

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Snowflake Inc. v. wang liang, Cambodia  
Case No. D2025-1760

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Snowflake Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Schwegman Lundberg & Woessner, P.A., United States.

The Respondent is wang liang, Cambodia, Cambodia.

### **2. The Domain Names and Registrar**

The disputed domain names <snowflakeai.online>, <snowflakeai.site>, and <snowflakeai.xyz> are 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 1, 2025 regarding the disputed domain names and another domain name. On May 2, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar and another registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On May 2 and 5, 2025, the Registrar and another registrar transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Unknown Registrant / Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 5, 2025 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar and another registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on May 8, 2025 only concerning the disputed domain names. On May 19, 2025, the Center informed the Parties and another registrar that the other domain name had been removed by the Complainant from the current proceeding.

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 May 20, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 9, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 10, 2025.

The Center appointed George R. F. Souter as the sole panelist in this matter on June 16, 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 global cloud computing-based data cloud company trading under its SNOWFLAKE trademark, with over 11,000 global customers. Specifically, within the realm of artificial intelligence ("AI"), the Complainant applies AI to data, enabling users to run analytical workflow on unstructured data, develop agentic apps and train models using both unstructured and structured data, all with minimal operational overhead and end-to-end governance.

The Complainant has provided the Panel with details of numerous registrations of its SNOWFLAKE trademark, domestically and internationally, including United States Registration No. 5610829, registered on November 20, 2018 and United Kingdom Registration No. 00917736083, registered on May 25, 2018.

The disputed domain name <snowflakeai.xyz> was registered on January 7, 2025. The disputed domain name <snoflakeai.site> was registered on January 10, 2025. The disputed domain name <snowflakeai.online> was registered on January 10, 2025.

According to the Complaint, all three disputed domain names previously resolved to websites which displayed the Complainant's trademark and logo, required username and password to log in, and claimed to offer data optimization services that are similar to those offered by the Complainant. At the time of filing of the amended Complaint, the disputed domain names were no longer accessible.

#### **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 the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the SNOWFLAKE trademark, the Respondent is not generally known by any of the disputed domain names, is not using the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, and that the Complainant has never granted permission to the Respondent to use its SNOWFLAKE trademark in connection with the registration of a domain name, or otherwise.

##### **B. Respondent**

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions and was notified of its default by the Center on June 10, 2025.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

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 each of 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 mere addition of the initialism “ai”, which is currently in common use and is known to stand for “artificial intelligence”, to the Complainant’s trademark in each of the disputed domain names certainly does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 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.

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

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

The Panel finds it implausible to conclude that any of the three disputed domain names was registered other than with the Complainant’s SNOWFLAKE trademark in mind, and this is confirmed by the Respondent’s use of the Complainant’s trademark and logo on the websites at the disputed domain names as referred to above.

It is beyond doubt from prior decisions under the Policy that the use of a disputed domain name to offer for sale of goods and services directly competing with genuine goods or services offered by the Complainant constitutes use of the disputed domain name in bad faith. This is clearly the case in the specific circumstances of the present case, and the Panel finds that all three disputed domain names are being used in bad faith.

The disputed domain names are no longer in active use. Considering the overall circumstances of this case, particularly the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant’s SNOWFLAKE trademark in the relevant industry, and the composition of the disputed domain names incorporating the Complainant’s trademark in its

entirety together with a term referring to the Complainant's business, the Panel finds that the current non-use of the disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3.

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 <snowflakeai.xyz>, <snowflakeai.site>, and <snowflakeai.online> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/George R. F. Souter/*

**George R. F. Souter**

Sole Panelist

Date: June 30, 2025