

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

FragranceX.com Inc. v. Quan Zhongjun, Juanita Co.
Case No. D2025-3606

1. The Parties

The Complainant is FragranceX.com Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by SafeNames Ltd, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Quan Zhongjun, Juanita Co., China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <fragrancex.com> is registered with Cosmotown, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 5, 2025. On September 8, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 8, 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 ("not currently displayed") and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 10, 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 September 11, 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 September 18, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 8, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 17, 2025.

The Center appointed Kaya Köklü as the sole panelist in this matter on October 22, 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 is a United States registered company, founded in 2001. It is an online retailer for fragrances and perfumes.

The Complainant is the owner of the FRAGRANCEX and FRAGRANCEX.COM trademarks. Among various others, the Complainant is the registered owner of the United States Trademark Registration No. 3365121, registered on January 8, 2008, for FRAGRANCEX.COM in Class 35, and the United States Trademark Registration No. 5375103, registered on January 9, 2018, for FRAGRANCEX in Class 35.

The Complainant further owns and operates its official website under the domain name <fragrance.com>.

The Respondent is reportedly located in China and has apparently been involved in numerous other UDRP disputes as a respondent before. For instance, see *VGP IP Co LLC and Valvoline Licensing and Intellectual Property LLC v. Quan Zhongjun*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-3376](#).

The disputed domain name was registered on December 25, 2024.

According to the case record, the website linked to the disputed domain name first displays a third-party website and then a “I’m not a robot” verification screen indicating “We have registered suspicious traffic coming from your network”. At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name resolves to a parked page displaying Pay-Per-Click (“PPC”) links related to perfume products.

Furthermore, the Complainant has provided un rebutted evidence that the Respondent has configured a Mail eXchange (“MX”) server for the disputed domain name, which enables the Respondent to send and receive emails using the disputed domain name.

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

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, the Panel shall decide the Complaint in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the three following elements is satisfied:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights;

- (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.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy states that the Complainant bears the burden of proving that all these requirements are fulfilled, even if the Respondent has not replied to the Complainant's contentions. *Stanworth Development Limited v. E Net Marketing Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-1228](#).

However, concerning the uncontested information provided by the Complainant, the Panel may, where relevant, accept the provided reasonable factual allegations in the Complaint as true. See section 4.3 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)").

For the evaluation of this case, the Panel has taken note of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), and, where appropriate, will decide consistently with the consensus views stated therein.

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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the FRAGRANCEX and FRAGRANCEX.COM trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds both marks are recognizable within the disputed domain name. As stated at section 1.9 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, misspellings do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. In the present case, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name incorporates an apparent misspelling of the Complainant's FRAGRANCEX and FRAGRANCEX.COM trademarks by simply transposing the second and third letters ("r" and "a"), which is indicative of typosquatting as it still makes the Complainant's trademarks recognizable within the disputed domain name.

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.

Bearing also in mind that the Respondent has configured an MX server for the disputed domain name, the Panel cannot exclude the possibility that the disputed domain name may have been used or will be used in connection with possibly fraudulent or illegitimate activities by the Respondent. Noting that except for the transposition of two letters, the disputed domain name is almost identical to the Complainant's trademarks, the Panel has no doubt that the Respondent's intent is to create confusion with the Complainant considering Internet users most likely would not notice the subtle difference between the Complainant's trademarks and 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.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its FRAGRANCEX and FRAGRANCEX.COM trademarks when registering the disputed domain name. It is obvious to the Panel, that the Respondent's deliberate choice of the disputed domain name, which is a misspelled version of the Complainant's trademarks, demonstrates its knowledge of the Complainant and intention to target the Complainant and mislead Internet users.

With respect to the use of the disputed domain name in bad faith, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name currently resolves to a landing page with PPC links to third-party websites related to products also offered by the Complainant. In addition, the Panel believes that the subtle misspelling of the disputed domain name compared to the Complainant's trademarks and the active MX server create an ongoing threat to the Complainant, since the disputed domain name may be used by the Respondent to mislead customers in a false belief that an email sent from the disputed domain name originates/comes from the Complainant.

In addition, the Panel accepts the failure of the Respondent to submit any response to the Complainant's contentions as an additional indication for bad faith use.

Lastly, the Panel further notes that the engagement of the Respondent in a pattern of trademark-abusive domain name registrations further supports the finding of bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name. See *Eli Lilly and Company v. Quan Zhongjun, Juanita Co.*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3359](#); *AirGSM Pte Ltd. v. Quan Zhongjun, Juanita Co.*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2868](#); *ecoATM, LLC v. Quan Zhongjun, Juanita Co.*, *Zhengzhou HeNan 450000 China*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-1429](#); *PN II, Inc. v. Quan Zhongjun, Juanita Co.*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-0224](#); *Asurion, LLC v. Quan Zhongjun, Juanita Co.*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-4299](#); *Dynatrace LLC v. Quan Zhongjun, Juanita Co.*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-4533](#); *Valvoline Licensing and Intellectual Property LLC, VGP ICo LLC v. Quan Zhongjun, Juanita Co.*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-3376](#); *American Airlines, Inc. v. Quan Zhongjun, Juanita Co.*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-1253](#); *Asurion, LLC v. quan zhongjun, aka zhongjun quan*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-4267](#); *Sealed Air Corporation (US) v. Quan Zhongjun, Juanita Co.*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-3832](#); *Averitt Express, Inc. v. Quan Zhongjun, Juanita Co.*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-3110](#).

In light of the above and having reviewed the record, the Panel has no doubts that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under 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 <fargrancex.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Kaya Köklü/

Kaya Köklü

Sole Panelist

Date: November 7, 2025