

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Alibaba Innovation Private Limited v. Xiaodong Li
Case No. DME2025-0030

1. The Parties

Complainant is Alibaba Innovation Private Limited, Singapore, represented by Convey Srl, Italy.

Respondent is Xiaodong Li, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <wanai.me> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 20, 2025. On October 20, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On October 20, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from named Respondent (unknown / Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on October 21, 2025, 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 October 21, 2025.

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 October 23, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 12, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on November 13, 2025.

The Center appointed Clive L. Elliott K.C. as the sole panelist in this matter on November 25, 2025. 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 company belonging to the Alibaba Group, a leading Chinese multinational conglomerate founded in 1999 in Hangzhou, Zhejiang, China, with its registered office located in Singapore. The Group operates globally across a wide range of sectors, including e-commerce, retail, Internet and technology, and provides services in digital media and entertainment, logistics, and cloud computing. As part of its AI (artificial intelligence) strategy, Complainant has developed QWEN, a family of large language models (LLMs) designed for multilingual understanding, reasoning, and enterprise applications. These models are accessible via Alibaba Cloud and form the foundation of the Group's generative AI ecosystem.

In the field of generative media, Complainant has also launched WAN, an open-source video generation framework capable of producing high-quality, multilingual video content from text prompts. One of Complainant's latest iterations has been abbreviated to WANX and ultimately rebranded as WAN in February 2025.

Complainant registered the domain name <wanxai.com> on November 4, 2023, followed by <wan.art> and <wan.video> on February 24, 2025. All three domain names resolve to Complainant's official website and platform "www.wan.video".

Complainant has made extensive use of the WAN designation across all major online environments, including on its official website, as well as verified accounts on leading social media and developer platforms such as GitHub, Hugging Face, X, YouTube, and Telegram.

Complainant and its related entities own multiple registered trade marks worldwide that include or consist of the terms WANX, WAN, and TONGYI WANXIANG (Complainant's Mark"), including in China, Hong Kong, China, United Kingdom, United Arab Emirates, Singapore, Philippines, Indonesia, Saudi Arabia, and European Union, with further applications pending in various other countries and regions.

Among Complainant's extensive trade mark portfolio, the following are notable:

Mark	Jurisdiction	Registration No	Registration Date	Class
WANX	Hong Kong, China	306741441	November 29, 2024	9, 42
WANX	United Kingdom	UK00004131080	February 28, 2025	9, 42
WAN	United Kingdom	UK00004164944	July 25, 2025	9, 42
TONGYI WANXIANG	United Kingdom	UK00004050859	August 2, 2024	9, 42
WANX	Indonesia	DID2024128996	June 26, 2025	9, 42
WAN CONNECTION	China	9162633	June 21, 2011	35

Complainant's Marks including WANX and WAN have been registered and have been actively used by Complainant in connection with goods and services falling under Nice Classes 9 and 42.

According to the publicly available WhoIs, the Domain Name was created on February 26, 2025 and it currently resolves to the website "www.wanai.me", which hosts a platform named "WAN.AI", displays a video for the Wan AI 2.1, and lists Complainant's products Qwen Image Edit, Wan 2.1, and Wan 2.2, etc. The website uses Complainant's Marks within its content, falsely implying a connection or origin. The website states that "Wan AI represents a breakthrough in AI-powered video generation technology, developed by Alibaba's Institute of Intelligence".

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Name.

Notably, Complainant contends that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to Complainant's Marks, as the entirety of the WAN mark and a substantial portion of the WANX mark are incorporated, together with addition of the generic and descriptive term "ai", which is commonly understood as an acronym for "artificial intelligence".

Complainant further contends that the inclusion of the term "ai" in the Domain Name reinforces the confusing similarity with Complainant's Marks as the term "ai" is not only generic and descriptive, but also directly associated with Complainant's brand and business. In particular, Complainant's WAN AI video generation application uses artificial intelligence to create videos from text and images. Therefore, rather than distinguishing the Domain Name from Complainant's Marks, the presence of "ai" strengthens the association between them.

Complainant asserts that its Marks WANX and WAN, have been registered and have been actively used by Complainant in connection with goods and services falling under Nice Classes 9 and 42. These Marks are recognized in the fields of artificial intelligence software, data processing systems, downloadable digital content, cloud computing platforms, and technological services related to AI-based video generation and multimodal content creation.

