

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fridababy, LLC v. 张辉 (zhang hui)
Case No. DCC2026-0004

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Fridababy, LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Abion AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is 张辉 (zhang hui), China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <fridaus.cc> (the "Disputed Domain Name") is registered with Alibaba Cloud Computing Ltd. d/b/a HiChina (www.net.cn) (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on March 17, 2026. On March 17, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On March 18, 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 (N/A) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 19, 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 in English on March 23, 2026.

On March 19, 2026, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the Disputed Domain Name is Chinese. On March 23, 2026, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the 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 the Respondent in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 24, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 13, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on April 15, 2026.

The Center appointed Rosita Li as the sole panelist in this matter on April 23, 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 was founded in 2016 and develops and sells products in the fields of baby care, pregnancy and fertility. Today, the Complainant's products can be found in over 50 countries and in over 40,000 stores throughout the United States.

Over the years, the Complainant has expanded its product offerings under dedicated brands like FRIDA FERTILITY, FRIDA MOM, and FRIDA BABY. The Complainant also enjoys a strong online presence via its official website and social media.

The Complainant is the owner of multiple trademark registrations for FRIDA, FRIDA BABY, FRIDA FERTILITY, and FRIDA MOM in different jurisdictions. These trademark registrations include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. International Registration No. 1591897 for FRIDA, registered in Classes 3, 5, 8, 10, 11, 20, 21, 24, 25, and 35, on December 17, 2020 designating, among others, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, the Republic of Korea, Singapore, and Switzerland;
2. United States Registration No. 6532417 for FRIDA, registered in Classes 8, 9, 10, 20, 21, and 35, on October 19, 2021;
3. Chinese Registration No. 61924304 for FRIDA, registered in Class 25 on October 21, 2023;
4. Chinese Registration No. 56575020 for FRIDA, registered in Class 25 on September 7, 2024;
5. International Registration No. 1716969 for FRIDA FERTILITY, registered in Classes 5, and 10 on February 9, 2023, designating Canada and the European Union;
6. United States Registration No. 6190838 for FRIDA MOM, registered in Classes 10, 11 on November 3, 2020;
7. International Registration No. 1576466 for FRIDA BABY, registered in Class 10 on December 17, 2020 designating, among others, Australia, Canada, Japan, Malaysia, and New Zealand; and
8. United States Registration No. 5155772 for FRIDA BABY, registered in Class 35 on March 7, 2017. (collectively, the "FRIDA Trademarks").

The Complainant is also the owner of several domain names comprising its FRIDA Trademarks, including:

1. <frida.com> (created on October 2, 1997);
2. <fridababy.com> (created on September 17, 2010);
3. <fridababy.us> (created on January 15, 2025); and

4. <fridababy.co> (created on January 11, 2022).

The Disputed Domain Name was registered by the Respondent on December 1, 2025.

On February 4, 2026, the Disputed Domain Name resolved to a website (the "Website") featuring the Complainant's logo FRIDA taken from the Complainant's official website, and purportedly offering the Complainant's products for sale. At the time of filing the Complaint on March 17, 2026, the Disputed Domain Name resolved to an inactive website as a result of takedown requests submitted to the relevant providers.

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.

(i) The Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service in which the Complainant has rights. The Complainant contends that:

- The Complainant is the owner of the FRIDA Trademarks in numerous jurisdictions all over the world.
- The Disputed Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's registered trademark FRIDA, followed by the relevant term "us". The FRIDA Trademark is clearly recognizable in the Disputed Domain Name, while the addition of the term "us" would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.
- The presence of the country-code Top-Level Domain extension ".cc" in the Disputed Domain Name may be disregarded when assessing confusing similarity.

(ii) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name. The Complainant contends that:

- The Complainant has never granted the Respondent any rights to use the FRIDA Trademarks in any form, including in the Disputed Domain Name.
- The Complainant has not found that the Respondent is known by the Disputed Domain Name.
- When searching for any trademarks incorporating the terms "frida us" or "fridaus" on online trademark search platforms, no results are to be found.
- Top suggested results of Google searches for "frida us" or "fridaus" do not show that the Respondent is known by the Disputed Domain Name.
- On February 4, 2026, the Website repeatedly featured the Complainant's copyrighted logo FRIDA, taken from the Complainant's official website, and displayed in prominent positions, namely on the top left corner of the website.
- The Website also made direct references to the FRIDA Trademarks. The Website displayed and offered for sale a number of products manufactured by the Complainant at a discounted price bearing the FRIDA Trademarks.
- The Website contained "Contact" and "Subscribe" buttons, as well as a shopping and payment section, suggesting to Internet users that they could contact the Complainant by inserting personal data, as well as allegedly purchasing the aforementioned discounted products.

