

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Canaan Creative Co., Ltd. (北京嘉楠捷思信息技术有限公司) v. Sophie
Case No. D2025-3217

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Canaan Creative Co., Ltd. (北京嘉楠捷思信息技术有限公司), China, represented by Watson Farley & Williams LLP, Singapore.

The Respondent is Sophie, United States of America (“United States”).

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <canmining.cc>, <canmining.com> and <canmining.net> are registered with Dominet (HK) Limited (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 12, 2025. On August 12, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 13, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (N/A) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 22, 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 August 27, 2025 and filed an amendment to the Complaint on September 3, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the Complaint and 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 September 15, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 5, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 6, 2025.

The Center appointed Adam Taylor as the sole panelist in this matter on October 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 Complainant's group has supplied bitcoin mining machines under the mark CANAAN since 2013. In 2024, the group's turnover was some USD 269.3 million.

The Complainant owns many registered trade marks for CANAAN including Hong Kong trade mark No. 304399228, registered on January 15, 2018, in classes 9, 35, 36 and 42.

The Complainant operates a website at "www.canaan.io".

The disputed domain name <canmining.com> was registered on March 20, 2025. The disputed domain names <canmining.net> and <canmining.cc> were registered on March 26, 2025.

The disputed domain name <canmining.com> has been used to resolve to a cryptocurrency website in Chinese that was branded with the Complainant's name and logo and which prominently displayed the balance held of a cryptocurrency called "USDT". When checked by the Panel, none of the disputed domain names resolved to active websites.

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's cease and desist letter sent on May 22, 2025.

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.

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 names. 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 Panel finds that an important feature of the mark, namely the first syllable "CAN" is recognisable within the disputed domain name. Furthermore, the content of the Respondent's website at "www.canmining.com" supports a finding of confusing similarity as use of the Complainant's logo indicates that the Respondent registered this, and the other disputed domain names, precisely because it believed that they were

confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7 and 1.15.

Although the addition of other terms (here, "mining") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names 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 recognised 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 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.

As to paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, and as further discussed below, the Panel considers that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name <canmining.com> to intentionally attempt to attract, confuse and profit from Internet users seeking the Complainant's goods and/or services. Such use of the disputed domain name is not bona fide.

There is no evidence that the disputed domain names <canmining.cc> and <canmining.net> have ever been used for active websites, let alone for bona fide offerings of goods or services.

Nor is there any evidence that paragraphs 4(c)(ii) or (iii) of the Policy are relevant in the circumstances of this case.

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 considers that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website at the disputed domain name <canmining.com> for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trade mark in accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

While the Panel has not been provided with a translation of the Respondent's website, it is obvious from the use of the Complainant's name and logo to brand what is plainly a cryptocurrency website that, at the very least, the Respondent intended to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark. Furthermore, the Respondent has not come forward to explain or defend its behaviour.

As regards the disputed domain names <canmining.cc> and <canmining.net>, panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the record, the Panel considers that the circumstances of this case are indicative of passive holding of the disputed domain names <canmining.cc> and <canmining.net> in bad faith, in particular the fact that they were clearly registered as part of an illicit pattern in conjunction with the disputed domain name <canmining.com>.

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 names <canmining.cc>, <canmining.com> and <canmining.net> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Adam Taylor/

Adam Taylor

Sole Panelist

Date: November 6, 2025