Complainant goes on to state that given the website offers services in the same field, namely AI-based technology, such use is likely to mislead consumers and cause confusion as to a possible affiliation or endorsement by Complainant. Further, Complainant contends that its Marks have been misused in the Domain Name and throughout the content of the website associated with the Domain Name and suggests that Respondent's intention appears to be to impersonate Complainant by falsely presenting itself as a partner or affiliate, thereby deceiving unsuspecting internet users searching for Complainant's products and services online.

Complainant asserts that, since Respondent's contact details were not publicly available, the only means of communication was through an online contact form, yet despite Complainant submitting the form, no response was received from Respondent.

Complainant claims that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name as Respondent is neither a licensee nor an authorized distributor of Complainant and has not been granted any permission to use Complainant's Marks, nor any variation, misspelling, or derivative thereof in the Domain Name or in any other manner.

Further, Complainant is not aware of any evidence indicating that Respondent is commonly known by the Domain Name, or by any name corresponding to it, whether as an individual, business, or other organization.

Moreover, Complainant states that although Complainant has made its WAN 2.1 AI video generation model available as free and open-source tool, it has not licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted Respondent to register domain names incorporating Complainant's Marks.

Complainant further claims that Respondent's website displays Complainant's Marks, thereby imitating Complainant and misleading Internet users into believing that the website is affiliated with or endorsed by Complainant. Such use is not legitimate and further confirms that Respondent is attempting to divert users by capitalizing on Complainant's brand identity.

Furthermore, Complainant declares that Respondent registered the Domain Name on February 26, 2025, which postdates registration of Complainant's Marks WAN, WANX, TONGYI WANX, and TONGYI WANXIANG, which timing further supports the conclusion that Respondent acted with knowledge of Complainant's rights and without any legitimate interest.

Finally, Complainant asserts that the Domain Name resolves to a website that cannot be considered trustworthy, as it provides information about Complainant's products and offers tiered pricing plans for access to related services. The use of Complainant's Marks both in the Domain Name and within the website is deceptive, as it tends to confuse users who may reasonably, but wrongly, believe that they are navigating the official website of Complainant.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The first element of the Policy functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between Complainant's Mark and the Domain Name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown registered rights in respect of the WAN and WANX Marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Domain Name includes the WAN Mark entirely, and differs only to the WANX Mark in not including the letter "x" and adding the letters "ai", which is the well-known abbreviation for "artificial intelligence". Nevertheless, the WAN and WANX Marks remain recognizable. Accordingly, the Domain Name is confusingly similar to Complainant's Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

While the removal and addition of the above elements may be relevant in terms of assessing the second and third elements, they do not, in and of themselves, prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the 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 Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the 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 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 fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

The Panel finds Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Respondent has failed to rebut Complainant's prima facie showing and has not supplied any argument or any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name, such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Of relevance in the present case, it is alleged that Respondent's website at "www.wanai.me", hosts a platform named "WAN.AI". Complainant asserts that the website displays Complainant's Mark, thereby imitating Complainant and misleading Internet users into believing that the website is affiliated with or endorsed by Complainant, contrary to the fact.

The Panel accepts that this conduct is likely to falsely imply a connection with Complainant.

Such activity on its own is not indicative of any rights or legitimate interests. Instead, it carries a risk that the Domain Name may be used to impersonate Complainant. In addition, in the Panel's view, the composition of the Domain Name carries a risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

Accordingly, 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.

Complainant's trademark registration WANX in Hong Kong, China in classes 9 and 42 is dated November 29, 2024. This registration predates the registration of the Domain Name. Complainant has provided evidence showing that it announced Wanx 2.1 on January 12, 2025. Furthermore, the website to which the Domain Name resolves makes reference to the Complainant and its products, and Respondent is located in China where Complainant's parent company Alibaba Group is located. The Panel notes that the composition of the Domain Name, incorporating Complainant's Mark with terms/indicia related to its operations, suggests Respondent knew of and sought to take advantage of Complainant's Mark when registering the Domain Name, and Respondent has done nothing to refute that inference.

Further, the Panel considers that there is a significant risk that communications originating from or associated with the Domain Name would be misleading or deceptive, falsely suggesting a connection with Complainant. Therefore, the Panel finds that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of 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 Domain Name <wanai.me> be transferred to Complainant.

/Clive L. Elliott K.C./

Clive L. Elliott K.C.

Sole Panelist

Date: December 16, 2025