

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

ADME (CY) Ltd (dba The Soul Publishing) v. Zhuo Pei Shi  
Case No. D2025-4105

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is ADME (CY) Ltd (dba The Soul Publishing), Cyprus, represented internally.

The Respondent is Zhuo Pei Shi, China, self-represented.

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

The disputed domain name <5minutecrafts.com> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 8, 2025. On October 8, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On October 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 (Domain By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 9, 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 amendment to the Complaint on the same date.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 10, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 30, 2025. The Response was filed with the Center on October 29, 2025.

The Center appointed Nick J. Gardner as the sole panelist in this matter on November 5, 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 Respondent has not challenged the evidence the Complainant has provided as to the Complainant's business and the Panel accepts it as factually correct. The Complainant was formed in October 2015. It operates a digital media company publishing a wide range of what it calls "lifehack" videos on Facebook and YouTube and other digital platforms. These are published under the branding "5-MINUTE CRAFTS".

The Complainant's "5-Minute Crafts" brand has, on the evidence, been very successful and achieved global recognition through extensive use across multiple digital platforms. The Complainant launched its YouTube channel on November 15, 2016, and this channel currently has over 81 million subscribers. The Complainant's Facebook page was launched on April 5, 2016, and currently has over 132 million followers. Cumulatively the Complainant has over 2 billion followers over multiple platforms and receives over 25 billion monthly views. The brand spans multiple variations including "5-Minute Crafts Family", "5-Minute Crafts Play", and others.

The Complainant holds various trademark registrations for "5-MINUTE CRAFTS" in both word and figurative form. See for example International registration number 1334847, for 5-MINUTE CRAFTS (word) registered November 2, 2016. These trademarks are referred to as the "5-MINUTE CRAFTS trademark" in this decision.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on October 2, 2017. There is no evidence it has ever resolved to an active website or been used in any other way.

The Respondent is an individual located in China.

#### **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.

The Complainant argues that the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to its 5-MINUTE CRAFTS trademark. The Disputed Domain Name reproduces the Complainant's mark in its entirety, merely combining the words and omitting spaces, which is standard practice in domain name registrations and does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. The Respondent is not using the Disputed Domain Name for any active website, has made no demonstrable preparations for bona fide use, is not commonly known by the name "5-minute crafts," and holds no trademark rights corresponding to the Disputed Domain Name. The Complainant argues that by registering the Disputed Domain Name, the Respondent is preventing the Complainant from reflecting its registered trademark in a corresponding ".com" domain name.

The Complainant asserts that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant's trademark registrations predate the Disputed Domain Name registration by nearly a year. Moreover, the Complainant's brand was already widely known prior to the Disputed Domain Name registration, with its YouTube channel launched in November 2016 and Facebook page launched in April

2016, both achieving massive followings. The Complainant argues that given this substantial reputation, the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant's trademark when registering the Disputed Domain Name. The passive holding of the Disputed Domain Name, combined with the impossibility of any good faith use given the Complainant's well-known trademark, demonstrates bad faith.

## **B. Respondent**

The Respondent argues that "5minutecrafts.com" consists of generic, descriptive English words. The Respondent contends that "5-minute crafts" is a generic term used widely across the Internet to describe quick DIY projects, lacks inherent distinctiveness, and falls into the public domain. The Respondent asserts that the Complainant's trademark, while registered, cannot monopolize a generic expression, and cites *Jacques Lafitte Sa v. 21st Century Communications SCP*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0443](#) for the proposition that generic terms are accessible for legitimate registration.

The Respondent claims to have registered the Disputed Domain Name due to its generic descriptive meaning, with the intent to potentially use it for a future personal blog, creative sharing platform, or information hub related to "five-minute crafts." The Respondent argues that this constitutes a legitimate, planned, and good-faith use, and that passive holding of a domain name can constitute a legitimate interest, particularly when the domain is generic. The Respondent emphasizes that no competing website has been created, no pay-per-click links have been placed, and no offer to sell has been made to the Complainant.