- The Website is intended to create a misleading impression in Internet users' minds that it is directly related to, or authorized by, the Complainant, when it is not the case.
- (iii) The Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant contends that:
 - The Disputed Domain Name was registered in bad faith.
 - The FRIDA Trademarks predate the registration of the Disputed Domain Name, and the Respondent has never been authorized by the Complainant to register the Disputed Domain Name.
 - A simple search online on popular search engines regarding terms "frida us" or "fridaus" would have allowed the Respondent to inevitably learn about the Complainant, its trademark and business, because the top-returned results directly relate to the Complainant.
 - The Disputed Domain Name resolved to the Website appearing to be the Complainant's original website, repeatedly displaying a logo identical to the Complainant's copyrighted logo for FRIDA in prominent positions, as well as making unauthorized use of copyrighted images of the Complainant, while providing several mentions clearly referring to the Complainant, its products, trademarks and business activity, as well as displaying and allegedly selling discounted products bearing the FRIDA Trademarks.
 - Furthermore, the Website contained "Contact" and "Subscribe" buttons, suggesting to Internet users that they can contact the Complainant by inserting personal data, as well as a shopping cart with a payment section.
 - Moreover, the Website showcased the copyright notice incorporating the FRIDA Trademarks and Complainant's trade name "© 2019-2025 Fridababy, LLC".
 - Such use of the Website shows that the Respondent registered it in bad faith, having the Complainant and its FRIDA Trademarks in mind.
 - The Respondent also registered numerous domain names incorporating third parties' trademarks and had been involved in at least two UDRP cases in which the panels have ordered the transfer of the domain names <elfontheshelfs.xyz> and <volvotrucksclub.com>.¹
 - A reverse Whois lookup using the Respondent's email revealed that the Respondent has registered the domain names <brooksrunnings.us>, infringing upon the BROOKS RUNNING and BROOKS trademarks of Brooks Sports, Inc., <gymsharkofficial.us> and <gymsharks.us>, infringing upon the GYM SHARK trademark of Gymshark, Ltd., and <hokas.us>, infringing upon the HOKA trademark of Deckers Outdoor Corporation, among many others.
 - The Respondent's behaviour clearly shows a recurring pattern of abusive conduct, in which the Respondent has registered domain names that infringe upon third-party trademarks.

B. Respondent

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

¹ This Panel notes that the respondent in *Volvo Trademark Holding Aktiebolag c/o AB Volvo v. 张慧 (Zhang Hui)*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-1808](#) regarding <volvotrucksclub.com> is 张慧 (Zhang Hui), which is not identical to the present Respondent.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Preliminary Issue: Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the Disputed Domain Name is Chinese. 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 proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including the fact that:

- The Disputed Domain Name is composed of Latin characters and incorporates English terms, includes the Complainant's FRIDA Trademark and the term "us", an English geographical indication for the United States;
- The Website is entirely in English;
- The Respondent has been involved in a number of previous adverse UDRP disputes delivered in English;²
- The Complainant, who is based in the United States, and the Complainant's representative, who is based in Sweden, are not familiar with the Chinese language, whereas the English language is commonly used internationally; and
- If the Complainant had to translate the Complaint and subsequent communications in Chinese, such translation would entail significant additional costs for the Complainant and delay in the proceedings.

The Respondent did not make any submissions nor respond to communications with respect to the language of the proceeding.

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).

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

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.

Based on the available materials, the Panel finds the Complainant has shown rights in respect of the FRIDA Trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

² Ibid.

The Panel finds that the entirety of the Complainant's FRIDA mark is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name. The addition of the term "us", an acronym for the United States, would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under this first element. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's FRIDA mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.8.

The term "cc" is a standard Top-Level Domain extension and may be disregarded when assessing whether the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's FRIDA Trademarks. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.

Based on the available materials, 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.

In accordance with [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1, where a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term (at the Second- or Top-Level), UDRP panels have largely held that such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. The Disputed Domain Name has included the FRIDA mark in its entirety, plus the geographical term "us", which would easily be understood as referring to the Complainant's FRIDA brand and its headquarters and operations in the United States. Thus, the Disputed Domain Name is likely to be interpreted by Internet users as indicating some form of relationship or association with the Complainant.

