

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Swedish Match North Europe AB, Philip Morris International, Inc. v. div coded, feng haung, 李吉瑞 (li ji rui), shengshi zhao
Case No. D2025-2309

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Swedish Match North Europe AB, Sweden, and Philip Morris International, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), both represented by D.M. Kisch Inc., South Africa.

The Respondents are div coded, Canada, feng haung, United States, 李吉瑞 (li ji rui), China, and shengshi zhao, China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <us-zyn.store> is registered with NameSilo, LLC.

The disputed domain name <zynshoponline.com> is registered with Alibaba Cloud Computing Ltd. d/b/a HiChina (www.net.cn).

The disputed domain name <zyn-us.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC.

The disputed domain name <zynuss.com> is registered with West263 International Limited.

NameSilo, LLC, Alibaba Cloud Computing Ltd. d/b/a HiChina (www.net.cn), GoDaddy.com, LLC, and West263 International Limited are separately and collectively 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 June 12, 2025. On June 13, 2025, the Center transmitted by emails to the Registrar requests for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On June 13 and 16, 2025, the Registrar transmitted its verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names that differed from the named Respondents (Redacted for Privacy, Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC, Private Registration) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on June 16, 2025 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the

Complainants either to 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 Complainants filed an amended Complaint in English on June 18, 2025.

On June 16, 2025, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name <zynshoponline.com> is Chinese. On June 18, 2025, the Complainants confirmed their 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 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 Respondents in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 23, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 13, 2025. The Respondents did not submit any Response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents’ default on July 17, 2025.

The Center appointed Matthew Kennedy as the sole panelist in this matter on July 23, 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 First Complainant, Swedish Match North Europe AB, is a wholly-owned subsidiary of the Second Complainant, Philip Morris International, Inc. The Complainants are primarily engaged in the business of manufacturing, marketing, and selling smoke-free tobacco products, including nicotine pouches, under the brand ZYN. The First Complainant holds multiple trademark registrations, including:

- International trademark registration number 1421212 for ZYN, registered on April 18, 2018, designating multiple jurisdictions, specifying goods in class 34; and
- International trademark registration number 1456681 for a semi-figurative ZYN mark (the “ZYN logo”), registered on December 27, 2018, designating multiple jurisdictions, specifying goods in class 34.

These trademark registrations are in force. The Complainants are jointly and separately referred to below as “the Complainant” unless otherwise indicated. The Complainant has also registered the domain name <swedishmatch.com> that it uses in connection with a website provides information about itself and its products, including ZYN nicotine pouches.

The Respondents are identified as various individuals or an alias. The disputed domain names were registered on the dates and in the names set out in the following table:

Disputed domain name	Registration date	Registrant
<zynshoponline.com>	July 18, 2024	李吉瑞 (li ji rui)
<zyn-us.com>	September 12, 2024	shengshi zhao
<us-zyn.store>	February 7, 2025	div coded
<zynuss.com>	May 21, 2025	feng haung

The disputed domain names all resolve to websites in English that prominently display the ZYN logo and offer for sale what purport to be the Complainant’s ZYN nicotine pouches at discount prices. According to the evidence, the website associated with the disputed domain name <zynshoponline.com> also displays a

link to a website selling a third party nicotine product (i.e., a vape pen), and promotes a ZYN Affiliate Program and a ZYN Rewards program.

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 ZYN trademark.

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 a domain name incorporating its trademark. The Respondents are not authorized distributors or resellers of the ZYN nicotine product. The Respondents are promoting competing nicotine products of other commercial origin.

The disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith. It is evident from the associated websites that the Respondents knew of the Complainant's ZYN trademark when registering the disputed domain names. The circumstances fall within the terms of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. In addition, the disputed domain name <zynshoponline.com> is being used for phishing by inviting Internet users to provide personal information to join a ZYN Affiliate Program.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Procedural Issues

A. Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was 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. It submits that: 1) the disputed domain names were registered on the same date or in close proximity to one another; 2) the registrant contact information for the disputed domain names is highly similar or identical; 3) the composition of the disputed domain names is similar in that they incorporate the ZYN trademark and non-distinctive and descriptive elements; 4) the websites associated with the disputed domain names <zyn-us.com>, <us-zyn.store>, and <zynuss.com> are virtually identical to one another; 5) the websites use similar copyright images proprietary to the Complainant; and 6) the websites associated with the disputed domain names (in particular, <zyn-us.com>, <us-zyn.store>, and <zynuss.com>) refer to their respective disputed domain names throughout. Further, to request the Complainant to file separate complaints would be contrary to the intentions of the Policy, which seeks to provide a cost-effective and expedited resolution process.

