

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Alibaba Innovation Private Limited v. Jian Liu
Case No. DCO2026-0006

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Alibaba Innovation Private Limited, Singapore, represented by Convey Srl, Italy.

The Respondent is Jian Liu, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <wan-ai.co> (the “Domain Name”) 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 January 19, 2026. On January 19, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On January 20, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the 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 January 21, 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 21, 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 of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on January 22, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 11, 2026. The Respondent filed a Response with the Center on February 9, 2026.

The Center appointed Ian Lowe as the sole panelist in this matter on February 19, 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 part of the Alibaba Group, a leading Chinese multinational conglomerate founded on June 28, 1999. The group operates globally across a wide range of sectors including e-commerce, retail, Internet and technology. It is active in over 190 countries.

As part of its AI strategy, Alibaba has developed WAN, an open-source video generation framework capable of producing high quality, multilingual video content from text prompts. Its latest version, WAN 2.6, offers multi-shot narrative generation, native audio-visual synchronisation, advanced role-playing functions and significantly improved portrait realism and lighting.

The Complainant registered the domain name <wanxai.com> on November 4, 2023. Following the rebrand of its product from WANX to WAN in February 2025, it registered <wan.art> and <wan.video>. All three domain names resolve to the Complainant's official website and platform at "wan.video" (the "Complainant's Website").

The Complainant is the proprietor of numerous registered trademarks worldwide that comprise WAN, including Hong Kong trademark number 306741441 WANX, registered on May 2, 2025; European Union trademark number 19113519 WANX, registered on August 2, 2025; United Kingdom trademark number 4164944 WAN registered on July 25, 2025; and Indonesia trademark number IDM001380513 WAN registered on September 18, 2025;

The Domain Name was registered on July 29, 2025. It resolves to a website at "www.xrmm.com" featuring "Wan AI" in the banner and the headline "AI Video Generator with Multi-Shot & Reference Video – Wan 2.6". It displays a series of rolling videos that are identical to those used on the Complainant's Website and purports to offer for sale a range of credits for use of the Complainant's product, WAN 2.6. The Respondent's website gives no information as to the operator of the website, save for a contact email address [...][@xrmm.com](mailto:).

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to its WANX and WAN trademarks, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name and that the Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

B. Respondent

The Respondent filed a Response on February 9, 2026 stating only "Agree and cooperate in transferring the domain name wan-ai.co".

6. Discussion and Findings

For this Complaint to succeed in relation to the Domain Name the Complainant must prove that:

- (i) the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the

Complainant has rights; and

- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[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.

Ignoring the country code Top-Level Domain ".co", the Domain Name comprises the entirety of the Complainant's WAN trademark (the "Mark"), with the addition of the term "-ai". The Panel finds that the addition of this term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the Mark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights, and 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 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. Accordingly, 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.

The Complainant has made out a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name. The Respondent has used the Domain Name for a website offering for sale the Complainant's WAN 2.6 product, featuring the Mark, and without any indication of its lack of relationship with the Complainant. Furthermore, the Respondent's website uses substantial video footage copied from the Complainant's Website. Such activity does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services. There is no suggestion that the Respondent has ever been known by the Domain Name. The Respondent has chosen not to respond substantively to the Complaint or to take any steps to counter the prima facie case established by the Complainant. In the circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name.

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 Domain Name comprises the entirety of the Mark with the addition of the term “ai”. The Respondent has used the Domain Name for a website prominently featuring the Mark and copies of the Complainant’s video footage and purporting to offer for sale the Complainant’s AI video generation tool. Accordingly, the Panel is in no doubt that the Respondent had the Complainant and its rights in the Mark in mind when it registered the Domain Name.

The Respondent’s Website fails to disclose accurately and prominently the lack of any relationship between the Respondent and the Complainant. In the circumstances, without any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name, the Panel finds that the Respondent has registered and used the Domain Name to take unfair advantage of the Complainant’s WAN trademark and to deceive Internet users into believing that the Domain Name is operated or authorized by the Complainant; thereby attracting Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Mark as to its source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith and the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 Name <wan-ai.co> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ian Lowe/

Ian Lowe

Sole Panelist

Date: February 27, 2026