

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Alibaba Group Holding Limited v. pingguo hanguo
Case No. D2025-0948

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Alibaba Group Holding Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Convey Srl, Italy.

The Respondent is pingguo hanguo, Cambodia.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <albbidn-cme.co> and <dhlalibaba-idn.org> are registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on March 7, 2025. On March 10, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On March 11, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 11, 2025, 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 13, 2025.

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 March 14, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 3, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on April 4, 2025.

The Center appointed Gonalo M. C. Da Cunha Ferreira as the sole panelist in this matter on April 9, 2025. 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 Chinese multinational technology company specializing in e-commerce, retail, Internet, and technology. Founded on June 28, 1999, the company provides consumer-to-consumer, business-to-consumer, and business-to-business sales services via Chinese and global marketplaces, as well as local consumer, digital media and entertainment, logistics and cloud computing services.

The Complainant is one of the world's largest retailers and e-commerce companies and is active in over 190 countries. For its business the Complainant registered the domain name <alibaba.com>. This domain name is resolved to the website and platform of the Complainant.

The Complainant is the owner of various trademark registrations ALIBABA, such as the following ones:

- the Indonesian Trademark Registration No. IDM000519183 - ALIBABA - Nice Cl.: 9, 16, 35, 36, 38, 39, 41, 42, registered on April 22, 2021;
- The Cambodian Trademark serial no. KH/41185/11 - ALIBABA - Nice Cl.: 36, registered on 2012, July 23;.

The Disputed Domain Names were registered on September 29, 2024.

The Complainant sent to the Respondent on February 24, 2025, and on February 17, 2025, cease-and-desist letters in order to notify the infringement of the Complainant's trademark rights, requesting the immediate cease of any use, and the transfer, of the disputed domain names to the Complainant but the Respondent did not answer.

At the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain name <albbidn-cme.co> resolved to a marketplace website which was displaying the ALIBABA trademarks and the disputed domain name <dhlalibaba-idn.org> resolved to a website displaying DHL related contents passing off as an approved DHL shipping service in Indonesia. According to the Complaint, when clicked on the "login" tab on the website connected to the disputed domain name <dhlalibaba-idn.org>, users were redirected to a webpage, showing the ALIBABA trademark and asking the users to log in.

On the date the Panel issued this Decision, the disputed domain names pointed to a "Sorry, you have been blocked. You are unable to access albbidn-cme.co" message.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that:

1. the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the trademarks ALIBABA.
2. the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".org" and the country-code Top Level Domain ("ccTLD") ".co" do not affect the evidence of the confusing similarity of the disputed domain names with respect to the Complainant's trademark ALIBABA.

3. the disputed domain name <albbidn-cme.co> is virtually identical to the Complainant's ALIBABA mark, differing only by the deletion of the vocals "i" and "a" in the disputed domain name and the addition of the string "idn" that seems to be an abbreviation of "indonesia" and the string "-cme" that seems to be an abbreviation of "e-commerce".
4. the disputed domain name <dhlalibaba-idn.org> indeed fully incorporates the word elements of the Complainant's trademark ALIBABA, with the mere addition of both the prefix "dhl" before the term "alibaba" as well as also of the suffix "-idn" after the term "alibaba", where "dhl" is a globally renown leader in the logistics industry, specialized in international shipping, courier services and transportation, while "-idn" is likely referring to the country Indonesia.
5. the Respondent is not a licensee or authorized dealer of the Complainant, nor has the Respondent been authorized by the Complainant to use the trademark ALIBABA or any variation/misspelling/typosquatting of the trademark ALIBABA in the disputed domain names or in any other manner.
6. the Complainant is not in possession of, nor aware of the existence of, any evidence demonstrating that the Respondent might be commonly known by the disputed domain names or names corresponding to the disputed domain names as an individual, business, or other organization.
7. the Respondent has not provided the Complainant with any evidence of its use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services before any notice of the dispute.
8. the Respondent's use can be considered neither a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names.
9. the Respondent did not intend to use the disputed domain names in connection with any legitimate purpose.
10. the Respondent could not have possibly ignored the existence of the Complainant's ALIBABA trademarks, from which the disputed domain names are both confusingly similar.
11. the disputed domain names have been pointed to the websites where the Complainant's trademark ALIBABA is displayed.
12. the Respondent was well aware of the trademark ALIBABA, and the Respondent has registered the disputed domain names with the intention to refer to the Complainant and its trademarks.
13. the Respondent's purpose is to capitalize on the reputation of the Complainant's trademarks by diverting Internet users seeking ALIBABA products and services to its website for financial gain, by intentionally creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's ALIBABA trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its web sites and/or the goods offered or promoted through said websites.
14. the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions

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 Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The disputed domain name <albbidn-cme.co> is a misspelling of the Complainant's ALIBABA mark, differing only by the deletion of the vowels "i" and "a" in the disputed domain name. The content of the website displaying the Complainant's ALIBABA trademark, further supports Panel's finding on confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.15.

The disputed domain name <dhlalibaba-idn.org> fully incorporates the Complainant's trademark ALIBABA, with the mere addition of the prefix "dhl" before the term "alibaba" and the suffix "-idn" after the word "alibaba". [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7 and 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 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 3.0](#), 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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, such as impersonation/passing off can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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 Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitute bad faith under paragraph 4(b) of the Policy. The Panel finds that the Respondent's actions have created a likelihood of confusion regarding the source of the websites, which display the Complainant's trademark. Given that the Respondent was aware of the ALIBABA trademarks and registered the disputed domain names to confuse Internet users, the Panel concludes that the registration and use were conducted in bad faith.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under the Policy, as it involves the deliberate attempt to mislead Internet users by impersonating the Complainant.

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 names <albbidn-cme.co> and <dhlalibaba-idn.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Gonçalo M. C. Da Cunha Ferreira/

Gonçalo M. C. Da Cunha Ferreira

Sole Panelist

Date: April 22, 2025