

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

MOLSON CANADA 2005, COORS BREWING COMPANY, and MOLSON COORS BEVERAGE COMPANY v. Mei Wang
Case No. D2025-2743

1. The Parties

The Complainants are MOLSON CANADA 2005, COORS BREWING COMPANY, and MOLSON COORS BEVERAGE COMPANY, Canada, represented by Lipkus Law LLP, Canada.

The Respondent is Mei Wang, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <coors.xyz> is registered with Nicnames, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 10, 2025. On July 11, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 14, 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 (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on July 14, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainants filed an amended Complaint on July 15, 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 July 18, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 7, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 8, 2025.

The Center appointed Gill Mansfield as the sole panelist in this matter on August 12, 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 Complainants (hereafter collectively referred to as “the Complainant”) are related companies engaged in the manufacturing, production and sale of malt beverages such as beers and liquors. Molson Coors Beverage Company is one of the largest brewing companies in the world, operating in Canada, the United States of America (“USA”), Europe, the United Kingdom, and other export markets. Molson Canada 2005 is a Canadian brewery responsible for the production and marketing of several brands including Molson Canadian. Coors Brewing Company (“COORS”) is a USA headquartered brewery responsible for the production and marketing of brands including COORS Banquet and COORS Light. In 2005, COORS’ holding company merged with Molson Canada 2005’s holding company to become Molson Coors Beverage Company.

COORS has been producing beer in the USA since 1873 and the COORS trademark has been in use since 1915.

The Complainant owns various COORS trademarks including (inter alia) the following:

USA trademark registration number 519209 for COORS (figurative mark) registered on December 27, 1949, in class 32.

USA trademark registration number 1071095 for COORS (word mark) registered on August 9, 1977, in class 32.

Canadian trademark registration number TMA230978 for COORS (word mark) registered on November 17, 1978, in class 32.

The Complainant owns the domain names <molsoncoors.com> which was registered in 2004 and <coors.com> which was registered in 1992. The Complainant has used and continues to use these domain names in connection with websites providing information about the Complainant’s history, brands and breweries, as well as news about the Complainant’s products.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 29, 2025, and currently resolves to a parked page. The record shows that at the time of the Complaint the disputed domain name was being offered for sale for GBP 972.06 (excluding domain transfer fees).

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 name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s COORS trademark. It argues that the entire mark is used in the disputed domain name and that the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) does not eliminate that confusing similarity. It contends that the “.xyz” gTLD is widely recognised as a domain extension used in connection with start-ups, developers, and blockchain projects. As such the disputed domain name could be perceived as a digital extension or initiative of the Complainant. It also submits that, as the whole of the Complainant’s COORS trademark is incorporated in the disputed domain name, it carries a high risk of implied affiliation.

It contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. It notes that the Complainant's first use of the COORS trademark pre-dates the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name by over 100 years. It states that the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant in any way, and that it has not authorised or licensed the Respondent register or use its trademarks, or to register or use any domain name incorporating those marks. It contends that the COORS trademark is famous and that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge or constructive knowledge of the Complainant's COORS trademark and its domain names.

The Complainant submits that at the time of the Complaint the disputed domain name did not resolve to an active website of the Respondent and that the Respondent was attempting to sell the disputed domain name for GBP 972.06 (not including domain transfer fees) via the Registrar's website. Accordingly, the Complainant asserts the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. It also contends that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, noting that the Respondent disclosed by the Registrar is "Mei Wang".

The Complainant also contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. It refers to the fact that the Respondent is attempting to sell the disputed domain name for a price that far exceeds the reasonable out-of-pocket costs for registration, demonstrating that the primary intention is to profit from the Complainant's mark. It also asserts that approximately 762 domains were registered by, or in association with, the email address for the Respondent disclosed by the Registrar. It states that all of these domains were registered in June 2025, and that several incorporate well-known brand names and also resolve to the Registrar's pages where they are listed for sale at USD 1,950.00. The Complainant contends that the Respondent's pattern of abusive registrations and the excessive pricing for those domains support the conclusion that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith. It concludes that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain names satisfies clauses 4(b) (i), (ii) and (iv) of the Policy.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant carries the burden of proving:

- (i) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The applicable Top-Level Domain ("TLD") in a domain name is viewed as a standard registration

requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1. As such, the TLD “.xyz” in the disputed domain name is disregarded for the purposes of the first element confusing similarity test.

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 name. 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 name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel finds that the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant in any way, and that it has not authorised or licensed the Respondent register or use its trademarks, or to register or use any domain name incorporating those marks. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Panel notes that the Respondent’s name, as disclosed by the Registrar, is “Mei Wang”.

There is no evidence of use, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, or of legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert customers. On the contrary, at the time of the Complaint the disputed domain name was being offered for sale.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant’s COORS trademark. It incorporates the whole of the Complainant’s well-known mark with only the addition of the TLD “.xyz”. The Panel accepts the Complainant’s contention that this domain extension is often used in connection with start-ups, developers, and blockchain projects, and as such the disputed domain name could be perceived as a digital extension or initiative of the Complainant.

As such the Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name is such as to carry a high risk of implied affiliation that cannot constitute fair use, as it effectively impersonates the Complainant, or suggests affiliation with, or sponsorship or endorsement by, the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

Further, under paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, the Panel may draw from the lack of response of the Respondent such inferences as it considers appropriate. The Panel is of the view that the lack of response from the Respondent corroborates the absence of any rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in the disputed domain name.

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 Complainant's first use of the COORS trademark pre-dates the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name by over 100 years. The Panel also notes the long history, international reputation and distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark, and finds that the COORS trademark is widely-known worldwide.

Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos or incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term) to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. WIPO Overview section 3.1.4.

Given the reputation in the Complainant's COORS trademark it is inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's mark at the date on which the disputed domain name was registered, and the Panel finds that the Respondent has targeted the Complainant's well-known mark. In making this finding, the Panel notes the composition of the disputed domain name, which incorporates the entirety of the COORS mark with the mere addition of a TLD (which corresponds to the Complainant's potential area of expansion (or one that, at the very least, may be perceived by Internet users as such)).

The record shows that at the time of the Complaint the disputed domain name was being offered for sale. The price of GBP 972.06 (excluding domain transfer fees) at which the disputed domain name was being offered for sale in all likelihood significantly exceeds the out-of-pocket expenses of registration of the disputed domain name.

Having regard to all of the circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name "primarily for the purpose of selling, renting or otherwise transferring the domain name to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of the complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the respondent's out-of-pocket expenses directly related to the domain name" under paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy.

The Panel also notes the Complainant's evidence of a pattern of abusive domain name registrations and bad faith on the part of the Respondent. The record shows a large volume of domain names being registered by, or in association with, the Respondent's email address in June 2025. Many of these registrations also correspond to other recognisable brands and trademarks which would also constitute a pattern of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy.

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 name <coors.xyz> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Gill Mansfield/

Gill Mansfield

Sole Panelist

Date: August 27, 2025