

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Philip Morris Products S.A. v. Wong Frank, pitters wang, Chen Junbin
Case No. D2025-4844

1. The Parties

Complainant is Philip Morris Products S.A., Switzerland, represented by D.M. Kisch Inc., South Africa.

Respondents are Wong Frank, Taiwan Province of China, pitters wang, China, and Chen Junbin, China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <hnb-line.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC; and the disputed domain names <hnb-yd.com>, and <terea-dzy.com> are registered with Internet Domain Service BS Corp (collectively the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 21, 2025. On November 21, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On November 21, 2025, and November 26, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center the verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Registration Private / Domains By Proxy, LLC, and Domain Admin / Whois Privacy Corp) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on November 28, 2025, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting Complainant to either file separate complaints for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on December 3, 2025.

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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on December 11, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 31, 2025. Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondents' default on January 7, 2026.

The Center appointed Yijun Tian as the sole panelist in this matter on January 15, 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

A. Complainant

Complainant, Philip Morris Products S.A, is a company incorporated in Neuchâtel, Switzerland. It is part of a group of companies affiliated with Philip Morris International Inc. ("PMI"). PMI is a leading international tobacco company, which has business in approximately 180 countries.

As part of its transition from combustible cigarettes to Reduced Risk Products ("RRPs"), PMI developed and commercialised the IQOS system, a controlled heating device used with specially designed tobacco sticks sold under trademarks including HEETS, HEATSTICKS, DELIA, LEVIA, and TEREA (the "IQOS System"). The IQOS System was first launched in 2014 and is now available in numerous markets worldwide.

Complainant has exclusive rights in the IQOS, TEREA and HNB marks. Complainant is the exclusive owner of numerous IQOS trademarks worldwide, including International Registration No. 1218246 registered on July 10, 2014, Chinese trademark registration No. 16314286 registered on May 14, 2016, and Chinese trademark registration No. 49264074 registered on May 7, 2021. Complainant is also the owner of International Registration No. 1629687 for the TEREA for IQOS ILUMA (figurative) mark registered on August 26, 2021, and International Registration No. 1765887 for the TEREA mark registered on October 19, 2023. In addition, Complainant owns Taiwan Province of China trademark registration No. 01766175 for the HNB mark, registered on April 16, 2016 (Annexes 6–7 to the Complaint).

B. Respondent

Respondents are Wong Frank (Taiwan Province of China), pitters wang (China), and Chen Junbin (China).

The disputed domain name <hnb-line.com> was registered by pitters wang (China) on October 20, 2025, with GoDaddy.com, LLC.

The disputed domain names <hnb-yd.com>, and <terea-dzy.com> were registered by Chen Junbin (China) and Wong Frank (Taiwan Province of China) on October 28, 2025, and June 30, 2025, respectively, with Internet Domain Service BS Corp.

According to the Complaint and the relevant evidence, the disputed domain names <terea-dzy.com>, <hnb-yd.com>, and <hnb-line.com> resolve to online stores prominently displaying the IQOS, TEREA, and HNB trademarks and purporting to be authorised retailers of Complainant's IQOS System and related tobacco products. The websites are presented in traditional Chinese, display prices in NTD, and contain statements suggesting that they are official IQOS retailers in Taiwan Province of China (Annex 8 to the Complaint). The websites further reproduce Complainant's official product images, while also offering third-party competing tobacco products (Annex 8 to the Complaint).

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that the disputed domain names <terea-dzy.com>, <hnb-yd.com>, and <hnb-line.com> are confusingly similar to its TEREA and HNB trademarks, as each disputed domain name incorporates the relevant mark in its entirety. The addition of the elements "dzy," "yd," and "line" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

Complainant contends that Respondents lack rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

Complainant contends that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

Complainant requests that the disputed domain names be transferred to it.

