputation.
- Accordingly, as the Respondent fails the Oki Data test and lacks any independent rights or authorization, the Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name under paragraph 4(c) of the Policy.

Third element: Bad faith

The Complaint argues the following elements:

- As established above, the Complainant is the global leader in the robotic vacuum industry, and the ROBOROCK trademark has attained high recognition and distinctiveness through extensive use and promotion.
- Given that the Respondent has, from the outset, used the Disputed Domain Name to offer products bearing the Complainant's brand, there is no doubt that the Respondent had actual knowledge of the Complainant's trademarks and business at the time of registration. The choice of a Disputed Domain Name that incorporates the Complainant's mark in its entirety further confirms that the Respondent targeted the Complainant's rights in bad faith.
- The Complainant submits that the presentation of the Respondent's website is designed to mislead Internet users into believing the site is operated, endorsed by, or affiliated with the Complainant. Specifically, the ROBOROCK logo is featured prominently in key locations on the website connected tot he Disputed Domain Name without any disclaimer of association or disclosure of the site's true ownership. This creates a deceptive impression of an "official" status.
- The Complainant maintains that the Respondent is intentionally using the Disputed Domain Name to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source or affiliation of the website. Pursuant to Policy paragraph 4(b)(iv), such conduct constitutes conclusive evidence of both bad faith registration and bad faith use under paragraph 4(a)(iii).
- In light of the Respondent's clear targeting of the Complainant's well-known mark and the deceptive nature of the associated website, the Complainant submits that the Respondent has registered and used the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith.

RESPONDENT

Respondent did not reply to the Complaint.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy).

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the Respondent to have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy).

BAD FAITH

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy).

PROCEDURAL FACTORS

Language of Proceeding

The Complainant has requested that the language of proceedings shall be in English. The Registrar confirmed on 3 March 2026 that the language of the registration agreement is English. Therefore, the Panel agrees that the current process should be conducted in

English.

The Panel is satisfied that all procedural requirements under UDRP were met and there is no other reason why it would be inappropriate to provide a decision.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

According to Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove each of the following three elements to obtain an order that a Disputed Domain Name should be transferred or cancelled:

(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 are being used in bad faith.

The Panel has reviewed in detail the evidence available to it and has come to the following conclusions concerning the satisfaction of the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy in the proceeding:

(A) THE COMPLAINANT'S RIGHTS AND CONFUSING SIMILARITY OF THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME TO THE COMPLAINANT'S RIGHTS.

Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy establishes the obligation of Complainant to demonstrate that the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights.

The Complainant submitted copies of different trademarks registrations pertaining the term ROBOROCK for different products, including robots (machines) and electric machines and apparatus for cleaning; central vacuum cleaning installations; cleaning appliances utilizing steam; vacuum cleaners, repair or maintenance of fans; installation and repair of electric appliances, etc.

The Complainant's trademarks were registered prior to 2025, the year of the creation date of the Disputed Domain Name.

In the current case, the Disputed Domain Name <roborockaustralia.com> is composed of the trademark ROBOROCK plus the country´s name "Australia".

In assessing confusing similarity, the Panel finds the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark, as it incorporates the entirety of the ROBOROCK trademark plus the country´s name "Australia". In this regard, UDRP panels agree that where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the Disputed Domain Name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. See paragraph 1.8. of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions ("WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.1.).

UDRP panels agree that the TLD may usually be ignored for the purpose of determination of identity or confusing similarity between a domain name and the Complainant's trademark as it is technical requirement of registration. See paragraph 1.11.1 of WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.1. Therefore, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has satisfied the requirement under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy and the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to Complainant's ROBOROCK mark.

(B) RESPONDENT'S LACK OF RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS IN THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME.

The second element of the Policy requires that the Complainant establishes that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. The generally adopted approach, when considering the second element, is that if a complainant makes out a prima facie case, the burden of proof shifts to the respondent to rebut it with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name; see, for example, CAC Case No. 102333, Amedei S.r.l. v sun xin. If the Respondent fails to do so, the Complainant is deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy (see e.g. WIPO case no. D2003-0455, Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd.).

In this vein, Paragraph 4 (c) provides with circumstances which could prove rights or legitimate interest in the Disputed Domain Name on behalf of the Respondent such as:

(i) before any notice to Respondent of the dispute, Respondent is using or provides with demonstrable preparations to use, the Disputed Domain Name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or

(ii) The Respondent (as an individual, business, or other organization) has been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name, even if the Respondent has acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or

(iii) The Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

The Respondent did not reply to the Complaint despite the efforts made by this Center to notify the Complaint. In this regard, the Complainant has confirmed in the Complaint that the Disputed Domain Name is not connected with or authorized by the Complainant in any way.

