

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Dr. Brown's Company v. 朱杰 朱杰 (jie zhu)
Case No. D2025-4299

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Dr. Brown's Company, United States of America ("United States" or "USA"), internally represented.

The Respondent is 朱杰 朱杰 (jie zhu), China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <brownsbottles.com> is registered with Chengdu West Dimension Digital Technology Co., Ltd. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on October 20, 2025. On October 21, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 22, 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 (Registration Private) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 24, 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 29, 2025.

On October 24, 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 29, 2025, the Complainant confirmed its request that English 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 31, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 20, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on November 27, 2025.

The Center appointed Jacob Changjie Chen as the sole panelist in this matter on December 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 Complainant, founded in the United States, is a leading company in infant feeding technology. Its DR. BROWN'S branded baby bottles have repeatedly won awards, and is one of the best-selling baby bottle brands in the USA.

The Complainant is the owner of the following DR. BROWN'S registrations:

- United States Trademark No. 4036671, registered on October 11, 2011, in classes 10, 11, 18, and 21; and
- United States Trademark No. 5151359, registered on February 28, 2017, in classes 8, 10, 11, and 20.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 3, 2023. It used to resolve to a DR. BROWN'S website prominently displaying the Complainant's DR. BROWN'S trademark and providing purported DR. BROWN'S branded products.

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 DR. BROWN'S trademark since "browns", the dominant element of the disputed domain name, is identical to the dominant element of the DR. BROWN'S trademark. Omitting the "DR." portion of the DR. BROWN'S trademark does not avoid the confusing similarity.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to register or use a domain name incorporating or that is otherwise similar to the DR. BROWN'S trademark. The Respondent is not making legitimate, noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name and it is not using it in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Complainant finally contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in 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 (i) the Respondent is competent in English as the disputed domain name is composed of Latin characters and resolves to a website entirely in English; and (ii) the proceedings would be delayed if the Complainant has to translate the Complaint and annexes.

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, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

6.2 Substantive Issues

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.

Though "DR." is missing from the disputed domain name, "BROWN'S", the dominant part of the DR. BROWN'S trademark, is clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name. Omitting the "DR." portion of the DR. BROWN'S trademark does not prevent a finding of the confusing similarity. 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 term "bottles" 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.

The website at the disputed domain name is prominently displaying the Complainant's DR. BROWN'S trademark and provides purported DR. BROWN'S products. The website associated with the disputed domain name fails to prominently and accurately represent that there is no relationship between the Complainant and Respondent, thereby creating an undue association with the Complainant and likely confusing Internet users as to the source of products provided through the Respondent's website. Based on evidence presented on record, some Internet users had been confused and believed the disputed domain name was associated with the Complainant. Accordingly, the use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent for illegitimate activity, here claimed impersonation / passing off, can never confer any rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent in the current case. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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 disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's DR. BROWN'S trademark, and resolves to a website purportedly providing DR. BROWN'S branded products. It is thus inconceivable that the Respondent could have registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant and its DR. BROWN'S trademark. Registration in bad faith is established.

By choosing the Complainant's trademark to register the disputed domain name and setting up a website to purportedly provide DR. BROWN'S products, the Respondent is deliberately attempting to misrepresent itself as being affiliated with the Complainant. Such use of the disputed domain name shows that 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 marks, which constitutes bad faith under 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 <brownsbottles.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Jacob Changjie Chen/

Jacob Changjie Chen

Sole Panelist

Date: December 19, 2025