

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Anker Innovations Limited v. Xujin jiang, xing zhou, gf fs, xiang liu, dfdsf ddsf fdsd, lanying Han, Tim Hahn, Kathrin Moritz, Valentina Geiger, Learco Marra, Colomba Mauro, Montague Grondin, Yanling Lv, zheng zhou  
Case No. D2025-2111

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Anker Innovations Limited, Hong Kong, China, represented by Boehmert & Boehmert, Germany.

The Respondents are Xujin jiang, China, xing zhou, China, gf fs, China, xiang liu, China, dfdsf ddsf fdsd, China, lanying Han, China, Tim Hahn, Germany, Kathrin Moritz, Germany, Valentina Geiger, United States of America, Learco Marra, Italy, Colomba Mauro, Italy, Montague Grondin, France, Yanling Lv, China, and zheng zhou, China.

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

The disputed domain names <ankerdatacable.com>, <ankergrc.com>, <ankeritaly.com>, <anker-it.com>, <ankeritaly.com>, <ankerromaniashop.com>, <anker-rom.com>, <belgiumanker.com>, <chargeranker.com>, <czechankercz.com>, <germanyanker.com>, <greeceanker.com>, <nl-anker.com>, and <soundcoreitaly.com> are registered with Hongkong Kouming International Limited.

The disputed domain names <anker-es.net>, and <anker-fr.com> are registered with Cosmotown, Inc.

Hongkong Kouming International Limited and Cosmotown, Inc. are separately and jointly referred to below as the "Registrar".

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 28, 2025. On May 30, 2025, and June 3, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar requests for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On June 3 and June 5, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names that differed from certain of the named Respondents (Xujin jiang, Tim Hahn, Kathrin Moritz, xing zhou, Learco Marra, gf fs, xiang liu, Colomba Mauro, dfdsf ddsf fdsd, Valentina Geiger, Montague Grondin, lanying Han) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 5, 2025 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaints 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 amendment to the Complaint in English on June 10, 2025.

On June 5, 2025, the Center informed the parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for certain disputed domain names is Chinese. On June 10, 2025, the Complainant confirmed its request that English be the language of the proceeding. The Respondents did not submit any comment on the language of the proceeding.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 13, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 3, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 7, 2025.

The Center appointed Matthew Kennedy as the sole panelist in this matter on July 14, 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 was founded in 2011 and now produces a range of electronic goods, including mobile chargers, audio components, home entertainment, home security, robotic appliances, and smart home appliances. The Complainant uses the ANKER brand and several sub-brands, including SOUNDCORE. The Complainant holds trademarks in multiple jurisdictions, including the following:

- European Union trademark registration number 010358406 for ANKER, registered on April 26, 2012;
- European Union trademark registration number 016662355 for a semi-figurative ANKER mark, registered on October 11, 2017; and
- European Union trademark registration number 015223712 for SOUNDCORE, registered on August 12, 2016.

The above trademark registrations are current. The Complainant also uses the domain names <anker.com> and <soundcore.com> in connection with websites that prominently display its ANKER and SOUNDCORE logos, respectively, and offer its electronic products for sale. <sup>1</sup>

The Respondents are identified as various individuals.

---

<sup>1</sup>The Panel notes its general powers articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules and has visited the Complainant's websites, which are publicly available, to verify the Complainant's submission regarding those sites. The Panel considers this process of verification useful in assessing the case merits and reaching a decision. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.8.

