

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Temasek Holdings (Private) Limited v. HuLiangLiang
Case No. D2026-0663

1. The Parties

Complainant is Temasek Holdings (Private) Limited, Singapore, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

Respondent is HuLiangLiang, China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <temasekglobalinvestments.com> and <temasekpartnershipsolutions.com> (the “Domain Names”) are registered with 22net, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 16, 2026. On February 17, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Names. On February 24, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Names which differed from the named Respondent (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on the same day, 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 in English on February 27, 2026.

On February 24, 2026, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the Domain Names is Chinese. On February 27, 2026, Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding. Respondent did not submit any comment on Complainant’s submission.

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 in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 2, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 22, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on March 26, 2026.

The Center appointed Kimberley Chen Nobles as the sole panelist in this matter on April 1, 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, a global investment company headquartered in Singapore, manages a portfolio of SGD 434 billion (approximately USD 341.41 billion) as of March 31, 2025. With 960 employees, encompassing 32 nationalities in 9 countries, Complainant's teams support a global network of 13 offices across four continents. On August 28, 2025, Complainant announced its new organizational structure, which established three new, wholly owned entities including Temasek Global Investments (TGI), and Temasek Partnership Solutions (TPS).

Complainant owns and operates numerous registered trademarks for the TEMASEK mark, including:

- United States of America registered trademark number 3187580 for the TEMASEK word mark, registered on December 19, 2006;
- International registered trademark number 861848 for the TEMASEK word mark, registered on June 2, 2005; and
- Chinese registered trademark number 12395342 for the TEMASEK word mark, registered on October 7, 2014.

Complainant also owns and operates numerous registered trademarks for the TEMASEK GLOBAL mark, including:

- International registered trademark number 1083151 for the TEMASEK GLOBAL word mark, registered on May 9, 2011;
- United Kingdom registered trademark number UK00002625195 for the TEMASEK GLOBAL word mark, registered on December 7, 2012; and
- Chinese registered trademark number G1083151 for the TEMASEK GLOBAL word mark, registered on May 9, 2011.

The above TEMASEK and TEMASEK GLOBAL trademarks will be referred to collectively hereinafter, as the TEMASEK trademarks.

Complainant is also the owner of numerous domain names containing its TEMASEK trademark. Complainant's primary domain name <temasek.com.sg> was registered in November 1995 and has been used continuously to promote Complainant and their products/services. Complainant is also the owner of the domain names, <temasek.com> and <temasekglobal.com>, registered in 1999 and 2010 respectively.

The Domain Names were registered on August 29, 2025, and resolve to inactive websites.

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 Names.

Notably, Complainant contends that (i) the Domain Names are confusingly similar to Complainant's trademarks; (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names; and (iii) Respondent registered and is using the Domain Names in bad faith.

In particular, Complainant contends that it has trademark registrations for TEMASEK and TEMASEK GLOBAL, and that Respondent has acted in bad faith in acquiring and setting up the Domain Names, when Respondent clearly knew of Complainant's rights.

On October 16, 2025, Complainant sent a cease and desist letter to Respondent, followed by reminders on October 27, 2025 and November 10, 2025, seeking resolution of infringement of Complainant's trademark rights. No response was received.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Preliminary Issue: Language of the Proceeding

The Rules, in paragraph 11(a), provide that unless otherwise agreed by the parties or specified otherwise in the registration agreement between the respondent and the registrar in relation to the disputed domain name, the language of the proceedings shall be the language of the registration agreement, subject to the authority of the panel to determine otherwise, having regard to the circumstances of the administrative proceedings.

Complainant submitted its original Complaint and amended Complaint in English. According to the information received from the Registrar, the language of the Registration Agreement for the Domain Names is Chinese.

Complainant requested that the language of the proceedings be English for several reasons, including the fact that the Domain Names include only Latin characters; Domain Names incorporate Complainant's TEMASEK mark with the descriptive terms "global investments" and "partnership solutions" – neither of which are Chinese words; further, that Complainant is unable to communicate in Chinese and it would be unduly expensive and burdensome, and cause unwarranted delay, to require Complainant to translate the Complaint into Chinese or to conduct the proceeding in Chinese.

Respondent did not comment on Complainant's request for the language of the proceeding be English.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see [WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions \("WIPO Overview 3.1"\)](#), section 4.5.1).

The Panel accepts Complainant's submissions regarding the language of the proceeding. The Panel notes that the Domain Names do not have any specific meaning in the Chinese language, and that each of the Domain Names is formed using Latin characters, and contains Complainant's TEMASEK trademark in its entirety. The Panel further notes that the Center notified the Parties in Chinese and English of the language of the proceeding as well as notified Respondent in Chinese and English of the Complaint. Respondent chose not to comment on the language of the proceeding, nor did Respondent choose to file a Response in Chinese or English.

Having considered all the circumstances of this case, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

6.2 Substantive Issues

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed Complainant must satisfy the Panel that:

- (i) the Domain Names are 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 Domain Names; and
- (iii) the Domain Names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

Section 4.3 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) states that failure to respond to the complainant's contentions would not by itself mean that the complainant is deemed to have prevailed; a respondent's default is not necessarily an admission that the complainant's claims are true.

Thus, although in this case, Respondent has failed to respond to the Complaint, the burden remains with Complainant to establish the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy by a preponderance of the evidence.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Ownership of a trademark registration is generally sufficient evidence that a complainant has the requisite rights in a mark for purposes of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1. Complainant has provided evidence of its rights in the TEMASEK trademarks, as noted above under Section 4. Complainant has therefore proven that it has the requisite rights in the TEMASEK trademarks.