From the information provided by the Complainant, there is no evidence or reason to believe that the Respondent (as individual, business or other organization) has been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name.

The Respondent's name "Emilia Weaver" provided in the Registrar's verification dated 03 March 2026 is all what it links the Disputed Domain Name with the Respondent. Absent of any other evidence such as a personal name, nickname or corporate identifier, the Panel is of the opinion that the Respondent is not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name.

In terms of the evidence provided by the Complainant, the Disputed Domain Name is currently used to host an online store mirroring the Complainant's core business.

In terms of the evidence provided by the Complainant, the website linked to the Disputed Domain Name has been used to host an online store mirroring the Complainant's core business in English language and targeting the Australian market. For this purpose, the Complainant presented a screenshot of the website connected to the Disputed Domain Name where the use of the Complainant ´s trademark and copyrighted images can be seen.

In this regard, the Complainant argues that by offering its products via the website, the Respondent attempts to mislead consumers into thinking that the goods purportedly offered for sale on the website originate from Complainant. The Complainant has confirmed that no license or authorization has been granted to the Respondent to make use of the Complainant's trademark.

Past panels have recognized that resellers, distributors, or service providers using a domain name containing the complainant's trademark to undertake sales or repairs related to the complainant's goods or services may be making a bona fide offering of goods and services and thus have a legitimate interest in such domain name provided the following cumulative requirements ("Oki Data test") are taken into account:

(i) the Respondent must actually be offering the goods or services at issue;

(ii) the Respondent must use the site to sell only the trademarked goods or services;

(iii) the site must accurately and prominently disclose the registrant's relationship with the trademark holder; and

(iv) the respondent must not try to "corner the market" in domain names that reflect the trademark.

See paragraph 2.8 of WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.1.

From the evidence presented by the Complainant and not contested by the Respondent, it is clear that the Respondent is offering the Complainant's products without disclosing the Respondent's relationship via a disclaimer of explanation with the Complainant and the Respondent is also using the Complainant's trademark prominently at the website without proper authorization. This use does not meet the criteria laid down in the Oki Data Test and, therefore, the Respondent cannot be considered as acting with goodwill since the current use makes the Panel to believe that the Disputed Domain Name was registered with intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue. Therefore, the Panel neither finds a bona fide offering of goods and service nor legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name.

In light of the reasons above mentioned, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has satisfied the second element of the Policy.

(C) BAD FAITH REGISTRATION AND USE OF THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME.

Paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy indicates that the Complainant must assert that the Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith.

In this sense, Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out four circumstances which if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith circumstances indicating that the respondent has registered or acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the Respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or

The Respondent has registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that Respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

The Respondent has registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

by using the domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website or location or of a product.

For the current case, the evidence provided by the Complainant and not rebutted by the Respondent shows that Complainant's ROBOROCK trademark is distinctive and it has a gained reputation in the sector of robotic vacuum industry. In addition, the Complainant's trademarks were registered long before the Disputed Domain Name was created. Furthermore, the Complainant provided with a Google Trends search data for the term ROBOROCOK over the past five years where the term ROBOROCOK had a

high search volume before the Disputed Domain Name was registered. Based on those elements, the Panel is of the opinion that Respondent knew or should have known that its domain name registration would be identical or confusingly similar to the ROBOROCK trademarks.

Furthermore, the Complainant provided with evidence showing that the Disputed Domain Name was set up by the Respondent to create a website which offers non authorized versions of Complainant's products – at reduced price - with the purpose to mislead internet consumers who are attempting to purchase authorized products through the Disputed Domain Name. In this sense, the Complainant has confirmed that no authorization was granted to the Respondent to register the Disputed Domain Name and no counterargument has been submitted by Respondent. This is a clear indication that the Disputed Domain Name was set up with the only intention to attract to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website or location or of a product.

In light of the evidence presented to the Panel, including: a) the likelihood of confusion between the Disputed Domain Name and the Complainant's ROBOROCK trademarks, b) the lack of reply to this Complaint by Respondent, and c) the fact that the Disputed Domain Name is being used for a website offering non authorized products of the Complainant's with the purpose to mislead internet consumers, the Panel draws the inference that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

AND THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME(S) IS (ARE) TO BE

1. **roborockaustralia.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Victor Garcia Padilla**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-04-06

Publish the Decision