The disputed domain names were registered on the dates and in the names shown in the following table:

Registration date	Disputed domain name	Registrant name
September 20, 2024	<anker-fr.com>	zheng zhou
October 9, 2024	<anker-es.net>	Yanling Lv
October 9, 2024	<anker-it.com>	Colomba Mauro
October 16, 2024	<anker-rom.com>	dfdsf ddsf fdsd
October 18, 2024	<czechankercz.com>	Valentina Geiger
October 18, 2024	<ankeritaly.com>	Valentina Geiger
October 30, 2024	<ankerdatacable.com>	Tim Hahn
October 31, 2024	<soundcoreitaly.com>	dfdsf ddsf fdsd
November 4, 2024	<germanyanker.com>	Kathrin Moritz
November 18, 2024	<chargeranker.com>	Montague Grondin
November 21, 2024	<belgiumanker.com>	xing zhou
November 22, 2024	<ankeritaly.com>	Learco Marra
November 26, 2024	<greeceanker.com>	gf fs
November 27, 2024	<ankergrc.com>	xiang liu
November 30, 2024	<nl-anker.com>	lanying Han
December 7, 2024	<ankerromaniashop.com>	Xujin jiang

The disputed domain names resolve to online shops displaying the Complainant's ANKER logo or the Complainant's SOUNDCORE logo, offering for sale what purport to be the Complainant's electronic products. The images displayed are reproduced from the Complainant's websites. The Respondents' online shops are in different languages and display prices in different currencies, depending on the country to which they are directed, as indicated in the respective associated disputed domain names.

## 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 its ANKER and SOUNDCORE marks.

The Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. The Complainant has not licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondents to use any of its trademarks or to register domain names incorporating its ANKER and SOUNDCORE marks. The Respondents are not authorized distributors or resellers of ANKER or SOUNDCORE products. The disputed domain names suggest an affiliation with the Complainant and the associated websites strongly indicate that the online shops not only pretend to have an affiliation with the Complainant but are also fake. The websites are largely made from stolen marketing material from the Complainant and any further information on the terms or services of the websites are either insubstantial placeholders or copied from other websites.

The disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith. It is evident from the use of the disputed domain names that the Respondents knew of the Complainant's ANKER and SOUNDCORE trademarks when registering the disputed domain names. The Respondents are using the disputed domain names to operate fake online shops designed to trick Internet users into believing that they are trustworthy, official shops of the Complainant. Recently, the Complainant has received a large number of complaints from customers who were misled into placing orders on fake online shops and did not receive the ordered goods, which has negatively affected the Complainants' brands' reputation.

## **B. Respondents**

The Respondents did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **6.1 Preliminary Issues**

#### **A. Consolidation: Multiple Respondents**

The Complaint and the amendment to the Complaint were filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder. Two disputed domain names (<czechankercz.com> and <ankeritaly.com>) are registered in the name of the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that the disputed domain names were registered in a relatively short period of three months, mostly following a naming pattern that combines the ANKER mark with a geographical reference or a term that describes an ANKER product ("datacable" or "charger"). One disputed domain name adds an extra geographical reference and another adds the word "shop". Although the disputed domain name <soundcoreitaly.com> does not incorporate the ANKER trademark, it is registered using the same alias and the same contact information as <anker-rom.com>. All disputed domain names resolve to online shops that share the same layout for their main banner and product listings and the same footer (in different languages), and they all offer for sale what purport to be the Complainant's products. In addition, all but two disputed domain names are registered with the same Registrar (Hongkong Kouming International Limited) with contact email addresses that use the same service provider (NetEase) and contact street addresses that are incomplete, incorrect, or non-existent. While one disputed domain name (<anker-es.net>) was registered with a different Registrar in a different generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") (".net"), it was registered on the same day as one of the other disputed domain names (<anker-it.com>). In view of all these circumstances, the Panel is persuaded that the disputed domain names and associated websites are under common control.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

#### **B. Language of the Proceeding**

The language of the Registration Agreements for the disputed domain names is Chinese, except for two disputed domain names (<anker-es.net>, and <anker-fr.com>) for which the language of the Registration Agreements is English. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint and the amendment to the Complaint were filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English because it can be assumed that the Respondent is capable of communicating in English, given the strong evidence indicating that all the disputed domain names are controlled by the same person or entity, and that some of the associated websites are partly or wholly in English.

The Panel has already found that the disputed domain names are under common control. The Registration Agreements for two of them are in English, from which it can be inferred that the Respondent is able to communicate in that language. Further, despite the Center having sent an email regarding the language of the proceeding and the Notification of Complaint and Commencement of Administrative Proceeding in both Chinese and English, the Respondent did not make any submission with respect to the language of the proceeding or indicate any interest in otherwise participating in the proceeding.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the Registration Agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time, and costs. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.5.1.

