

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LVDV Holdings, LLC v. 胡雪峰 (Hu Xue Feng)
Case No. D2026-0196

1. The Parties

The Complainant is LVDV Holdings, LLC, United States of America (“United States”), internally represented.

The Respondent is 胡雪峰 (Hu Xue Feng), China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <vlone.com> is registered with Alibaba Cloud Computing (Beijing) Co., Ltd. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 17, 2026. On January 20, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 21, 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 (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 29, 2026, 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 January 28, 2026, and amendments to the Complaint on January 29, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint and amendments to the 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 January 30, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 19, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Deanna Wong Wai Man as the sole panelist in this matter on February 27, 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.

On April 1, 2026, the Panel issued Administrative Panel Procedural Order No. 1 (“Panel Order”), in which it provisionally noted that although the Complainant owns the VLONE trademark (registered in 2014 with claimed first use in 2012), the disputed domain name was originally registered earlier in 2010. However, in light of section 3.9 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), which provides that the relevant date for assessing bad faith is when the current registrant acquired the domain name, the Panel highlighted certain evidence submitted by the Complainant prima facie suggesting a possible change in registrant around 2019; accordingly, the Panel invited the Complainant to submit, by April 8, 2026, arguments and further specific evidence showing that the disputed domain name was registered/acquired targeting its trademark, and invited the Respondent to indicate when it became the registrant of the disputed domain name and to comment on the Complainant’s submission by April 15, 2026.

On April 2, 2026, the Complainant submitted a statement in response to the Panel Order. The Respondent did not submit any response by the relevant deadline of April 15, 2026.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a company headquartered in the United States and uses the VLONE mark in commerce in connection with apparel, accessories, retail services, digital commerce, and brand collaborations.

The Complainant provides evidence of the ownership of United States Trademark Registration No. 4,578,741 for the mark VLONE, registered on August 5, 2014, with the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”), covering apparel and related goods in International Class 25. The registration indicates a first use in commerce of April 1, 2012. The registration currently is subject to a cancellation proceeding at the USPTO Trademark Trial and Appeal Board.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 15, 2010, i.e. several years before the date of registration (and, incidentally, even the date of first use in commerce) of the abovementioned trademark registration and directs to an inactive website.

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 it is the lawful owner of the VLONE trademark, which it has used extensively in commerce in connection with apparel and related goods and services, and that the mark has acquired substantial goodwill and recognition.

With respect to paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is identical to its VLONE trademark, as it consists solely of the mark together with the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.com”, which should be disregarded for the purpose of assessing identity or confusing similarity.

As to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, the Complainant essentially argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, as it has not been authorized to use the VLONE mark, is not commonly known by that name, and is not using the disputed domain name in connection with any bona

vide offering of goods or services or any legitimate noncommercial or fair use, noting that the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website.

With respect to paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, the Complainant essentially contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, given the distinctiveness and reputation of the VLONE mark, the Respondent's alleged awareness of the Complainant's rights, the passive holding of a domain name identical to the mark, and the absence of any plausible good-faith use, which the Complainant claims supports a finding of bad faith under established UDRP principles.

On April 2, 2026, in response to the Panel Order the Complainant submitted a submission essentially adding that the case turns on whether the Respondent targeted the VLONE mark when acquiring the domain name around 2019, arguing that VLONE was already globally recognized by that time, that the Respondent's acquisition of the exact-match disputed domain name was opportunistic, and that its current passive holding supports a finding of bad faith; accordingly, the Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark 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 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 that 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.

Based on the evidence provided, the Panel notes that the Respondent is not connected with or licensed by the Complainant in any way and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and that there are no elements in this case that point to the Respondent having made any demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Instead, according to the record, the disputed domain name does not resolve to any active website. In this regard, noting the Panel's finding below that by acquiring the disputed domain name the Respondent intended to target the Complainant, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name (see in this regard earlier UDRP decisions such as *Bollore SE v. 赵竹飞 (Zhao Zhu Fei)*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-0691](#)).

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.

As noted in the Panel Order, the date on which the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name, if different from its original registration date, is determinative for the assessment of bad faith under section 3.9 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#). The Panel notes that current public Whois records for the disputed domain name contain no registrant data. The historical Whois records submitted by the Complainant indicate that as of November 16, 2010 (i.e. one day after the original registration date) the registrant of the disputed domain name was an individual different from the Respondent. Those records were subsequently updated on November 26, 2010, to identify a company based in China as the registrant which remained the registrant on record of the disputed domain name until 2019. Thereafter, the historical Whois records indicate prima facie further changes in registrant data occurring in the year 2019. In these circumstances, and in accordance with section 3.9 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), the Panel considers that there is a credible indication of a change in registrant, such that the relevant burden shifts to the Respondent to demonstrate an unbroken chain of possession. While the Respondent was invited to provide the relevant evidence by the Panel Order, the Respondent did not comply with such Panel Order and failed to provide any evidence as to when it acquired the disputed domain name or to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case regarding a change in registrant.

Therefore, in the absence of any such evidence, and on the balance of probabilities, the Panel accepts the Complainant's claim and evidence that the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name in the year 2019, which is after the Complainant's trademark registration and is the relevant date for assessing bad faith registration under the Policy.

In this context, the Panel notes, as an ancillary observation, that the original Complaint did not explicitly address the date of acquisition of the disputed domain name, which required clarification through the Panel's Order. The Panel considers that this issue concerns a fundamental requirement under the Policy and would ordinarily be expected to be clearly addressed, with supporting evidence, at the time of filing of the Complaint. The Panel also notes that, while the use of AI software or other automated drafting tools may assist in the preparation of submissions, such tools do not replace proper legal advice, analysis, preparation, and verification of pleadings (see *Arcelormittal v. Ruben Puerto*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2916](#)).

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent has acquired a domain name which is identical to the Complainant's VLONE trademark which was registered on August 5, 2014, i.e. approximately 5 years after the Complainant had acquired trademark rights (see above) and that the Complainant had, in the meantime, already made intensive and public use of this trademark (including, inter alia, a widely publicized collaboration with Nike that concluded in 2017 and featured a pop-up shop during New York Fashion Week, as well as public collaborations with certain well-known artists). This means that even a cursory Internet or

trademark search at the time of acquisition of the disputed domain name would have revealed the Complainant's, by then, longstanding rights in, and public and intensive use of, the VLONE mark. In the Panel's view, the above elements, on balance, indicate an intention to target the Complainant on the part of the Respondent, and the Panel therefore finds that it has been demonstrated that the Respondent acquired the disputed 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 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.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness, reputation and intensive use of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name, the failure of the Respondent to submit a Response or reply to the Panel Order, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Given the above-mentioned elements, 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 <vlone.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Deanna Wong Wai Man/

Deanna Wong Wai Man

Sole Panelist

Date: April 22, 2026