ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Zinzino AB v. hang myen lee (이행면)
Case No. D2026-2005

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Zinzino AB, Sweden, represented by Abion AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is hang myen lee (이행면), Republic of Korea, self-represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <zinzinokorea.com> is registered with Gabia, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 8, 2026. On May 8, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 11, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 11, 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 May 11, 2026.

On May 11, 2026, the Center informed the parties in Korean and English, that the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain name is Korean. On May 11, 2026, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceedings. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant's submission but sent email communications in Korean on May 11, 12, and 13, 2026. On June 8, 2026, the Respondent filed a Response in English and Korean.

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").

On May 13, 2026, the Complainant requested the Center to suspend of the proceedings, and on May 20, 2026 – to reinstitute them. Accordingly, on May 13, 2026, the Center suspended and on May 21, 2026, reinstituted the proceedings.

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent in English and Korean of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 21, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 10, 2026. The Response was filed in English and Korean with the Center on June 8, 2026.

The Center appointed Kathryn Lee as the sole panelist in this matter on June 8, 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 June 8, 2026, the Complainant made an unsolicited Supplemental Filing.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a Swedish health and wellness company that develops and markets personalized nutrition products, including dietary supplements tailored to individual needs based on blood test analysis. The Complainant was founded in 2007 and offers its products and services in 100 markets through a network of 40,000 independent partners. The Complainant is headquartered in Gothenburg, Sweden, and has offices in countries such as Finland, Latvia, the United States of America ("United States" or "US"), Australia, Hong Kong, China, and Malaysia. The Complainant is publicly listed on the Nasdaq First North Growth Market. The Complainant uses the mark ZINZINO in business and owns a number of trademark registrations for the mark, including International Trademark Registration Number 1497126 registered on October 4, 2019, designating, among others, the Republic of Korea; United States Trademark Registration Number 6383021 registered on June 15, 2021; and New Zealand Trademark Registration Number 1167594 registered on January 6, 2022. The Complainant operates its official website at the domain name <zinzino.com> which was registered on July 5, 2004. In 2025, the Complainant acquired the South Korean subsidiary of the US-based direct sales company Truvy in support of its business in the Republic of Korea.

The Respondent is an individual with an address in the Republic of Korea. The Respondent claims to operate a marketing entity named "Edulist" which assisted Truvy with development of a website and launch of a YouTube channel to market the Complainant's products in the Republic of Korea. The Respondent also claims to now be an independent distributor of the Complainant's products and that he registered the disputed domain name to promote the Complainant's products in the Republic of Korea.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 7, 2026, and resolves to a Korean-language website that promotes a business called "Zinzino Z" providing information on health supplements and marketing other services. Based on the information at the website, the operator is Edulist whose Representative Director is the Respondent. Following the filing of the Complaint, the website was updated to include the statement "본 사이트는 진지노 본사의 공식 홈페이지가 아닌, 독립적인 파트너가 운영하는 개인 정보 공유 및 리뷰 사이트입니다" (in English "This site is not the official homepage of Zinzino headquarters, but a personal information sharing and review site operated by independent partners") and provide a link to the Complainant's official website "www.zinzino.com".

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 has rights in the ZINZINO mark, and that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark given that it just adds geographical term, “korea”.

The Complainant also contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and confirms that it has not authorized or licensed rights to the Respondent or the entity called “Edulist” in any respect. The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is inherently misleading since it incorporates the Complainant’s mark plus “korea” and therefore is likely to create a false impression that it is affiliated with, endorsed by, or otherwise connected to, the Complainant.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Specifically, the Complainant contends that the Respondent surely knew of the Complainant when registering the disputed domain name, since online searches for “zinzino” give results directly related to the Complainant, and the combination of the Complainant’s mark with “korea” is designed to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant. The Complainant also contends that the use of the disputed domain name to display the Complainant’s ZINZINO mark, references to the Complainant’s official website at the domain name <zinzino.com>, images of the Complainant’s products, and offers of health and wellness-related content and products similar or identical to those of the Complainant all represent use in bad faith to intentionally attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent’s copycat website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement. The Complainant further contends that a link at the website associated with the disputed domain name leads to the website at the domain name <edulist.kr> which is operated by the Respondent and promotes a Korean online marketing and advertising business unrelated to the Complainant. The Complainant contends that this demonstrates that the Respondent is using the Complainant’s ZINZINO trademark and its Korean transliteration to misleadingly attract Internet users and divert traffic for the Respondent’s own commercial purposes which also supports a finding of bad faith use.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied the second and third elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent contends that he is a small business owner and also a seller at the company Truvy. The Respondent further contends that he obtained authorization from a high-level sponsor at Truvy to register and use the disputed domain name for promotion of the Complainant’s products and that he made good faith investment in registering the disputed domain name and offering bona fide goods and services.

