Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108967

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108967
Time of filing	2026-09-01 09:17:01
Domain names	thelightroommodapk.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Adobe Inc.

Complainant representative

Organization	Convey srl

Respondent

Name	asma tariq

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 owns the trade marks ADOBE and LIGHTROOM including the following registered trade marks:

- EU TM n. 009595356 – “ADOBE” – in classes 9, 35, 42 registered May 3, 2011;
- US TM n. 1475793 – “ADOBE” – in class 9 registered February 9, 1988;
- EU TM n. 004111274 – “LIGHTROOM” – in Classes 9, 16, 42 registered April 11, 2006;
- US TM n. 3288605 – “LIGHTROOM” – in Class 9 registered September 4, 2007.

Over the years since launch in 2007 Lightroom has established a strong reputation among photographers worldwide, who regularly rely on the software as a central component of their creative and post-production activities. As a result, the LIGHTROOM mark has become closely associated with the Complainant and enjoys substantial goodwill and recognition in the global photography industry.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is widely recognized as one of the world’s leading companies in the development of professional software for digital media creation, publishing, and communication.

The Complainant offers a comprehensive portfolio of globally recognized creative software applications including ADOBE LIGHTROOM for professional photography editing and workflow management. Originally developed by Adobe under the code name “Shadowland”, LIGHTROOM was introduced through a public beta program in 2006 and officially released as Lightroom 1.0 on February 19, 2007.

The disputed Domain Name was registered by the Respondent on September 18th, 2025 and was attached to a site that made prominent use of the Complainant's LIGHTROOM mark and offered an unauthorised version of the Complainant's LIGHTROOM software for free without making it clear that the site had no connection with the Complainant.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

Complainant

1. The Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights.

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s LIGHTROOM trademark containing it in its entirety.

The addition of the generic word “the” preceding the LIGHTROOM trademark in the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. As a mere definite article, “the” is devoid of any distinguishing character and does not alter the overall impression conveyed by the disputed domain name.

Nor does the addition of the terms “mod” and “apk” after the LIGHTROOM trademark in the disputed domain name dispel the association with the Complainant. In the software and mobile application context, “APK” refers to the installation package format used for Android applications, while “MOD APK” commonly refers to a modified version of an application that has been altered to unlock premium features, bypass licensing restrictions, or otherwise provide unauthorized functionalities. Therefore, the combination of the Complainant’s LIGHTROOM trademark with the terms “mod” and “apk” directly suggests to Internet users that the disputed domain name is an official or authorized source for a modified version of ADOBE LIGHTROOM for Android devices. Rather than distinguishing the disputed domain name from the Complainant’s LIGHTROOM trademark, the terms “mod” and “apk” increase the likelihood of confusion by describing the very type of software that Internet users would expect to obtain in connection with the LIGHTROOM product. Therefore, the disputed domain name “thelightroommodapk.com” conveys the false impression that it is operated, endorsed, or otherwise authorized by the Complainant for the distribution of LIGHTROOM-related software. Such composition further demonstrates the Respondent’s deliberate targeting of the Complainant and its well-known LIGHTROOM mark and constitutes an additional indication of bad faith registration and use.

In light of the above, the Complainant respectfully submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s prior registered LIGHTROOM trademark, in accordance with Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

2. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name.

It is a well-established principle that the burden of proof lies with the Complainant. Nevertheless, meeting this burden with respect to demonstrating the Respondent’s lack of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name is particularly challenging, as proving a negative circumstance is inherently more difficult than establishing a positive one and often requires information that is primarily within the knowledge or control of the Respondent. Accordingly, it is sufficient that Complainant establishes a prima facie case in order to shift the burden of proof to the Respondent.

The mere registration of a domain name does not, in itself, confer rights or legitimate interests upon the registrant.

The Respondent is neither a licensee nor an authorized distributor of the Complainant and has received no permission—express or implied—to use the Complainant’s LIGHTROOM trademark or to register a domain name incorporating it. The Complainant has not granted the Respondent any rights to operate a domain name identical or confusingly similar to its trademarks.

The Respondent uses the disputed domain name to promote tools that purport to enable users to download the Complainant’s software ADOBE LIGHTROOM in an unauthorized form through the Respondent’s website. Such use clearly targets the Complainant’s products and is inherently illegitimate, as it is based on the unauthorized distribution and exploitation of the Complainant’s software. Accordingly, such use cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor any legitimate non-commercial or fair use.

The Panel has held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (e.g. phishing, scams, unauthorized account access/hacking, impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent.

For all the reasons set out above, the Complainant respectfully submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name in accordance with Paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

3. The Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

As to the assessment of the Respondent’s bad faith at the time of registration, in light of the Complainant’s trademark filings and the widespread use of the LIGHTROOM trademark, it is inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant’s rights when registering the disputed domain name.

On the contrary, in light of the content of the website, it can reasonably be inferred that the Respondent has, from the outset, intentionally sought to exploit the Complainant's trademarks and reputation in order to derive an illicit commercial benefit.

