

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Intel Corporation v. xiao qian  
Case No. D2025-3925

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Intel Corporation, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Sideman & Bancroft LLP, United States.

The Respondent is xiao qian, Hong Kong, China.

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

The disputed domain name <Intelng.com> is registered with Gname.com Pte. Ltd. (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 25, 2025. On September 26, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 28, 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 (Registrant Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 6, 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 in English on October 10, 2025.

On October 6, 2025, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. On October 10, 2025, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant's submission.

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 in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on October 13, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 2, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on November 10, 2025.

The Center appointed Deanna Wong Wai Man as the sole panelist in this matter on November 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 Complainant is a technology company headquartered in the United States and founded in 1968 that develops, manufactures, and sells a wide range of computer-related goods and services. The Complainant has used the coined term “Intel”, referring to the combination of the words “integrated” and “electronics”, as a trademark since its founding. The Complainant has also submitted evidence from which it appears that the INTEL brand has been recognized for many years in industry rankings of leading global brands. The Complainant operates its main customer-facing website at the domain name <intel.com>, registered in 1986.

The Complainant owns a large international trademark portfolio for the INTEL marks, including, but not limited to, the following United States trademark registrations: the word mark INTEL with registration number 938772, registered on July 25, 1972 for goods in International Class 9; and the word mark INTEL with registration number 939641, registered on August 1, 1972 for goods in International Class 9. The Panel also notes that numerous other panels applying the Policy have accepted that the Complainant's INTEL marks are well known, see for instance: *Intel Corporation v. Biswajit Das, Mediaware Infotech Private Limited*, WIPO Case No. [D2015-2104](#).

The disputed domain name was registered on July 27, 2025 and redirects to an active website at “www.Intelnga.cc/?id=”. This webpage displays English-language advertisements for technology solutions and data security services and prompts visitors to register an account. All links on this page redirect to a website at another domain name. That webpage, also in English, requests that visitors enter their mobile phone numbers and passwords and purports to offer “Access” and “Register” options, although it contains no functioning links.

#### **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 its INTEL mark. The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name incorporates an intentional misspelling of its INTEL mark by replacing the initial uppercase letter “I” with a visually similar lowercase “l”, a common form of typosquatting. The Complainant argues that its INTEL mark remains clearly recognizable in the disputed domain name, and that the addition of the letters “ng” does not dispel this similarity.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant argues that it has made out a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks such rights, shifting the burden of production to the Respondent. The Complainant submits that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, has no authorization or relationship with the Complainant, and is not making a bona fide use of the disputed domain name. Rather, the Complainant argues that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to display advertisements

for competing technology solutions and to solicit visitors' mobile numbers through a non-functional registration interface constitutes phishing, which can never establish rights or legitimate interests under the UDRP.

The Complainant also contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant argues that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name decades after the Complainant's INTEL mark became well-known worldwide and after the Complainant had long used its <intel.com> domain name. The Complainant submits that the Respondent's typosquatting on its famous mark and the use of the disputed domain name for fraudulent purposes, specifically, impersonation and phishing, demonstrate bad faith registration and use. The Complainant contends that such targeting of a widely-known mark, coupled with illegal activity and the absence of any credible explanation for the Respondent's registration, amounts to clear evidence of bad faith.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **6.1 Preliminary Issue: Language of the Proceeding**

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including that English is the primary language of the Complainant, which is based in the United States and conducts its business and operates its trademarks in English. The Complainant submits that proceeding in English will allow it to participate meaningfully without the burden and expense of translation. The Complainant further notes that the website to which the disputed domain name resolves, as well as all linked subpages, are entirely in English, and that the disputed domain name itself comprises terms confusingly similar to the Complainant's English-language marks. According to the Complainant, by registering an English-language domain name and operating an English-language website, the Respondent has intentionally targeted an English-speaking audience and has demonstrated sufficient familiarity with English to participate in this proceeding without prejudice. The Complainant also observes that the Respondent appears to be located in Hong Kong, China, where English is one of the official languages.

The Respondent did not make any specific submissions with respect to the language of the proceeding.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.5.1).

Having considered all the matters above, and giving particular weight to the fact that the website at the disputed domain name is predominantly in English, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

## 6.2 Findings on the Merits

### 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 a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the Complainant's mark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name. In particular, the Panel notes that the Respondent has engaged in a common form of intentional misspelling, or "typosquatting", by substituting the initial uppercase letter "I" in the Complainant's well-known trademark with a visually similar lowercase "l". Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark for the purposes of the Policy, see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7 and 1.9.

Although the addition of other terms here, the letters "ng", 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 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.

Moreover, upon review of the facts and evidence, the Panel notes that the Respondent is not affiliated with, authorized by, or commonly known by reference to the INTEL name or mark and that the Respondent has not provided any evidence of the use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Instead, upon review of the facts and the evidence submitted in this proceeding, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name redirects to an active website under a different domain name displaying advertisements for technology solutions and data security services (which are services competing with the Complaint's services) and prompting visitors to register an account and provide personal data such as phone numbers and passwords. The website also includes statements offering "solutions to transform your financial experience". Such use does not constitute a bona fide offering and presents a risk of phishing.

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 has registered the disputed domain name which is confusingly similar to the Complainant's INTEL trademarks, which the Panel accepts to be well-known trademarks (see also the prior decision applying the Policy cited under Section 4 above). Therefore, the Panel finds that by registering the disputed domain name, the Respondent deliberately and consciously targeted the Complainant's prior well-known trademarks for INTEL. The Panel also notes that the Complainant's trademarks in this case predate the registration date of the disputed domain name by many years, and that the Respondent could not have been reasonably unaware of them. Furthermore, the Panel notes that even a cursory Internet search or trademark search at the time of registration of the disputed domain name would have made it clear to the Respondent that the Complainant owned prior rights in its trademarks for INTEL. In the Panel's view, the above elements clearly indicate bad faith on the part of the Respondent, and the Panel therefore finds that it has been demonstrated that the Respondent has registered the disputed 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.

As to use of the disputed domain name in bad faith, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name redirects to an active website under a different domain name displaying advertisements for technology solutions and data security services (which are services competing with the Complaint's services), and prompting visitors to register an account and provide personal data such as phone numbers and passwords, coupled with statements offering "solutions to transform your financial experience". Such use presents a risk of phishing. In addition, by using the disputed domain name to attract Internet users for possible commercial gain, the Respondent's conduct falls within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. 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 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 <Intelng.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Deanna Wong Wai Man/*

**Deanna Wong Wai Man**

Sole Panelist

Date: November 24, 2025