

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Alibaba Group Holding Limited v. Rajeev Singh
Case No. DIO2026-0011

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Alibaba Group Holding Limited, Cayman Islands, United Kingdom, represented by Convey S.r.l., Italy.

The Respondent is Rajeev Singh, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <agentbay.io> 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 March 17, 2026. On March 18, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 20, 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, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 20, 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 March 24, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the .IO Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy”), the Rules for .IO Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for .IO 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 March 26, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 15, 2026. On March 31, 2026, the Respondent requested an extension to file a Response. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5(b), the new due date for Response was April 19, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any formal response. Accordingly, the Center notified Commencement of Panel Appointment Process on April 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Jeremy Speres as the sole panelist in this matter on April 27, 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 a multinational technology and e-commerce company founded in 1999, in Hangzhou, Zhejiang, China. As part of its Artificial Intelligence (“AI”) strategy, the Complainant developed “AgentBay” - also known as “Wuying” - a cloud-based platform that provides a secure and pre-configured environment for running AI Agents, which launched publicly in July 2025.

The Complainant’s wider corporate group owns various trademark registrations for AGENTBAY, including European Union Trademark Registration No. 019213395 AGENTBAY in classes 9 and 42, having a registration date of November 15, 2025 (and a filing date of July 4, 2025), and United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00004229333, having a registration date of September 26, 2025 (and a filing date of July 4, 2025), both in the name of Cloud Intelligence Assets Holding (Singapore) Private Limited (a member of the Complainant’s corporate group).

The disputed domain name was registered on December 26, 2024. Presently, the disputed domain name does not resolve to any website, however, the Complainant’s evidence establishes that, at the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website entitled “AgentHub – The World’s Most Complete AI Agent Directory”, ostensibly offering a directory of AI agents.

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.

Although it admits that the disputed domain name was registered before the public launch of the Complainant’s AGENTBAY service in July 2025, the Complainant argues that the disputed domain name was registered and has been used in bad faith in order to capitalize on confusion with the Complainant’s mark for the following reasons: The Complainant’s AGENTBAY service was developed and was already in use within the Complainant’s internal cloud-computing ecosystem “Wuying” prior to registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant had also registered the domain name <agb.ai> in 2021, which reflects its naming strategy for its AgentBay project. The Complainant’s AGENTBAY mark is a coined term, and, in the circumstances, the Respondent’s selection of an identical domain name for use in an overlapping sector cannot reasonably be attributed to coincidence.

B. Respondent

Apart from requesting the automatic extension to file a Response, the Respondent did not formally reply to the Complainant’s contentions. In its informal response, the Respondent stated: “Whats going on. we have this domain, we are using to track AI agents in the agentic world”.

6. Discussion and Findings

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 1.7.¹

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 identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Given the Panel's findings in relation to the third element below, there is no need for the Panel to consider the second element.

C. Registered or Used in Bad Faith

The Panel finds, on balance of probabilities, that the Complainant has not satisfied its burden of proving that the disputed domain name was registered or has been used in bad faith.

The disputed domain name was registered before the public launch of the Complainant's AGENTBAY service in July 2025, and before any of its trademarks were filed or registered.

The Complainant claims that the AGENTBAY mark was already in use internally prior to registration of the disputed domain name. While some limited evidence is provided in this respect, the Complainant does not show that the Respondent had any insider knowledge of such use, nor does it explain how an external party like the Respondent could have otherwise been aware of the Complainant's adoption of the mark through internal use.

The Complainant has presented no evidence of public use prior to launch of the "AgentBay" service in July 2025. The Panel has independently² conducted Internet searches for the term "agentbay" and can find no evidence that it was used publicly by the Complainant prior to registration of the disputed domain name, nor any evidence of any exposure to the term that could have led the Respondent to anticipate the launch of the service or any nascent trademark rights. The earliest reference that the Panel could find was the initial commit to the Complainant's GitHub repository, dated May 26, 2025.

The Complainant's reliance on its 2021 registration of <agb.ai> does not assist the Complainant. The Complainant has not presented any evidence showing that this domain name was used in connection with the AGENTBAY mark. This domain name does not presently resolve to any website, and the Panel has independently viewed the Internet Archive records for this domain name, which do not show any use for an AGENTBAY offering at all – the only use being for registrar parking pages displaying "agb.ai".³ The

¹ Noting the substantive similarities between the Policy and the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy ("UDRP"), the Panel has referred to prior UDRP cases and the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), where appropriate.

² In accordance with its powers articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, the Panel is entitled to conduct limited independent research into matters of public record. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.8.

³"www.web.archive.org/web/20240619190919/http://www.agb.ai/"

Complainant has also not presented any evidence showing why the Respondent, assuming he was aware of the Complainant's ownership of this domain name (which itself, in the absence of evidence, does not appear evident) would or should have deduced that this domain name concerned an AGENTBAY offering. The term "agentbay" does not readily come to mind when faced with "agb", and it would likely take some additional influence, in the form of prior exposure to the AGENTBAY project for example, to move from "agb" to "agentbay", for which there is no evidence in the record.

The Respondent has provided a plausible explanation for its selection of "agentbay" unrelated to the Complainant, affirmed also by its actual use of the domain name supported by the Complainant's own evidence. The Panel has also independently viewed the Internet Archive records for the disputed domain name, which show that as early as February 2025, the Respondent had used the disputed domain name for the AI agent directory described in the Factual Background section above. This predates the earliest public exposure of the AGENTBAY service (in May 2025), as well as the Complainant's trademark application dates.

In the circumstances, based on the evidence in the record, the Respondent registered and began using the disputed domain name prior to any public use of or trademark applications for the Complainant's mark. In these circumstances, it is difficult to conceive of how the Respondent could have had the Complainant's mark in mind when it registered and first began using the disputed domain name.

Noting that the Policy's bad faith element is disjunctive, requiring bad faith registration or bad faith use, the Complainant could still succeed if it showed that the disputed domain name had, subsequent to its registration, been used to target the Complainant. There is, however, no evidence of this in the record. The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name for its AI agent directory appears to have remained consistent from at least as early as February 2025 until shortly before filing of the Complaint. If the Respondent did not have the Complainant in mind in February 2025 (there is no evidence suggesting that he had, as detailed above), then the Respondent has apparently done nothing since then to suggest that he subsequently targeted the Complainant.

Admittedly, the disputed domain name has been used in the AI sector, overlapping to a degree with the Complainant's offering. However, the Second-Level Domain "agentbay" consists of two dictionary words which, when combined, are descriptive or at least suggestive in the context of the Respondent's AI agent directory, and it is perfectly plausible, and indeed on this record more likely, that the Respondent landed on this term independently, without knowledge of the Complainant's mark.

The Panel finds the third element of the Policy has not been established.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Jeremy Speres/
Jeremy Speres
Sole Panelist
Date: May 6, 2026