Furthermore, in accordance with [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.2, beyond looking at the domain name itself and the nature of any additional terms, the Panel will also assess whether the overall facts and circumstances of the case support a claimed fair use, including the following:

- whether the domain name registration and use by the respondent is consistent with a broader pattern of bona fide activity (whether online or offline) and not to take advantage of a complainant's mark in a bad faith or abusive way;
- whether it is clear to Internet users visiting the respondent's website that it is not operated by the complainant especially where this is readily apparent from the site look-and-feel and content (which may include the use of a reasonably clear and prominent/visible disclaimer); and
- whether a prominent link (including with explanatory text) is provided to the relevant trademark owner's website.

In the present case, the Panel finds that the Website does not appear to be a bona fide offering of goods or services, but instead appears to take advantage of the Complainant's FRIDA Trademarks in a bad faith or abusive way:

- The Website repeatedly featured the Complainant's logo FRIDA in prominent positions;
- The Website displayed and offered for sale, a number of products purportedly manufactured by the Complainant at a discounted price bearing the FRIDA Trademarks; and
- The Website is designed as an online shopping platform, suggesting to Internet users that they could share their personal data and purchase the aforementioned discounted products.

The Panel finds that the Respondent appears to be intentionally misleading consumers into believing that the Disputed Domain Name and the Website are linked in some manner to the Complainant in order to trade on the fame and goodwill of the Complainant for its own commercial gain.

Given the above, the Panel finds that there is a real risk that the public would assume that the Disputed Domain Name is authorized by or affiliated with the Complainant. It is clear that the use of the Disputed Domain Name and operation of the Website, is an attempt by the Respondent to capitalize on the goodwill and reputation of the Complainant and its FRIDA Trademarks. The Panel does not consider this to be a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name nor a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Further or alternatively, the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, claimed passing off, or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.

Based on the available materials, 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Disputed Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's FRIDA mark in its entirety. The Panel also notes that the Disputed Domain Name was registered on December 1, 2025, well after the registration of the Complainant's FRIDA Trademarks. The Panel is satisfied that the FRIDA Trademarks are well known and reputable, with long-standing and substantial use by the Complainant in the field of baby care, pregnancy and fertility. The Panel is prepared to find that the Respondent knew or should have known that the registration of the Disputed Domain Name would be confusingly similar to the FRIDA Trademarks. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent's registration of the Disputed Domain Name, which is confusingly similar to the FRIDA Trademarks, is a clear indication of bad faith.

In accordance with paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy, the circumstances indicate that the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's website and its FRIDA Trademarks, in particular, in relation to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, endorsement of the Website and of the products featured on the Website.

The Disputed Domain Name resolved to the Website repeatedly displaying a logo identical to the Complainant's logo for FRIDA in prominent positions, as well as making unauthorized use of copyrighted images of the Complainant, while providing several mentions referring to the Complainant, its products, trademarks and business activity. The Panel finds that the Respondent, through the Website, appears to be mimicking the Complainant's website, while the circumstances do not show any conceivable good faith use. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4

Further, the Respondent also appears to have engaged in a pattern of registering domain names corresponding to the distinct marks of other brand owners – a clear pattern of abuse and indicator of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.2.

The Complainant's reverse Whois lookup using the Respondent's email revealed that the Respondent has registered the domain names <brooksrunnings.us>, reminiscent of the BROOKS RUNNING and BROOKS trademarks of Brooks Sports, Inc., <gymsharkofficial.us> and <gymsharks.us>, reminiscent of the GYM SHARK trademark of Gymshark, Ltd., and <hokas.us>, reminiscent of the HOKA trademark of Deckers Outdoor Corporation, among many others. Such findings suggest a pattern of abusive registrations and add to the Panel's conclusion of bad faith on the part of the Respondent.

By reason of the matters stated above, and with no response from the Respondent, the Panel is prepared to find the Respondent's aim in registering the Disputed Domain Name was to target, profit from, and exploit the goodwill and reputation of the Complainant and its FRIDA Trademarks.

At the time of filing the Complaint, the Disputed Domain Name resolved to an inactive website. This does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the circumstances of this case.

Having reviewed the materials, the Panel finds that the Respondent's registration and inappropriate use of the Disputed Domain Name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 <fridaus.cc> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Rosita Li/

Rosita Li

Sole Panelist

Date: May 7, 2026