

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Infinite Mass Inc. v. haitang wang

Case No. D2025-4567

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Infinite Mass Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Focal PLLC, United States.

The Respondent is haitang wang, Hong Kong, China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <add3ppcspace.com> and <add3prohub.com> are registered with Aceville Pte. Ltd. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English 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 names. On November 14, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 14, 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 November 19, 2025.

On November 14, 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 November 19, 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 November 19, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 9, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on December 12, 2025.

The Center appointed Karen Fong as the sole panelist in this matter on December 16, 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 the owner of the trade mark ADD3 which it uses in connection with digital marketing services since 2007. The Complainant owns United States Trade Mark Registration No. 4410469 for ADD3 registered on October 1, 2013 (the "Trade Mark"). The Complainant also owns and uses a logo which consists of a stylised numeral "3" in white set within a bold, curved geometric shape in a white outline (the "Logo"). The Logo is used to the left of the words "Add3" which is also in white on the Complainant's website at "www.add3.com".

The Respondent, who appears to be based in Hong Kong, China, registered both disputed domain names on September 3, 2025. The disputed domain names resolve to identical websites which invite Internet users to create an account by submitting personal information, including login credentials and contact details before accessing its purported services. The websites display the Logo and the Trade Mark prominently in the form and style used by the Complainant on its own website. (the "Websites").

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Trade Mark, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain names, and that the disputed domain names were registered and are 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 names 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 the following main reasons:

- The Websites are in English;
- The disputed domain names are in English letters rather than Chinese script;
- The Complainant is based in the United States and is not familiar with Chinese. It would be unfairly prejudiced by the time and expense it would take to translate the Complaint and evidence into Chinese when the Respondent is proficient in English.

The Respondent has not challenged the Complainant's language request and in fact has failed to file a Response in either English or Chinese despite being duly notified by the Center in both English and Chinese of the language of the proceeding and of the commencement 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 identity or confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trade mark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the entirety of the Trade Mark is reproduced within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Trade Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

While the addition of the terms "prohub" for one and "ppcspace" for the other after the Trade Mark may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of these terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the Trade Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Based on the available record, 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.

While 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 often impossible 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. 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 record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a *prima facie* case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Moreover, the composition of the disputed domain names is inherently misleading, as it suggests sponsorship, endorsement, or affiliation with the Complainant. Each disputed domain name incorporates the terms "prohub" and "ppcspace", which are descriptive of digital marketing services and directly reference the Complainant's core commercial activities. In these circumstances, the use of such terms alongside the Complainant's mark is apt to reinforce a false association with the Complainant, in line with the principles set out in [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1. Such false association is reinforced by the fact that the Websites prominently display the Complainant's Trade Mark.

Based on the available record, 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 considers it evident that the Respondent was aware of the Trade Mark when registering the disputed domain names given the Trade Mark was registered prior to registration of the disputed domain names and the Respondent has used both the Trade Mark and the Logo on the Websites.

In the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2 states as follows:

"Noting the near instantaneous and global reach of the Internet and search engines, and particularly in circumstances where the complainant's mark is widely known (including in its sector) or highly specific and a respondent cannot credibly claim to have been unaware of the mark (particularly in the case of domainers), panels have been prepared to infer that the respondent knew, or have found that the respondent should have known, that its registration would be identical or confusingly similar to a complainant's mark. Further factors including the nature of the domain name, the chosen top-level domain, any use of the domain name, or any respondent pattern, may obviate a respondent's claim not to have been aware of the complainant's mark."

The Panel further notes that there is a clear absence of rights or legitimate interests on the part of the Respondent. When coupled with the Respondent's unexplained choice of the disputed domain name incorporating the Trade Mark, this is a significant factor supporting a finding of bad faith registration (See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1). The Panel therefore finds that registration of the disputed domain names is in bad faith.

The disputed domain names are also being used in bad faith. The Websites prominently display the Complainant's Trade Mark and Logo and prompt Internet users to sign up and create an account by providing personal information. The Websites are structured to solicit user data prior to access, despite there being no apparent relationship between the Respondent and the Complainant.

In these circumstances, the use of confusingly similar domain names to collect user information strongly indicates an intent to mislead Internet users and presents a risk of phishing or other fraudulent activity. This conduct is consistent with an attempt to exploit the Complainant's Trade Mark to attract users under false pretences.

It is highly likely that Internet users who type the disputed domain names into their browser or encounter them via a search engine would expect to reach websites operated by, or affiliated with, the Complainant.

The disputed domain names wholly incorporate the Trade Mark and have been used in a manner that reinforces that false association, thereby increasing the likelihood of confusion.

From the totality of the circumstances, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users, for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's Trade Mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Websites and the services offered on them, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith. Based on the available record, the Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 names <add3ppcspace.com> and <add3prohub.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Karen Fong/

Karen Fong

Sole Panelist

Date: January 6, 2026