

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Google LLC v. Bill Johnson, cloudmap , Loong Two
Case No. DIO2025-0055

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Google LLC, United States of America, represented Morgan, Lewis & Bockius, LLP, United States of America.

The Respondents are Loong Two, United States of America, self-represented, and Bill Johnson, cloudmap, United States of America.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <ainanobanana.io> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”). The disputed domain name <nanobananapro.io> 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 December 17, 2025. On December 18, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On December 18 and December 19, 2025, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondents and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 22, 2025, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar(s), requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on December 22, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the .IO Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy”), the Rules for .IO Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for .IO 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 December 29, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 22, 2026. The Center received email communications

from the Respondent Loong Two on January 18 and 22, 2026, both requesting an extension of the time to file its Response.

The Center appointed Martin Schwimmer, Richard Hill, and W. Scott Blackmer as panelists in this matter on February 27, 2026. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. Each member of 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.

On March 3, 2026, the Center, at the request of the Panel, issued a Procedural Order extending the time for the Respondent Loong Two to file its Response to March 17, 2026.

The Respondent Loong Two did not file a Response.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a Delaware limited liability company located in California, United States of America.

Based on the Complainant's documented and undisputed allegations, on August 12, 2025, the Complainant released its AI-powered image editing model, "Nano Banana", on the publicly available LMArena platform. The model allows users to edit images using text prompts through the Google Gemini platform. The release of the "Nano Banana" software model immediately generated public commentary, including discussions on Reddit. Shortly thereafter, on August 26, 2025, the Complainant officially released its AI image model under the name Gemini 2.5 Flash Image, codenamed "nano-banana". Public commentary continued following this official release.

The disputed domain name <ainanobanana.io> was registered on August 26, 2025; the disputed domain name <nanobananapro.io> was registered on November 15, 2025.

The Complainant provided uncontested evidence that the disputed domain names resolve to identical websites that intentionally create the impression that they are operated by or affiliated with, sponsored or endorsed by, or otherwise authorized by the Complainant in relation to its NANO BANANA software and services. Specifically, the sites reference the Complainant and its Gemini, Veo, and Nano Banana software and offer to sell software under the infringing Nano Banana name.

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 names.

The Complainant alleges that it owns unregistered, common law rights in the highly distinctive trademark NANO BANANA, which it uses in connection with AI-powered image editing models. These rights predate the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names, which are confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark.

According to the Complainant, it has not authorized or licensed the Respondent to use the NANO BANANA mark in any way. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names. The Respondent has not used and is not using the disputed domain names in connection with any bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Instead, the resolving websites create the impression that they are operated by or affiliated with, sponsored or endorsed by, or otherwise authorized by the Complainant; and they offer to sell competing software.

Further, says the Complainant, the timing of the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain names, and the creation of a directly competing and commercial AI service that references Google and its NANO BANANA mark, demonstrate the Respondent's awareness of the Complainant's rights, and the Respondent's bad faith intention to confuse consumers and profit off the goodwill the Complainant has created in its unregistered NANO BANANA mark.

B. Respondent

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

6. Preliminary issue: Multiple Respondents

There are two Respondents in the instant case.

According to WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"),¹ section 4.11.2, where a complaint is filed against multiple respondents, panels look at whether (i) the domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control, and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all parties. Procedural efficiency would also underpin panel consideration of such a consolidation scenario.

Here, as already noted, the resolving websites are identical. Thus, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names are under common control and it decides that consolidation would be fair and equitable to all parties.

The two named Respondents will be henceforth referred to as "the Respondent".

7. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to "decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable". Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires a complainant to prove each of the following three elements in order to obtain an order that the disputed domain name 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;
- (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 or is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant asserts unregistered common law rights in its NANO BANANA mark.

To establish unregistered or common law trademark rights for purposes of the Policy, the complainant must show that its mark has become a distinctive identifier which consumers associate with the complainant's goods and/or services. Relevant evidence demonstrating such acquired distinctiveness (also referred to as secondary meaning) includes a range of factors such as (i) the duration and nature of the use of the mark (which may include social media presence and engagement), (ii) the amount of sales under the mark and during which time period, (iii) the nature and extent of advertising using the mark – including evidence of expenditures over a relevant time period, (iv) the degree of actual public (e.g., consumer, industry such as trade and professional associations, media) recognition, and (v) consumer surveys. The fact that a respondent is shown to have been targeting the complainant's mark (e.g., based on the manner in which the mark is used on the related website or impersonating documents or other instruments) may also support the

¹ Given the similarities between the Policy and the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "UDRP"), the Panel will refer to cases decided under both the Policy and the UDRP, and notably the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), if relevant to this proceeding

complainant's assertion and evidence that its mark has achieved significance as a source identifier. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.3.

Based on the Complainant's documented and undisputed allegations, the Complainant's Nano Banana AI-powered image editing model generated widespread public commentary as of August 12, 2025. Furthermore, the evidence on file shows that the Respondent targeted the Complainant's coined and arbitrary mark. This supports the Complainant's assertion and evidence that its mark has achieved significance as a source identifier. Based on the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has shown unregistered common law rights in NANO BANANA, for the purposes of the Policy. The said common law trademark rights precede the registration of the disputed domain names.

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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Panel assessment of identity or confusing similarity involves comparing the (alpha-numeric) domain name and the textual components of the relevant mark. Here, the disputed domain names each incorporate the Complainant's NANO BANANA mark in its entirety, merely adding the generic/descriptive terms "ai", "pro", and the ".io" country code Top-Level Domain ("ccTLD"). In accordance with the consistent case law of the Policy, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark.

Based on the available record, 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 .IO 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 3.1](#), 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 relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

From the undisputed evidence before the Panel, it results that the Complainant never granted any kind of authorization to the Respondent to register and/or to use its trademark in any manner, including as a domain name. Furthermore, there is no evidence in the record that can possibly suggest that the Respondent has become commonly known by the disputed domain name. According to the Registrar Verification Responses, the WhoIs information for the disputed domain names lists the Respondents as "Bill Johnson, cloudmap" and "Loong Two". Thus, the Panel finds that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names, see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.2.

The Respondent is using the disputed domain names to resolve to a commercial website that intentionally creates the false impression that the site is operated by or affiliated with, sponsored or endorsed by, or otherwise authorized by the Complainant in relation to its own offerings. This shows that the Respondent has not used and is not using the disputed domain names in connection with any bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 2.4 and 2.5.

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

C. Registered or 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 or use of a domain name 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 or used in bad faith. One of these circumstances is that the respondent, by using the disputed domain name, has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website or location or of a product or service on its website or location (paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy).

In the present case, as already noted, the resolving website attempts to impersonate the Complainant while offering for sale competing products; this constitutes bad faith use, see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

Further, considering the coined and arbitrary nature of the Complainant's trademark, the Panel finds that the Respondent clearly knew of the Complainant's trademark rights when it registered the disputed domain names shortly after the Complainant announced its products; this constitutes bad faith registration, see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.8.2.

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

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 names <ainanobanana.io> and <nanobananapro.io> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Martin Schwimmer/
Martin Schwimmer
Presiding Panelist

/Richard Hill/
Richard Hill
Panelist

/W. Scott Blackmer/
W. Scott Blackmer
Panelist
Date: April 5, 2026