ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Swedish Match North Europe AB, Philip Morris International, Inc. v.
Jianrong Qiu, Haikou Xingji E-commerce Co., Ltd.
Case No. D2025-4554

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Swedish Match North Europe AB, Sweden, and Philip Morris International, Inc., United States of America ("United States" or "US"), represented by D.M. Kisch Inc., South Africa.

The Respondent is Jianrong Qiu, Haikou Xingji E-commerce Co., Ltd., China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <zynvelos.com> is registered with Instra Corporation Pty Ltd. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on November 4, 2025. On November 5, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 21, 2026, 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 (Redacted for privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on January 21, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainants to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainants filed an amended Complaint on January 22, 2026.

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 January 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 12, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on February 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Pablo A. Palazzi as the sole panelist in this matter on February 20, 2026. 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 first Complainant in this administrative proceeding is Swedish Match North Europe AB, a Swedish company established under the laws of Sweden and a subsidiary of Philip Morris International, Inc. The second Complainant in this administrative proceeding is Philip Morris International, Inc., a company established under the laws of the Commonwealth of Virginia, United States, and the first Complainant belongs to the same group of companies as the second Complainant.

One of the smoke-free products manufactured and sold by the first Complainant is a nicotine pouch under the ZYN trademark. The ZYN brand was first launched in the US in 2016, and today, the ZYN nicotine product is available in around 40 markets around the world.

The first Complainant owns several registered trademarks consisting of or containing the term "ZYN", including:

- the International trademark registration No. 1421212 for ZYN, registered on April 18, 2018, in class 34; and
- the International trademark registration No. 1456681 for ZYN (figurative), registered on December 27, 2018, in class 34.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 11, 2025. At the time of filing the Complaint and rendering this decision, the disputed domain name resolves to an online shop selling and offering the Complainants' ZYN products together with competing third-party products under the name "Zyn & Velos" and the line "Buy Swedish nicotine pouches online at ZynVelos.com". The website is in English language.

The Complainants will be hereinafter collectively referred to as the "Complainant".

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

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 Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here "velo" and "'s" 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 3.1, 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 that 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 3.1, 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 Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Oki Data principles (*Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. D2001-0903) cannot confer rights or legitimate rights on the Respondent in the present case, as the Respondent is not only offering the Complainant's products but also competing nicotine products and accessories of other commercial origin, namely the Velo, Klint, Killa and Pablo products, which in itself is sufficient to exclude any rights or legitimate interests in the form of a bona fide offering of goods.

Furthermore, the operator of the website prominently and without authorization displays the Complainant's registered ZYN trademark, as well as a mark highly similar and phonetically almost identical to the Complainant's registered logo, both at the top of the website and within the tab interface — locations where consumers would ordinarily expect to find the name of the online shop or website provider — thereby reinforcing the false impression of affiliation with the Complainant.

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.

The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Respondent's bad faith is clearly established by the very composition of the disputed domain name, which combines the Complainant's well-known and registered ZYN trademark with the trademark of one of the Complainant's direct competitors, a combination that could only have been made with full knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark. It is inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's ZYN trademark at the time of registration, given its widespread recognition in the nicotine pouch market and the fact that the disputed domain name deliberately incorporates it alongside a competing brand. Such registration constitutes bad faith in itself, as the Respondent could not have had any legitimate purpose in mind when selecting a domain name that pairs the Complainant's mark with that of a direct competitor.

The bad faith use is equally evident: the Respondent has populated the website resolving from the disputed domain name with unauthorized commercial content, offering for sale both the Complainant's products and competing nicotine products without any authorization from the Complainant, while prominently displaying the Complainant's trademark and a logo nearly identical to the Complainant's registered mark, thereby intentionally creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the website, in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of 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 <zynvelos.com> be transferred to the first Complainant.

/Pablo A. Palazzi/
Pablo A. Palazzi
Sole Panelist
Date: March 6, 2026