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding is English.

## **6.2 Substantive Issues**

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that a complainant must demonstrate each of the following elements with respect to each disputed domain name:

- (i) the disputed 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 disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The burden of proof of each element is borne by the Complainant.

### **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. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the ANKER trademark and the SOUNDCORE trademark for the purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

Each disputed domain name wholly incorporates the ANKER mark or the SOUNDCORE mark. They add one or more geographical references (i.e., "Czech", "Italy", "Germany", "Belgium", "Greece", or "Romania", "fr" for France, "es" for Spain, "it" for Italy, "rom" for Romania, "cz" for the Czech Republic, "grc" for Greece", and "nl" for the Netherlands (Kingdom of the), in some cases separated by a hyphen) or words (i.e., "data cable", "charger", or "shop"). Despite these additions, the ANKER mark or the SOUNDCORE mark is recognizable within each disputed domain name. The only other element in each disputed domain name is a gTLD extension (".com" or ".net") which, as a standard requirement of domain name registration, may be disregarded in the assessment of confusing similarity for the purposes of the first element of the Policy. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are all confusingly similar to one or other of the Complainant's marks for the purposes of the Policy.

Therefore, 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. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

In the present case, the disputed domain names combine the Complainant’s ANKER trademark or SOUNDCORE trademark with a mere geographical reference or a term descriptive of the Complainant’s goods, which creates a risk of implied affiliation. The disputed domain names resolve to online shops that prominently display the Complainant’s ANKER logo or SOUNDCORE logo, and offer for sale what purport to be the Complainant’s products. The online shops use the language and currency of the country, if any, indicated in the associated disputed domain name. The overall impression is that the websites are the Complainant’s or its authorized distributor’s online shop for that country or, in any event, that they are operated or endorsed by, or affiliated with, the Complainant. However, the Complainant submits that it has not licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use any of its trademarks and that the Respondent is not an authorized distributor or reseller of ANKER or SOUNDCORE products. The websites associated with the disputed domain names do not display any prominent disclaimer of a relationship with the Complainant. In view of these circumstances, the Panel does not consider that the Respondent is using the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor is it making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names.

Moreover, the Respondent is identified in the WhoIs database by the names set out in the table in Section 4 above. While many of these names appear to be false, nothing on the record indicates that the Respondent has been commonly known by any of the disputed domain names.

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.

Based on the 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. The fourth of these circumstances is as follows:

“(iv) by using the [disputed] domain name, [the respondent has] intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [the respondent’s] website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of [the respondent’s] website or location or of a product or service on [the respondent’s] web site or location.”

In the present case, the disputed domain names were registered in 2024, years after the registration of the Complainant's ANKER and SOUNDSCORE trademarks. The disputed domain names resolve to online shops that display the ANKER logo or SOUNDSCORE logo as used on the Complainant's websites, display photographs from the Complainant's websites, and offer for sale what purport to be the Complainant's products. In view of these circumstances, the Panel has reason to find that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names with the Complainant and its trademarks in mind.

As regards use, the disputed domain names resolve to online shops that are presented as if they were operated or endorsed by, or affiliated with, the Complainant. This use is intentional and for commercial gain. In view of the findings in Section 6.2B above, the Panel finds that these circumstances fall within the terms of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Therefore, 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 <ankerdatacable.com>, <anker-es.net>, <anker-fr.com>, <ankergrc.com>, <ankeritaly.com>, <anker-it.com>, <ankeritaly.com>, <ankerromaniashop.com>, <anker-rom.com>, <belgiumanker.com>, <chargeranker.com>, <czechankercz.com>, <germanyanker.com>, <greeceanker.com>, <nl-anker.com>, and <soundcoreitaly.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Matthew Kennedy/*

**Matthew Kennedy**

Sole Panelist

Date: July 25, 2025