The Respondent claims that its dealings with Truvy resulted in a commercial dispute due to the lack of proper compensation. In that regard, the Respondent made a filing before the Korea Fair Trade Commission.

The Respondent also contends that he believed the registration and use of the disputed domain name to be permissible in light of the claimed approval from his sponsor, and that any use of the Complainant’s mark was undertaken in good faith for commercial promotion, not to exploit or abuse the Complainant’s rights. The Respondent further contends that the disputed domain name was not registered for the purpose of sale to the Complainant or a competitor; that it was not intended to disrupt the Complainant’s business; and that it was not used to intentionally mislead or divert consumers, but rather to promote the Complainant’s products as part of his distribution business. The Respondent also notes that neither the Complainant, nor its subsidiary intend to use the disputed domain name.

The Respondent requested the Panel to deny the requested remedy and make a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking (“RDNH”).

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Procedural Issues

A. Language of the Proceedings

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Korean. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceedings shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceedings be English for several reasons, including the fact that the Complainant is based in Sweden and that preparing a Korean translation of the Complainant would result in unnecessary delay and costs, and that the disputed domain name is registered in Latin script which suggests that the Respondent is capable of understanding English.

The Respondent did not comment on the Complainant's request for the language of the proceedings to be English but sent email communications in Korean before submitting the Response in both Korean and 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). Here, both Parties were given the opportunity to submit arguments in the language of their preference. Further, the Respondent did not raise any objection as to the language of the proceedings, and actually, submitted a response in combination of English and Korean, which indicates that he will be able to understand the decision rendered in English.

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceedings shall be English.

B. Complainant's Supplemental Filing

On June 8, 2026, the Complainant made an unsolicited Supplemental Filing.

Paragraph 10 of the UDRP Rules vests the Panel with the authority to determine the admissibility, relevance, materiality and weight of the evidence, and also to conduct the proceedings with due expedition. Paragraph 12 of the UDRP Rules expressly provides that it is for the panel to request, in its sole discretion, any further statements or documents from the parties it may deem necessary to decide the case. Unsolicited supplemental filings are generally discouraged unless a party can clearly show its relevance to the case and why it was unable to provide the information contained therein in its complaint or response. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 4.6.

Having reviewed the Complainant's Supplemental Filing, the Panel finds that it does not materially add to the narrative of the case in relation to the analysis under the three elements of the Policy. Accordingly, the Panel declines to accept the Complainant's Supplemental Filing.

The Panel notes that the Complainant's Supplemental Filing, inter alia, addresses the Respondent's action before the Korea Fair Trade Commission which was initiated after the Complaint was filed. It is not clear from the Respondent's submission if the proceedings before the Korea Fair Trade Commission concern the disputed domain name, but its determination is prima facie not germane to the present proceedings and involves what appear to be commercial matters. Therefore, noting that both Parties requested the Panel to proceed with the Decision on merits, the Panel will proceed further with the Decision.

6.2. Substantive Issues

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 confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms – here, "korea" – 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 3.1, 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 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.

As for the Respondent, he contends that he registered and used the disputed domain name in connection with his activities as a contractor and an independent distributor of the Complainant's products and that he acted with the approval or guidance of a sponsor within his distribution network. However, the Respondent has not provided any evidence of such an authorization by the Complainant. Although the Respondent submitted transcripts and a recording of alleged telephone conversations with someone identified as his sponsor in support of his claims, the transcripts lack clarity as to the identity of the other party and the substance of the conversations.