With Complainant's rights in the TEMASEK trademarks established, the remaining question under the first element of the Policy is whether the Domain Names, typically disregarding the generic Top-Level Domains ("gTLDs") in which they are registered (in this case, ".com"), are identical or confusingly similar to Complainant's trademark. See, e.g., *B & H Foto & Electronics Corp. v. Domains by Proxy, Inc. / Joseph Gross*, WIPO Case No. [D2010-0842](#).

Here, the Domain Names are confusingly similar to Complainant's TEMASEK trademarks. The TEMASEK trademark is reproduced and recognizable in the Domain Names.

Domain Name	Additional term(s) added to Complainant's trademarks
<temasekglobalinvestments.com>	"investments" with regards to the TEMASEK GLOBAL trademark or "global" and "investments" with regards to the TEMASEK trademark
<temasekpartnershipsolutions.com>	"partnership" and "solutions" with regards to the TEMASEK trademark

In particular, the Domain Names' inclusion of Complainant's TEMASEK trademark in its entirety, and the addition of the respective term(s) noted above, following the TEMASEK mark, does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Names and the TEMASEK trademarks. See section 1.8 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

Thus, the Panel finds that Complainant has satisfied the first element of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, a complainant must make a prima facie showing that a respondent possesses no rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name. See, e.g., *Malayan Banking Berhad v. Beauty, Success & Truth International*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-1393](#). Once a complainant makes out such a prima facie showing, the burden of production shifts to the respondent, though the burden of proof always remains on the complainant. If the respondent fails to come forward with relevant evidence showing rights or legitimate interests, the complainant will have sustained its burden under the second element of the UDRP.

From the record in this case, it is evident that Respondent was, and is, aware of Complainant and its TEMASEK trademarks, and does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names. Complainant also owns and operates its website at the domain name <temasek.com.sg> and also owns the domain names, <temasek.com> and <temasekglobal.com>. Complainant has confirmed that Respondent is not affiliated with Complainant, or otherwise authorized or licensed to use the TEMASEK trademarks or to seek registration of any domain name incorporating these trademarks. Respondent is also not known to be associated with the TEMASEK trademarks and there is no evidence showing that Respondent has been commonly known by the Domain Names.

In addition, Respondent has not used the Domain Names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Rather, the record shows that each of the Domain Names resolves to an inactive website. Furthermore, the Panel considers that the composition of the Domain Names carries a risk of implied affiliation with Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

Thus, such use by Respondent does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use and cannot under the circumstances confer on Respondent any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names.

Accordingly, Complainant has provided evidence supporting its prima facie claim that Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names. Respondent has failed to produce countervailing evidence of any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names.

Thus, the Panel concludes that Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names, and Complainant has met its burden under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel finds that Respondent's actions indicate that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Names in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides a non-exhaustive list of circumstances indicating bad faith registration and use on the part of a domain name registrant, namely:

“(i) circumstances indicating that you have registered or you have acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of your documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or

(ii) you have registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that you have engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) you have registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the domain name, you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your 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 your website or location or of a product or service on your website or location."

The Panel finds that Complainant has provided ample evidence to show that registration and use of the TEMASEK trademarks long predate the registration of the Domain Names. Complainant is also well known and established. Indeed, the record shows that Complainant's TEMASEK trademarks and related products and services are widely known and recognized. Therefore, the Panel is of the view that Respondent was aware of the TEMASEK trademarks when they registered the Domain Names. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2; see also *TTT Moneycorp Limited v. Privacy Gods / Privacy Gods Limited*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-1973](#).

The Panel therefore finds that Respondent's awareness of Complainant's trademark rights at the time of registration suggests bad faith. See *Red Bull GmbH v. Credit du Léman SA, Jean-Denis Deletraz*, WIPO Case No. [D2011-2209](#); *Nintendo of America Inc v. Marco Beijen, Beijen Consulting, Pokemon Fan Clubs Org., and Pokemon Fans Unite*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-1070](#); and *BellSouth Intellectual Property Corporation v. Serena, Axel*, WIPO Case No. [D2006-0007](#).

Further, the registration of the Domain Names, each of which includes Complainant's TEMASEK trademark and terms "global investments" and "partnership solutions" as noted above, suggests Respondent's actual knowledge of Complainant's rights in the TEMASEK trademarks at the time of registration of the Domain Names and their effort to opportunistically capitalize on the registration and use of the Domain Names. Complainant also owns and operates its website at the domain name at <temasek.com.sg> and also owns the domain names, <temasek.com> and <temasekglobal.com>. Such adoption of Complainant's trademarks at the time of registration of the Domain Names illustrates Respondent's effort to mislead Internet users as to the Domain Names' association with Complainant. In addition, there is no indication or evidence that Respondent is preparing to use the Domain Names for any other alternate purpose.

As noted above, at the time of filing of the Complaint, the Domain Names each resolved to an inactive website. 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. Considering the composition of the Domain Names, the reputation or distinctiveness of the trademarks, and the Panel finds that passive holding of the Domain Names does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the circumstances of this case.

Finally, the Panel also notes the failure of Respondent to submit a Response and the Domain Names were registered one day after Complainant announced its new organizational structure, which established three new, wholly owned entities including Temasek Global Investments (TGI), and Temasek Partnership Solutions (TPS).

Accordingly, the Panel finds that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Names in bad faith and Complainant has succeeded under the third element of paragraph 4(a) 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 Names <temasekglobalinvestments.com> and <temasekpartnershipsolutions.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Kimberley Chen Nobles/

Kimberley Chen Nobles

Sole Panelist

Date: April 10, 2026