

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Vizta Pte. Ltd. v. andy wang, weidian
Case No. D2025-2013

1. The Parties

Complainant is Vizta Pte. Ltd., Singapore, represented by Han Kun Law Offices, China.

Respondent is andy wang, weidian, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <magicchessgogo.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 21, 2025. On May 21, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 21, 2025, 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 (Unknown Respondent / Privacy Protected) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on May 23, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on May 27, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 30, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 19, 2025. Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on May 30, 2025. However, Respondent did not file any formal response. Accordingly, the Center notified the commencement of panel appointment process on June 20, 2025.

The Center appointed Yijun Tian as the sole panelist in this matter on June 25, 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

A. Complainant

Complainant, Vizta Pte. Ltd., is a company incorporated in Singapore. It is an affiliated entity controlled by Moonton Games, which operates a game where players strategically place and combine different heroes with unique abilities to battle opponents in an automatic combat system. Magic Chess: Go Go is a popular auto-chess style game developed by Complainant.

Complainant has rights in the MAGIC CHESS: GO GO and MAGIC CHESS: GO GO related marks. Complainant is the owner of numerous MAGIC CHESS: GO GO trademarks worldwide, including the Singaporean trademark filed on November 18, 2024 (the Singaporean Trademark registration number 40202426980Y), and the Malaysian trademark registered on October 1, 2024 (the Malaysian Trademark registration number TM2024030376).

B. Respondent

Respondent is andy wang, weidian, China.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 4, 2025. According to the Complaint and supporting evidence, the disputed domain resolves to a website purporting to be a website of the game “Magic Chess Go Go”, featuring sections such as “About Magic Chess Go Go”, “FAQs”, “Player Comments”, “Download Magic Chess Go Go” and “2025 Magic Chess Go Go All rights reserved” (Annex 5 to the Complaint). The download links for both the Windows and MacOS versions redirect users to the third-party platform BlueStacks, requiring installation of its software to access the game (Annex 6 to the Complaint).

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical to its MAGIC CHESS: GO GO trademark, as it incorporates the mark in its entirety. The omission of spaces and punctuation does not create any meaningful distinction between the disputed domain name and Complainant’s trademark.

Complainant contends that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to it.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not formally reply to Complainant’s contentions but, in an email dated May 30, 2025, claimed to be a loyal fan who created the website to promote the game without commercial intent, expressed willingness to transfer the disputed domain name, and requested compensation for the disputed domain name registration and technical efforts.

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

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.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 Complainant's MAGIC CHESS: GO GO mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

While the omission of punctuation may bear on the assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the omission of such a character does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Based on the available record, 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 Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

While 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 often impossible 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. 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 record, the Panel finds that Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent has not submitted a formal response nor provided any evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests under the circumstances set out in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy or otherwise. In an email dated May 30, 2025, Respondent claimed to be a loyal fan who created the website to promote the game without commercial intent, expressed willingness to transfer the disputed domain name, and requested compensation for domain registration and technical efforts. However, this assertion does not establish a legitimate interest under the Policy.

More specifically:

(i) there has been no evidence adduced to show that Respondent has used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Respondent has not provided evidence or reasons to justify the choice of the term "magicchessgogo", Complainant's MAGIC CHESS: GO GO trademark, in the disputed domain name. There has been no evidence to show that Complainant has licensed or otherwise permitted Respondent to use the MAGIC CHESS: GO GO trademark or to apply for or use any domain name incorporating the MAGIC CHESS: GO GO marks;

(ii) there has been no evidence adduced to show that Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name. There has been no evidence adduced to show that Respondent has any registered trademark rights with respect to the disputed domain name. Respondent registered the disputed domain name on March 4, 2025, after the MAGIC CHESS: GO GO mark was registered in Singapore (since 2024). The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's MAGIC CHESS: GO GO marks, and carries a high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1); and

(iii) there has been no evidence adduced to show that Respondent was making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Panels have found that a respondent's fan site must be active, genuinely noncommercial, and clearly distinct from any official complainant site. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.7.1. By contrast, the website looks and feels to be an official site of Complainant and includes download links that redirect users to the third-party platform BlueStacks, requiring installation of its software to access the game (Annex 6 to the Complaint). This suggests Respondent is attempting to derive benefit from Internet traffic attracted by the disputed domain name, which incorporates Complainant's trademark.

Based on the available record, 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 Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

Based on the information provided by Complainant, the Panel finds that Complainant has established a reputation in the MAGIC CHESS: GO GO trademark in connection with its products and services. The disputed domain name, registered in 2025, incorporates the trademark in its entirety (save for the omission of punctuation) and features it prominently on the associated website. These circumstances make it inconceivable that Respondent was unaware of Complainant's rights at the time of registration. This is further supported by Respondent's own statement.

Respondent has used the website to promote what appear to be Complainant's services, while prominently displaying a logo similar to Complainant's MAGIC CHESS: GO GO mark. The website also provides download links that redirect users to the third-party platform BlueStacks, requiring installation of its software to access the game (Annex 6 to the Complaint).

Thus, the Panel concludes that Respondent is using a confusingly similar domain name with the intent to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant. Such use constitutes bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 disputed domain name <magicchessgogo.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Yijun Tian/

Yijun Tian

Sole Panelist

Date: July 27, 2025