

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Kamee Inc. v. jou ria, asdsad  
Case No. D2025-2881

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Kamee Inc., Taiwan Province of China, represented by Han Kun Law Offices, China.

The Respondent is jou ria, asdsad, United States of America.

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

The disputed domain name <kamee-life.com> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 21, 2025. On July 21, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On the same day, 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 the Complainant on July 21, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on July 25, 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 28, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 17, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 22, 2025.


The Center appointed Francine Tan as the sole panelist in this matter on August 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

The Complainant was founded in Taiwan Province of China, on September 23, 2021 by a team of pharmacists, physicians, nutritionists, and software engineers. The Complainant leverages technology with medical expertise to create personalized health solutions for individuals. The Complainant offers its KIHAS personalized health assessment system free of charge to the public including through its website at the domain name <kameelife.com>, and users can access this tool without registration.

Since its inception, the Complainant has partnered with a Silicon Valley-born global fund and startup accelerator. The Complainant has been named a Google Project Hatcher 2022 partner and a selected venture in the Ministry of Economic affairs' FINDIT 2022 Early Investment Series in Taiwan Province of China.

The Complainant states that its website has served over 388,000 people with its KIHAS system, and between June 23, 2024 and June 23, 2025, attracted over 2.5 million users. The Complainant has over 45,817 followers on the social media platform, LINE.

The Complainant owns various trade mark registrations in Taiwan Province of China, for KAMEE,  Kamee ("KAMEE (figurative) mark"), and Kamee咖米, including the following:

- trade mark Registration No. 02227494, registered on June 16, 2022;
- trade mark Registration No. 02236540, registered on July 16, 2022; and
- trade mark Registration No. 02463400, registered on June 16, 2025.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 2, 2025, and at the time of filing the Complaint, resolved to a webpage displaying the Complainant's trade mark, and offering for sale erectile dysfunction drugs, including Cialis, Viagra and Levitra.

#### 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 trade mark KAMEE in which the Complainant has rights. The disputed domain name wholly incorporates the Complainant's KAMEE trade mark with the addition of the suffix "-life". The suffix does not create any material distinction between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trade mark. The generic Top-Level Domain ".com" is a technical requirement and is generally disregarded in an assessment of confusing similarity.
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the dispute domain name. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Respondent has no trade mark rights in the term "Kamee". The Complainant has no relationship with the Respondent, and has not authorized any use of its trade marks to the Respondent. The disputed domain name was registered

after the Complainant's trade mark registrations. The disputed domain name resolves to a website which prominently displays the Complainant's KAMEE (figurative) mark. The disputed domain name therefore falsely suggests affiliation with the Complainant by resolving to a website offering similar service contents and functional modules as the Complainant's official website, which creates a strong and misleading representation of association or endorsement by the Complainant.

- the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's KAMEE trade mark, and resolves to a website that mimics the structure and contents of the Complainant's official website, falsely implying an affiliation or endorsement by the Complainant, and diverts users for potential commercial gain. The Respondent's offering for sale of erectile dysfunction drugs on its website undermines the Complainant's reputation in providing personalized health food services. Given the distinctive nature and popularity of the Complainant's KAMEE brand in Taiwan Province of China, it is highly improbable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's rights at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. The registration of a domain name which is highly similar to the Complainant's trade mark, and official domain name, coupled with the specific references to the Complainant's services on the Respondent's website, strongly demonstrates that the Respondent had actual knowledge of the Complainant at the time of registering the disputed domain name. The Complainant has submitted a request to Google to remove the disputed domain name's URL, and the request has been supported by Google.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **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 the Complainant's trade mark 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 trade mark 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 and is identifiable therein. Although the addition of another term, here, "-life", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such a term 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.

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 Respondent was not licensed or authorized by the Complainant to use the latter's KAMEE trade mark or to register a domain name incorporating the trade mark. There is no evidence that the Respondent is using or preparing to use the disputed domain name for any legitimate noncommercial or fair use, without intent for commercial gain. In fact, the Respondent's website prominently displays the Complainant's KAMEE (figurative) mark.

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.

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.

The disputed domain name incorporates the entirety of the Complainant's distinctive KAMEE trade mark with the addition of the suffix "-life". The Complainant's KAMEE marks have been registered for several years before the date of registration of the disputed domain name. Given the length of time of registration, the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's KAMEE marks, the similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's own domain name <kameelife.com>, and the fact that the disputed domain name is used by the Respondent for a webpage displaying the Complainant's KAMEE (figurative) trade mark, it is obvious that the Respondent knew of the Complainant and its KAMEE trade marks at the time it registered the disputed domain name and targeted the Complainant. The Panel concludes that the Respondent has "intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website 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 [its] web site or location or of a product or service on [its] or location", which constitutes bad faith per paragraph 4(b)(iv) 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 <kamee-life.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Francine Tan/*

**Francine Tan**

Sole Panelist

Date: September 7, 2025