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.

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

As regards common control, the Panel notes that the disputed domain names <zyn-us.com>, <us-zyn.store>, and <zynuss.com> follow a naming pattern insofar as they combine "zyn" with the geographical term "us" (meaning "United States"). These disputed domain names resolve to websites displaying the same or similar images (including the same "How to Use Nicotine Pouches" material) and similarly worded terms of service, although only the website associated with <us-zyn.store> displays a "BUYZYN-US" logo. In these circumstances, the Panel is persuaded that these three disputed domain names registered in the names of shengshi zhao, div coded, and feng haung, respectively, and the associated websites, are under common control.

However, the Panel does not find a sufficient basis in the record to infer that the disputed domain name <zynshoponline.com> is under common control with the other three. This disputed domain name does not follow the same naming pattern, its Registration Agreement is in a different language, and it resolves to a different website, presented variously as the "ZYN Official Online Shop" or the "ZYN Shop", with different product images, a different product listing format, customer reviews, a favicon, a ZYN Affiliate Program and a ZYN Rewards program, all absent from the other websites. Certain contact email addresses on the site use the domain name <zyn-shop.com>, which was registered by the same person (李吉瑞 (li ji rui)) and was the subject of a prior UDRP proceeding. See *Swedish Match North Europe AB, Philip Morris International, Inc. v. 李吉瑞 (li ji rui)*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-4325](#). According to evidence presented by the Complainant, the website associated with the disputed domain name <zynshoponline.com> is similar to the website that corresponded to the domain name <zyn-shop.com> in that prior proceeding, including its promotion of the ZYN Affiliate Program. In view of all these circumstances, the Panel is not satisfied that, on the balance of probabilities, the disputed domain name <zynshoponline.com> or the associated website is under common control with the other three at issue in the present proceeding.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes regarding the disputed domain name registrants shengshi zhao, div coded, and feng haung would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel will decide the Complaint regarding the disputed domain names <zyn-us.com>, <us-zyn.store>, and <zynuss.com> (referred to below as the "disputed domain names"), registered in the names of shengshi zhao, div coded, and feng haung, respectively (separately and collectively referred to below as the "Respondent"). On the other hand, the Panel declines to consolidate the dispute regarding the disputed domain name <zynshoponline.com>. This Decision is made without prejudice to the possibility of refiling the complaint regarding this disputed domain name.

B. Language of the Proceeding

The Panel notes that the Registration Agreements for the consolidated disputed domain names (i.e., <zyn-us.com>, <us-zyn.store>, and <zynuss.com>) are all in 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 ZYN trademark for the purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the ZYN mark is incorporated within each disputed domain name. Despite the addition of the geographical term "us" (meaning "United States") and either a hyphen or another letter "s", the ZYN mark remains clearly recognizable within each disputed domain name. The only other element in each is a generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") extension (either ".com" or ".store") which, as a standard requirement of domain name registration, may be disregarded in the assessment of confusing similarity under the Policy. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7 and 1.11.1.

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 resolve to websites displaying the ZYN logo and offering for sale what purport to be the Complainant's ZYN products. The websites give the impression 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 Respondents to use any of its trademarks or to register a domain name incorporating its trademark. These circumstances indicate that the Respondent is not 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.

Further, the Registrar has confirmed that the Respondent is identified in the Whois database as "shengshi zhao", "div coded", and "feng haung". None of these names resembles any of the disputed domain names. Nothing in the record indicates that the Respondent has been commonly known by 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] web site or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of [the respondent’s] web site or location or of a product or service on [the respondent’s] web site or location.”

The disputed domain names were registered in 2024 and 2025, years after the registration of the Complainant’s ZYN trademark. The disputed domain names incorporate the ZYN mark, resolve to websites that display the Complainant’s ZYN logo, including its figurative elements, and display images of the Complainant’s ZYN products. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent had the Complainant and its ZYN mark in mind at the times when it registered the disputed domain names.

As regards use, the disputed domain names resolve to websites that give the false impression they are operated or endorsed by, or affiliated with, the Complainant. This use is intentional and for commercial gain as the websites offer what purport to be the Complainant’s products for sale. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the 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:

- (i) in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain names <us-zyn.store>, <zyn-us.com>, and <zynuss.com> be transferred to the Complainant; and
- (ii) the Complaint is denied as regards the disputed domain name <zynshoponline.com>.

/Matthew Kennedy/

Matthew Kennedy

Sole Panelist

Date: August 4, 2025