

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

TetraMem Inc. v. hyatt ronon
Case No. D2026-1616

1. The Parties

Complainant is TetraMem Inc., United States of America (“United States”), internally represented.

Respondent is hyatt ronon, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <tetramem.dev> is registered with Name.com, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 16, 2026. On April 16, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 17, 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 (“Redacted for Privacy, Domain Protection Services, Inc. / Unknown Registrant”) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on April 20, 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 on April 24, 2026.

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 of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on April 24, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 14, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on May 15, 2026.

The Center appointed Frederick M. Abbott as the sole panelist in this matter on May 19, 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

Complainant is a corporation organized in the State of Delaware, United States, and based in San Jose, California, United States¹. Complainant's business involves development and production of analog-in memory chips (RRAM) intended to reduce energy requirements for AI applications. Complainant operates a commercial website at the domain name <tetramem.com>.

Complainant is the owner of registrations for the word trademark and service mark TETRAMEM on the Principal Register of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, registration number 7355821, registration dated April 9, 2024, in international class (IC) 42, covering product design and development in the fields of computer-based artificial intelligence and artificial intelligence software, as further specified; registration number 6504258, registration dated September 28, 2021, in IC 42, covering design of computer components, including chips, as further specified, and; registration number 7575837, registration dated November 26, 2024, in ICs 9 and 42, covering integrated circuits and computer chips, and product design and development services relating to AI software, as further specified.²

According to the Registrar's verification, Respondent is registrant of the disputed domain name. According to the WhoIs report, the disputed domain name was registered on March 22, 2026.

Respondent has used the disputed domain name to direct Internet users to a website with home page headed by Complainant's distinctive trademark, and with a large-font statement referencing "Analog In-Memory Compute, Scalable to 5nm, 3nm & Beyond", also present on Complainant's official website. It includes a purported timeline of the milestones of Respondent's business (using Complainant's trademark), corresponding to the timeline exhibited on Complainant's own site, with founding in 2018. There is a contact page for Respondent using Complainant's trademark and headquarters location, and a link to a LinkedIn account. That LinkedIn page displays Complainant's trademark and headquarters location, and at "About us" states "TetraMem is developing cutting edge analog computing solutions for AI applications, offering exceptional performance with ultra-low power consumption."

There is no evidence on the record of this proceeding of any association or affiliation, commercial or otherwise, between Complainant and Respondent.

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 it owns rights in the TETRAMEM trademark, and that the disputed domain name creates a likelihood of confusion as to Respondent's association with Complainant.

¹ Noting the general powers of a panel articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, the incorporation data per Panel search of May 25, 2026, including confirmation by State of Delaware incorporation records, and further confirmed by United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO") Trademark Electronic Search System ("TESS") and Trademark Status & Document Retrieval ("TSDR") data.

² Trademark data furnished by Complainant supplemented by Panel search at USPTO TESS and TSDR databases of May 25, 2026.

Complainant alleges that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because: (1) Respondent is in no way authorized by Complainant to use its trademark in the disputed domain name or otherwise; (2) Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and is not using the disputed domain name for a bona fide offering of goods or services; and (3) Respondent's website is designed to create confusion regarding an association between Respondent and Complainant.

Complainant argues that Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain name in bad faith because: (1) Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the intention of targeting Complainant and its trademark; (2) Respondent clearly had knowledge of Complainant's trademark when it registered the disputed domain name; (3) the website hosted by the disputed domain name is intended to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's mark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement, as well as to solicit customer or business-facing information; (4) Respondent's conduct creates a material risk of phishing, fraud, or diversion of business opportunities; and (5) the identity between Complainant's trademark and Respondent's Second-Level Domain deceptively inviting contact and engagement under Complainant's trademark identity.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy sets forth three elements that must be established by a complainant to merit a finding that a respondent has engaged in abusive domain name registration and use and to obtain relief.

These elements are that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which complainant has rights;
- (ii) 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.

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 trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

Complainant has shown rights in respect of the trademark and service mark TETRAMEM 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 Complainant, panels have recognized that proving that 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 Respondent. As such, where Complainant, as here, makes out a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to Respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on Complainant). If Respondent, as here, fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, 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. Respondent has not rebutted 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.

Respondent has used the disputed domain name to establish a website that prominently uses Complainant’s distinctive trademark and is otherwise designed, including with content, to convey the impression to Internet users that it is operated by or affiliated with Complainant. Such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor does it constitute fair or legitimate noncommercial use by Respondent of Complainant’s trademark in the disputed domain name. There is no indication that Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name, and Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name does not otherwise suggest any plausible legitimate reason for having done so.

In addition, Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate or illegal activity, here claimed as passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on Respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel finds 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that Respondent was manifestly aware of Complainant and its trademark when it registered the disputed domain name based on Respondent’s use of Complainant’s mark in the disputed domain name and on the associated website offering goods and services substantially similar to those offered by Complainant. Respondent was targeting Complainant inter alia through soliciting contact with and data from its potential clients or customers. Respondent has not responded to the Complaint to suggest any plausible legitimate grounds for registration of the disputed domain name.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent’s registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Respondent has used the disputed domain name in connection with establishing a website designed, including its content, to convey to Internet users the impression that it is operated or authorized by Complainant, which it is not. The solicitation of Internet user information under false pretenses strongly implies a commercial motive on the part of Respondent. Respondent has registered and is using Complainant’s distinctive trademark in the disputed domain name for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion for Internet users as to Complainant acting as the source, sponsor, affiliate or endorser of Respondent’s website. Such use constitutes bad faith within the meaning of paragraph (4)(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate or illegal activity, here claimed as passing off, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 <tetramem.dev> be transferred to Complainant.

/Frederick M. Abbott/

Frederick M. Abbott

Sole Panelist

Date: June 2, 2026