B. Respondents

Respondents did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants, namely Wong Frank, pitters wang, and Chen Junbin. Complainant submits that the disputed domain names are under common control and should therefore be treated as involving a single Respondent.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel finds that Complainant has provided sufficient evidence to establish that the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control, for the following reasons:

- (a) The disputed domain names were registered within a relatively short period, between June 30, 2025 and October 28, 2025;
- (b) Each disputed domain name incorporates Complainant's TEREA or HNB mark in its entirety with additional elements ("dzy," "yd," and "line");
- (c) The corresponding websites are interconnected, with the "www.hnb-yd.com" and "www.hnb-line.com" websites accessible via hyperlinks on the "www.terea-dzy.com" website; and
- (d) The websites share common features, including traditional Chinese language, pricing in NTD, and representations suggesting official IQOS retail status in Taiwan Province of China.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as “Respondent” or “Respondents”) in a single proceeding.

6.2 Substantive Issues: Three Elements

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 Complainant’s trademark and the disputed domain names. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds that Complainant has established rights in the TERE and HNB trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that Complainant’s TERE mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name <tereadzy.com>, and that Complainant’s HNB mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names <hnb-yd.com> and <hnb-line.com>. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to Complainant’s marks for the purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

While the addition of the other elements “zy,” “yd,” and “line” may be relevant to the assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that the inclusion of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 Respondents may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in disputed domain names.

While the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognised 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 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondents lack rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. Respondents have not rebutted Complainant’s prima facie showing and have 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.

More specifically:

(i) There has been no evidence adduced to show that Respondents used the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Respondents have not provided evidence of reasons to justify their choice of the terms “tere” and “hnb”, the entirety of Complainant’s TERE and HNB trademark, in the disputed domain name. There has been no evidence to show that Complainant has

licensed or otherwise permitted Respondent to use the TEREA or HNB trademarks or to apply for or use any domain name incorporating those marks;

(ii) There has been no evidence adduced to show that Respondents have been commonly known by the disputed domain names. There is no evidence that Respondents hold any registered trademark rights corresponding to TEREA or HNB. The disputed domain names were registered in 2025, long after Complainant's trademark registrations, and are confusingly similar to Complainant's marks; and

(iii) There has been no evidence adduced to show that Respondents were making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names. By contrast, the disputed domain names resolve to interconnected websites presented in traditional Chinese and priced in NTD, purporting to be official IQOS retailers in Taiwan Province of China. The websites prominently display Complainant's IQOS, TEREA, and HNB trademarks, reproduce official product images, and offer Complainant's products alongside competing third-party tobacco products, further increasing the likelihood of consumer confusion. It seems likely that Respondents were making profits through the Internet traffic attracted to the websites under the disputed domain names. (See *BKS Bank AG v. Jianwei Guo*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-1041](#); and *Pet Plan Ltd. v. 权中俊 and 李金梁 (Li Jin Liang)*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-3358](#).)

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, claimed passing off) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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 finds that the disputed domain names were registered and is being used 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 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Based on the record, the Panel is satisfied that Complainant has established rights and reputation in the TEREA and HNB trademarks prior to the registration of the disputed domain names in 2025. The terms "terea" and "hnb" are distinctive and obviously associated with Complainant. It is therefore not conceivable that Respondents registered the disputed domain names without knowledge of Complainant's marks. This conclusion is reinforced by the fact that each disputed domain name incorporates Complainant's TEREA or HNB mark in its entirety.

The disputed domain names resolve to interconnected websites presented in traditional Chinese, priced in NTD, and containing statements suggesting official IQOS retail status in Taiwan Province of China. The websites prominently display Complainant's IQOS, TEREA, and HNB trademarks, reproduce official product images, and offer Complainant's products for sale alongside competing third-party tobacco products.

The Panel therefore concludes that Respondents intentionally used the disputed domain names to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to their websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement. Such conduct constitutes bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

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 <hnb-line.com>, <hnb-yd.com>, and <terea-dzy.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Yijun Tian/

Yijun Tian

Sole Panelist

Date: February 28, 2026