Regarding bad faith, the Respondent argues that the Complainant has failed to prove both bad faith registration and use. The Respondent contends that there is no evidence that the Respondent's primary motive at registration was to target the Complainant, and that as "5-minute crafts" is a generic phrase, the most reasonable inference is that the Respondent registered it for its descriptive value. The Respondent argues that the mere fact that the domain does not resolve to a website is insufficient to meet the "bad faith use" requirement under the Policy, citing [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3, which recognizes that "passive holding of a domain name, without more, does not constitute bad faith use."

The Respondent says he was unaware of the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration. The Disputed Domain Name was chosen for its descriptive value, not to target the Complainant.

Finally, the Respondent requests a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking, arguing that the Complainant, as a large corporation with substantial legal resources, should be aware of the UDRP's evidentiary standards, and its decision to file the Complaint in the absence of concrete evidence of bad faith use constitutes an abuse of the administrative process.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

To succeed, in accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must satisfy the Panel that:

- (i) the Disputed Domain Name is identical with 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;
- (iii) the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

The Complainant has rights in the 5-MINUTE CRAFTS trademark. The Panel finds the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to this trademark. It contains the trademark in its entirety simply omitting the spaces and the hyphen between the words and number in the trademark. Spaces cannot in any event form part of a domain name for technical reasons.

It is well established that the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”), in this case “.com”, does not affect the Disputed Domain Name for the purpose of determining whether it is identical or confusingly similar. See, for example, *Rollerblade, Inc. v. Chris McCrady*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0429](#).

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark and hence the first condition of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been fulfilled.

### **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances any of which is sufficient to demonstrate that a respondent has rights or legitimate interests in a domain name:

(i) before any notice to the respondent of the dispute, use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the domain name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or

(ii) the respondent has been commonly known by the domain name, even if the respondent has acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or

(iii) the respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

None of these apply in the present circumstances. The Complainant has not authorized, licensed, or permitted the Respondent to register or use the Disputed Domain Name or to use the 5-MINUTE CRAFTS trademark. The Complainant has prior rights in the 5-MINUTE CRAFTS trademark which precedes the Respondent’s acquisition of the Disputed Domain Name. The Complainant has therefore established a prima facie case that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the 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. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1. See also, for example, *Do The Hustle, LLC v. Tropic Web*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0624](#); *Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2003-0455](#).

The Panel finds that the Respondent has failed to produce any evidence to establish his rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. The Respondent has owned the Disputed Domain Name for eight years but there is no evidence that he has taken any steps to develop the project he says he has in mind, namely “a future personal blog, creative sharing platform, or information hub related to five-minute crafts.”

Accordingly, the Panel finds the Respondent has no rights or any legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name and the second condition of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been fulfilled.

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

In the present circumstances the evidence as to the extent of the reputation the Complainant enjoys in the 5-MINUTE CRAFTS trademark, and the fact that the Disputed Domain Name is substantially identical to this trademark leads the Panel to conclude the registration and use were in bad faith.

Under paragraph 4(b) of the Policy a non-exhaustive list of factors evidencing registration and use in bad faith comprises:

(i) circumstances indicating that you have registered or you have acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of your documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or

(ii) you have registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that you have engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) you have registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the domain name, you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your web site 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 your web site or location or of a product or service on your web site or location.

In the present circumstances the Respondent's exact motivation is difficult to discern and it is not clear that any of these sub-paragraphs are applicable. But the list under paragraph 4(b) is non-exhaustive. The question is why did the Respondent register the Disputed Domain Name?

