ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Guangzhou Gefeng Clothing Co., Ltd. v. Wenxi Song, Polar Bear Group Limited
Case No. D2026-2210

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Guangzhou Gefeng Clothing Co., Ltd., China, represented by Advance Law Firm, China.

The Respondent is Wenxi Song, Polar Bear Group Limited, Hong Kong, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <gloeria.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 22, 2026. On May 22, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 22, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 27, 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 June 1, 2026.

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 the Respondent in English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 3, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 23, 2026. The Center received an email from the email address associated with the disputed domain name, which is available on the website at the disputed domain name, on June 4, 2026. The Center notifies the Parties of the commencement of panel appointment process on June 24, 2026.

The Center appointed James Wang as the sole panelist in this matter on July 6, 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

The Complainant is the owner of the Chinese women's clothing brand GOELIA (previously known as and rebranded from GLORIA, collectively referred to as the "GOELIA brand").

Founded in 1995, the GOELIA brand enjoys high reputation in China and has received numerous honors and awards from various platforms and associations of the clothing industry.

The Complainant, directly or through its affiliated entities, owns multiple GOELIA and GLORIA trademark registrations, including but not limited to:

- China trademark registration No. 5895218 for GOELIA, registered on March 28, 2010;
- China trademark registration No. 5895219 for GOELIA, registered on February 14, 2010; and
- China trademark registration No. 22525060 for GLORIA, registered on April 7, 2018.

The Complainant operates official websites under the domain names "www.goelia1995.com" and "www.gloria.com.cn". Subscribed users of the websites are located in more than 190 jurisdictions worldwide.

The Complainant has over 200 physical stores under the GOELIA brand in different Chinese cities, including Xi'an, and worldwide.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 25, 2025 and resolves to a website purporting to offer Gloeria branded women's clothing. The website's "Our Story" page lists the contact information of a Chinese company located in Xi'an, China, while the store location under the "Contact Us" page displays a physical address, which apparently belongs to a restaurant in the United States of America.

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 the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademarks in which the Complainant has rights. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Center received an email on June 4, 2026 from the email address associated with the disputed domain name, which is available on the website at the disputed domain name saying "[w]e apologize, but we do not require collaboration at this time". The Respondent submitted no formal response to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that:

(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 and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has provided evidence that the Complainant has rights in multiple GOELIA and GLORIA trademark registrations.

The applicable Top-Level Domain ("TLD") in a domain name is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is typically disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. Therefore, the TLD ".com" shall be disregarded under the confusing similarity test in this case. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 1.11.1.

The term "gloeria" differs from the GOELIA trademark only by shifting the second letter "l" to replace the third-to-last letter "r". Similarly, the term "gloeria" differs from the GLORIA trademark only by adding the letter "e" between "glo" and "ria". Such minor differences are not readily noticeable to the relevant public exercising an ordinary degree of attention. The Panel finds that the GOELIA and GLORIA trademarks remain recognizable in the disputed domain name. Therefore, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to both of the Complainant's GOELIA and GLORIA trademarks. See WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 1.7 and 1.9.

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

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the often impossible 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. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1.

According to the Complaint, the Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant and has never been authorized by the Complainant to use the GLORIA and GOELIA trademarks or register similar names as domain names.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website, purporting to offer Gloeria branded women's clothing and closely resembling the Complainant's official websites in appearance. Further, the website's "Our Story" page lists the contact information of a Chinese company, which is different from the registrant information provided by the Registrar, and the store location under the "Contact Us" page displays a physical address, which apparently belongs to a restaurant in the United States of America. Given that the disputed domain name is a misspelling of the Complainant's GLORIA and GOELIA trademarks, that the Respondent did not submit any formal response, and that the website at the disputed domain name appears to display a fake store address, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name has not been used for a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate commercial or fair use. Therefore, such use does not confer any rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has made a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, and the Respondent failed to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Given the distinctiveness, long history and strong reputation of the Complainant's GOELIA brand in China, it is inconceivable that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the GOELIA brand at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name. This can be further corroborated by the fact that the Respondent is apparently located in Hong Kong, China, the website to which the disputed domain name resolves seems to be operated by a Chinese company located in Xi'an, where the Complainant has physical stores, and the disputed domain name is a misspelling of the Complainant's GLORIA and GOELIA trademarks. The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website purporting to offer women's clothing, which is the Complainant's core business. Considering the Panel's discussion under the section 6.B above and the lack of a formal response from the Respondent, the Panel finds that by using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.4.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel therefore 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 <gloeria.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/James Wang/
James Wang
Sole Panelist
Date: July 20, 2026