

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Alphablocks Limited v. Jason King, Shenzhen Yunnuotaifeng Tech Co., Ltd.
Case No. D2025-3917

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Alphablocks Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Marks & Clerk LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Jason King, Shenzhen Yunnuotaifeng Tech Co., Ltd., China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

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

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 25, 2025. On September 25, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 26, 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 (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 30, 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 October 2, 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 October 3, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 23, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 28, 2025. In accordance with paragraph 14 of the Rules, the Panel may draw such inferences from the Respondent's default as it considers appropriate.

The Center appointed Nesrine Roudane as the sole panelist in this matter on November 3, 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.

No further submissions were received, and no extensions or procedural orders were requested or issued.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant, Alphablocks Limited, is a company established in the United Kingdom and specializes in producing award-winning children's educational TV animations. Its flagship series, Numberblocks, launched in 2017, airs on CBeebies in the United Kingdom and on Netflix worldwide. The Complainant also operates a Numberblocks YouTube channel with over 13 million subscribers, reflecting the substantial goodwill and reputation associated with the NUMBERBLOCKS brand internationally. The Complainant submits that it has developed significant global recognition in the NUMBERBLOCKS mark in connection with educational content and licensed merchandise, including toys and plush products.

The Complainant is the proprietor of several registered trademarks for NUMBERBLOCKS (the "NUMBERBLOCKS Marks"), including the following:

1. United Kingdom Trade Mark No. 3192337 (NUMBERBLOCKS), registered on March 17, 2017, covering goods and services across multiple classes, including toys, character toys, dolls, fluffy toys, and plush toys in Class 28.
2. International Registration No. 1445796 (NUMBERBLOCKS), registered on July 27, 2018, designating multiple jurisdictions including China, where the Respondent is located, covering goods including toys, character toys, dolls, fluffy toys, and plush toys in Class 28.
3. United Kingdom Trade Mark No. 3531992 (NUMBERBLOCKS), registered on January 1, 2021, for goods and services in Classes 9, 16, 18, 21, 24, 25 and 28 (including toys, soft toys and character toys).
4. International Registration No. 1810806 (NUMBERBLOCKS), registered on February 8, 2024, designating Australia, Brazil, Canada, European Union, Japan, Mexico, Republic of Korea, and Vietnam, covering goods and services in Classes 9, 14, 16, 18, 21, 24, 25, 28 (including toys, character toys, dolls, fluffy toys and soft toys), 30, 32 and 41.

These registrations predate the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name, except for the 2024 international registration, and demonstrate the Complainant's consistent and expanding trademark protection for NUMBERBLOCKS worldwide.

The disputed domain name <numberblocksplushies.com> was registered on May 25, 2023. The disputed domain name resolves to a website (the "Website") that offers soft (plush) toys depicting the Complainant's NUMBERBLOCKS characters and describes itself as the "Official Numberblocks Stuffed Animal Store." The Website displays the Complainant's NUMBERBLOCKS Marks, logos, character artwork, and other copyrighted assets without authorization. The Complainant asserts that the goods offered are unauthorized and counterfeit. The Complainant has provided evidence of a NUMBERBLOCKS plush toy purchased from the Website which, on the record, appears to be a counterfeit product (Annex 6).

The Website lists a United States of America business address and a Chinese warehouse address; however, both have been confirmed by the Complainant's counsel to be false. Registrar verification identified the Respondent as Jason King, Shenzhen Yunnuotaifeng Tech Co., Ltd., based in Guangdong, China.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

In particular, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name <numberblocksplushies.com> is confusingly similar to the Complainant's NUMBERBLOCKS trademark, as it wholly incorporates the mark with the mere addition of the descriptive term "plushies," which does not avoid a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant further submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not affiliated with, endorsed by, or licensed by the Complainant in any way, and the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to purport to operate an "Official Numberblocks Stuffed Animal Store," while offering counterfeit plush toys and reproducing the Complainant's NUMBERBLOCKS marks and copyrighted character artwork, is inherently illegitimate.

The Complainant also contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's NUMBERBLOCKS trademark. The Complainant emphasizes that the Respondent is engaged in a pattern of registering infringing domain names and offering counterfeit goods, as evidenced by multiple previous UDRP decisions issued against the Respondent or its associated entity Shenzhen Yunnuotaifeng Tech Co., Ltd.

B. Respondent

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

Accordingly, the Panel will proceed to a decision based on the Complaint, drawing such inferences from the Respondent's default as the Panel considers appropriate under paragraph 14(b) of the Rules.

6. Discussion and Findings

The Panel has considered the Complaint, the evidence submitted by the Complainant, and the procedural history of the case. In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove each of the following three elements:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark 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.

In accordance with paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, the Panel may draw such inferences as it considers appropriate from the Respondent's failure to submit a Response. The Respondent's default does not automatically result in a decision for the Complainant, but the Panel will assess the Complaint on its merits based on the available record.

No procedural issues requiring determination arise in this case. The language of the proceeding is English, in accordance with paragraph 11(a) of the Rules, as the Registration Agreement is in English. The identity of the Respondent has been confirmed through the Registrar's verification, and no request for consolidation or supplemental filings was made.

The Panel will therefore proceed to assess each of the three elements under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy below.

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 confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here, "plushies", 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 addition of the descriptive term "plushies" does not prevent the NUMBERBLOCKS mark from being recognizable within the disputed domain name; the Top-Level Domain ".com" is disregarded for purposes of the confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7, 1.8 and 1.11.

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 Complainant has never licensed, permitted, or otherwise authorized the Respondent to use its NUMBERBLOCKS trademark in any manner, including as part of a domain name. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor has it provided any evidence of a bona fide offering of goods or services. Instead, the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant by claiming to operate the "Official Numberblocks Stuffed Animal Store" and by displaying the Complainant's characters, logo, and registered device marks without authorization. Such conduct cannot give rise to any rights or legitimate interests under the Policy.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, the sale of counterfeit goods) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

The Respondent's use of false contact details on the Website, coupled with evidence of a counterfeit plush toy purchased from the Website, further confirms that the Respondent's activities are inherently illegitimate. 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 Respondent targeted a well-known and distinctive trademark, NUMBERBLOCKS, long after the Complainant had secured registered rights in multiple jurisdictions including China, where the Respondent is located. The composition of the disputed domain name, the nature of the goods offered, and the explicit claim to be an "Official Numberblocks Stuffed Animal Store" leave no plausible explanation other than intentional targeting of the Complainant's mark.

The Panel finds the Respondent's conduct falls squarely under two circumstances enumerated in paragraph 4(b) of the Policy:

First, under paragraph 4(b)(iv), the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's NUMBERBLOCKS trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Website. The Respondent reproduced the Complainant's characters, logo, and device marks, falsely claimed official status, and sold counterfeit plush toys directly corresponding to the Complainant's trademarked products.

Second, under paragraph 4(b)(ii), the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of abusive registrations. The Complainant has provided evidence of at least four prior adverse UDRP decisions involving the same Respondent entity, each involving the unauthorized registration and use of third-party trademarks to sell infringing or counterfeit goods. Such a pattern is conclusive evidence of bad faith under the Policy.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, the sale of counterfeit goods) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Respondent's provision of false contact information on the Website further reinforces the inference of bad faith. There is no evidence of any legitimate commercial activity, bona fide use, or innocent explanation.

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 <numberblocksplushies.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nesrine Roudane/

Nesrine Roudane

Sole Panelist

Date: November 17, 2025