While the Panel accepts that the Respondent may have been involved in promoting the Complainant's products, such involvement does not, of itself, confer a right or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name especially noting that it wholly incorporates the Complainant's trademark in a manner that suggests an official or authorized presence, particularly where the domain name consists of the Complainant's mark combined with a geographic designation, falsely suggesting that the website at the disputed domain name is that of the Complainant's Korean office. This is moreover compounded by the overall look and feel of the website, which (despite the later-added disclaimer) does not bear the hallmarks of an independent third party. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.1. Furthermore, some of the photos of the products listed on the

Respondent's website were copied from the Complainant's website, which further enhances the false impression that the website at the disputed domain name is operated or affiliated with the Complainant.

While the above – suggestion of a non-existent affiliation – is enough to dispose of the case, for completeness, the Panel notes that panels have recognized that resellers and distributors using a domain name containing the brand owner's trademark to undertake sales of the brand owner's goods may be making bona fide offering of goods and services and thus have a legitimate interest in such domain name, as long as the following conditions are met under the "Oki Data test" (see WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.8, and *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. D2001-0903):

(i) the respondent must actually be offering the goods or services at issue;
(ii) the respondent must use the site to sell only the trademarked goods or services;
(iii) the site must accurately and prominently disclose the registrant's relationship with the trademark holder; and
(iv) the respondent must not try to "corner the market" in domain names that reflect the trademark.

Here, the Respondent fails at least on conditions (ii) as the website at the disputed domain name advertises marketing and other services which are not services provided by the Complainant; and (iii) as the webpages at the disputed domain name did not provide any disclaimer on the nature of the relationship between the Respondent and the Complainant until after the filing of the Complaint. Therefore, the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name cannot fall under fair use. The Panel notes that there was no evidence submitted in the record that speaks directly to the other two conditions.

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.

The Panel has considered the Respondent's contention that he acted in good faith and with authorization from someone with authority to grant such permission. While it is theoretically possible that the Respondent believed he had received such authorization, the Respondent has failed to provide any credible or persuasive evidence to substantiate this assertion. The only materials submitted in support of this contention are a recording and transcripts of alleged telephone conversations, which are of limited probative value, lack clarity as to the identity of the other party and the substance of the discussions, and are not supported by any corroborating documentation. The Complainant, in turn, has denied authorizing the registration of the disputed domain name.

In the absence of credible evidence supporting the Respondent's claim of good faith, the Panel is not persuaded that the disputed domain name was registered and is being so used. Rather, on the balance of probabilities, the Panel finds it more likely than not that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in order to obtain an unfair commercial benefit by giving the (false) impression that it is somehow (officially) affiliated with the Complainant. The Panel also notes that the Respondent is involved in a commercial dispute with the Complainant's subsidiary in Republic of Korea. Specifically, the Panel notes that the Respondent runs a marketing business through the entity called Edulist, and the website at the disputed domain name contains links to the Edulist website. Further, in addition to health supplements, the website at the disputed domain name also promotes marketing-related services. In these circumstances, the use of the disputed domain name, which incorporates the Complainant's trademark, to promote such business activities supports a finding of bad faith. In particular, such use suggests an attempt to capitalize on the goodwill associated with the Complainant's mark by attracting Internet users to the Respondent's website – based on use of the Complainant's mark and reputation – for commercial gain.

Further, the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark in its entirety together with the geographic term "korea", which is inherently suggestive of an official website of the Complainant in the Korean market. The Panel finds that such composition creates a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

D. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking

Paragraph 15(e) of the Rules provides that, if after considering the submissions, the Panel finds that the Complaint was brought in bad faith, for example in an attempt at RDNH or to harass the domain-name holder, the Panel shall declare in its decision that the Complaint was brought in bad faith and constitutes an abuse of the administrative proceeding. The mere lack of success of the complaint is not, on its own, sufficient to constitute RDNH. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 4.16.

In light of the Panel's findings above, the Panel declines to make an RDNH finding.

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 <zinzinokorea.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Kathryn Lee/
Kathryn Lee
Sole Panelist
Date: June 9, 2026