The Panel accepts that the term "5-Minute Crafts" comprises two ordinary English words and the number 5, and might be said to be descriptive of a 5 minute long video depicting a craft project. However, that term in the Panel's opinion has the capacity to acquire distinctiveness through use. The filed evidence establishes that this has clearly occurred. Although the Respondent says the term is descriptive and is widely used by third parties, he has not produced a single example of such third-party usage. The Panel also notes that the Complainant's trademark comprises the numeral 5 (as opposed to the word five) followed by the words "MINUTE CRAFTS". The Respondent chose exactly the same combination for the Disputed Domain Name – although the Panel notes that in various places in the Response he refers to "FIVE MINUTE CRAFTS".

The Respondent says the term "5-minute crafts" is generic and the Complainant cannot prevent the Respondent using such a generic term. The Respondent says the case of *Jacques Lafitte Sa v. 21st Century Communications SCP*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0443](#) is applicable and that it emphasizes that generic terms are accessible for legitimate registration. That case deals with the term "who's who" when used to compile directories of persons with particular characteristics. The panel in that case held that "the fact that the words "who's who" in the English-speaking world are rather trite to designate some kinds of compilations, lists or directories with facts about notable persons...". The present Panel understands that to be a finding that multiple different entities use those words, and they were not exclusively associated with the complainant. That is not the situation in the present case. The Complainant has developed a very significant reputation in the term "5-minute crafts" and there is no evidence anyone else at all uses the same term as a trademark or indeed in any other way. The Panel does not consider the Respondent has established the words are generic and available for anyone to use.

The Respondent also says that he "was unaware of the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration. The domain was chosen for its descriptive value, not to target the Complainant". The Complainant has provided detailed information that as at the present date its trademark is extremely widely recognized, and its videos attract a very large audience (see above). Although the Complainant has not provided information that allows the Panel to directly understand what the position was in October 2017 when the Disputed Domain Name was registered, the registration occurred approximately 18 months after the Complainant launched its Facebook page and approximately one year after the Complainant launched its YouTube channel. Moreover, given the enormously high figures the Complainant has now achieved (see above) the Panel finds it is more likely than not that the Complainant had developed a significant presence by October

2017. The Respondent says he was not aware of the “Complainant’s trademarks” but he does not say he was unaware of the Complainant or its videos. The Panel thinks the choice of the exact same name as the Complainant was using – 5 MINUTE CRAFTS was unlikely to be coincidental particularly given the use of the numeral 5 rather than the word “five”. Without any contemporaneous evidence supporting the Respondent’s claim to independent derivation the Panel considers it more likely than not that the Disputed Domain Name was registered because it corresponded to the Complainant’s brand name.

The Panel has considered whether the doctrine of bad faith as a result of passive holding as established in the well-known decision in *Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0003](#) is applicable here. The Respondent says “that the mere fact that the domain does not resolve to a website is insufficient to meet the ‘bad faith use’ requirement under the Policy, citing [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3, which recognizes that “passive holding of a domain name, without more, does not constitute bad faith use.” This is not what [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) section 3.3 says. It reads as follows “From the inception of the UDRP, panelists have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or “coming soon” page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. While panelists will look at the totality of the circumstances in each case, factors that have been considered relevant in applying the passive holding doctrine include: (i) the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant’s mark, (ii) the failure of the respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, (iii) the respondent’s concealing its identity or use of false contact details (noted to be in breach of its registration agreement), and (iv) the implausibility of any good faith use to which the domain name may be put”. Factors (i) to (iv) are based on the factors identified by the panel in the *Telstra* decision (supra).

Given the enormous success of the Complainant (see statistics above) and the huge recognition the 5-MINUTES CRAFTS trademark enjoys (ditto) the Panel considers that at least factors (i), (ii), and (iv) are present in this case and that in all the circumstances the non-use of the Disputed Domain Name does not prevent a finding of bad faith.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith and the third condition of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been fulfilled.

#### **D. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking**

Given the Complainant succeeds it follows that the Respondent’s request for a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking is rejected.

#### **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 <5minutecrafts.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Nick J. Gardner/*

**Nick J. Gardner**

Sole Panelist

Date: November 19, 2025