Notably, the disputed domain name resolves to a website on which the Complainant's trademark LIGHTROOM is prominently and unduly displayed.

Further demonstrating that the Respondent was fully aware of the Complainant's brand and deliberately sought to associate its own offerings with it. Such conduct constitutes clear evidence of bad-faith registration and use under the Policy.

The composition of the disputed domain name - and its resolving content - makes it impossible to believe that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's LIGHTROOM trademark at the time of registration. By incorporating the LIGHTROOM trademark in its entirety, together with the terms "mod" and "apk", which specifically refer to modified software applications and installation packages, the Respondent deliberately created a domain name that directly targets Internet users seeking the Complainant's LIGHTROOM software. As evidenced by the content of the Respondent's website, which promotes and facilitates the download of a purported modified version of LIGHTROOM software, the Respondent was plainly aware of the Complainant's rights and intentionally sought to exploit the reputation of the LIGHTROOM trademark.

Significantly, the website even contains a video tutorial specifically designed to guide users through the use of the website and the unauthorized download of LIGHTROOM software. The presence of such detailed instructions leaves no doubt that the Respondent was fully aware of the Complainant's product, LIGHTROOM trademark, and software offering, and was actively encouraging Internet users to obtain LIGHTROOM software through unauthorized means. These circumstances leave no plausible basis for any claim of coincidence or good-faith registration and instead constitute compelling evidence that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

With reference to the above, the Complainant highlights that it has been stated in various decisions that the registration of a domain name with the knowledge of the complainant's trademark is evidence of bad faith.

The Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name occurred at a time when the Complainant's ADOBE and LIGHTROOM brands had already gained notable visibility. The Respondent's decision to register a domain name incorporating the Complainant's distinctive LIGHTROOM trademark together with the non-distinctive article "the" and the descriptive terms "mod" and "apk" cannot reasonably be viewed as coincidental.

The addition of "the" does not alter the overall impression of the disputed domain name, while "mod" and "apk" are terms commonly associated with modified versions of software applications and are repeatedly referenced on the Respondent's website. Rather than distinguishing the disputed domain name from the Complainant's LIGHTROOM mark, these terms reinforce the association with the Complainant and its LIGHTROOM software, creating the false impression of an authorized or endorsed source of LIGHTROOM-related applications.

This conduct is carried out with the intent of obtaining a commercial advantage by inducing unsuspecting Internet users to access the website and click on unverified and potentially harmful links, under the false impression that they may obtain LIGHTROOM software, thereby exposing them to significant security and reliability risks.

In light of the extensive evidence submitted and the significant commercial presence of the LIGHTROOM trademark, its well-established and widely recognized notoriety is unequivocal. The Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith, with the intent to exploit the Complainant's brand recognition and goodwill. The factual context leaves little doubt that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's activities and deliberately sought to benefit from its commercial success.

The use of a domain name for illegal activity (e.g., the sale of counterfeit goods or illegal pharmaceuticals, phishing, distributing malware, unauthorized account access/hacking, impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud) constitutes bad faith.

The Respondent never sought authorization from Adobe Inc. to use the LIGHTROOM trademark within the disputed domain name. The Respondent sought to exploit the LIGHTROOM mark's notoriety without permission and subsequently failed to respond when contacted by the Complainant in an effort to explore an amicable resolution. This absence of cooperation, combined with the Respondent's refusal to respond to official communications, further underscores its bad-faith intent and its failure to demonstrate any bona fide basis for the registration or use of the disputed domain name.

As a further indication of bad faith, after receiving the notice from the Complainant, the disputed domain name "thelightroommodapk.com" currently resolves to a blank webpage where no genuine content is available and all prior content has been removed.

Given the distinctive and well-known nature of the Complainant's LIGHTROOM trademark, the Respondent's passive holding of the disputed domain name cannot give rise to any plausible good-faith use.

In these circumstances, the absence of any active use further supports the inference that the Respondent registered and continues to hold the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Respondent

No administratively compliant Response has been filed.

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

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

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s prior LIGHTROOM trademark, containing it in its entirety and adding only descriptive or generic terms and a gTLD.

The Respondent is not authorised by the Complainant and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Respondent makes prominent use of the Complainant's LIGHTROOM mark on its site and offers an unauthorised version of the Complainant's LIGHTROOM software without making it clear that the site is not authorised by the Complainant. This is confusing, so cannot be a bona fide offering of goods or services and shows actual knowledge of the Complainant and its business.

The Respondent has not responded to this Complaint and has not rebutted the prima facie case supported by the evidence adduced by the Complainant.

The Respondent has caused confusion with the Complainant's LIGHTROOM trade mark for commercial gain and disrupted the Complainant's business.

The offering of an unauthorised copy of the Respondent's LIGHTROOM software is illegal and bad faith per se.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **thelightroommodapk.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Dawn Osborne**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-10-02

Publish the Decision