

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Lenovo (Beijing) Limited v. Wu Yu
Case No. D2024-3910

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Lenovo (Beijing) Limited, China, represented by Neal, Gerber & Eisenberg LLP, United States of America.

The Respondent is Wu Yu, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lenovo-news.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 24, 2024. On September 25, 2024, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 26, 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 (Super Privacy Service LTD) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 26, 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 September 30, 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 October 2, 2024. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 22, 2024. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 23, 2024.

The Center appointed James Wang as the sole panelist in this matter on October 28, 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 is one of the world's largest and fastest growing personal computer companies, serving customers in more than 160 countries. In addition to personal computers, the Complainant also offers tablets, smartphones, workstations, servers, electronic storage devices, IT management software and smart televisions.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous LENOVO trademarks registered in various jurisdictions, including but not limited to the following:

- No. 3368147 Chinese Trademark Registration, registered on March 14, 2004;
- No. 855149 International Trademark Registration, registered on March 30, 2005; and
- No. 1299513 International Trademark Registration, registered on September 29, 2015, designating China, among others;

The Complainant is also the owner of the domain name <lenovo.com> which was registered on September 6, 2002.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 18, 2024, and resolves to a pay-per-click ("PPC") page.

The Complainant's counsel sent a letter to the Respondent's privacy proxy on August 13, 2024, regarding the disputed domain name but received no response.

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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark in which the Complainant has rights. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant requested that the disputed domain name be transferred to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (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 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 the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has provided evidence that it is the registrant of LENOVO trademark registrations in different jurisdictions. The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark LENOVO is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, "-news") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

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 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 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 evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

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 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

In the present case, LENOVO is a coined mark, in addition to other jurisdictions registered in China where the Respondent is reportedly located and has no inherent meaning in English or Chinese Pinyin.

The Complainant has provided evidence that the Complainant's LENOVO trademark has been registered in different jurisdictions and is well known. A simple online search could reveal that the LENOVO trademark is in wide use by the Complainant.

Given the above, it would be inconceivable that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the LENOVO trademark at the time of the registration. The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

According to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the disputed domain name resolves to a PPC page with links related to the Complainant and a competitor of the Complainant. Therefore, the Panel finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's LENOVO mark, which constitutes bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 <lenovo-news.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/James Wang/

James Wang

Sole Panelist

Date: November 11, 2024