

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Care & Bloom Pte. Ltd. v. 吴海龙 (Hai Long Wu)

Case No. D2025-5160

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Care & Bloom Pte. Ltd., Singapore, represented by Accolade IP Limited, Hong Kong, China.

The Respondent is 吴海龙 (Hai Long Wu), China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <hellosnancy.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 December 11, 2025. On the same day, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 12, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name that differed from the named Respondent (Publicly unavailable) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on the same day, 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 December 16, 2025 and an amendment to the Complaint in English on December 17, 2025.

On December 12, 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 December 16, 2025, the Complainant requested that English be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the language of the proceeding.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint and 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, in Chinese

and English, of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on December 18, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 7, 2026. The Response was filed in English with the Center on January 6, 2025.

The Center appointed Matthew Kennedy as the sole panelist in this matter on January 21, 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.

On January 22, and January 23, 2026, the Center received three email communications from the Complainant regarding an eventual supplementary filing.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant sells personal intimate wellness devices. The Complainant holds the following trademark registrations for a series of marks comprising “NANCY, Nancy, nancy”:

- Hong Kong, China trademark registration number 305969116, registered on December 8, 2022, specifying goods and services in classes 4, 10, 35, and 41; and
- Singapore trademark registration number 40202250321P, registered on March 10, 2023, specifying goods and services in classes 3, 4, 5, 10, 35, 41, and 44.

The above trademark registrations are current. The Complainant uses the domain name <hellonancy.com> in connection with a website in English where it offers for sale a range of fruit-inspired clitoral massagers. The Complainant refers to itself in its marketing materials as both “Nancy” and “Hello Nancy” and has received over 15,000 customer reviews. It operates social media accounts with the usernames “hellonancy_official” and “hellonancy26”, and the account names “Nancy” and “hellonancy”. Two social media posts refer to the Complainant’s brand as “Hello Nancy” while another uses the hashtag #hellonancy. The Complainant’s top-selling product in the last year (launched on Instagram on November 20, 2023) is a clitoral massager in the shape of a lemon that has received over 9,000 consumer reviews. It is referred to in customer reviews on the Complainant’s website and in a press article as “Hello Nancy Lem”, “Nancy’s Lem”, “Nancy Lem”, and “the Lem”.

The Respondent is an individual based in China.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 12, 2025. It resolves to a website in English titled “Hellosnancy” offering personal intimate wellness devices, including one in the shape of a lemon marketed as “Lem air suction vibrator” that appears to be identical to one of the Complainant’s products. The promotional photographs of this product are very similar to those on the Complainant’s website. The Respondent provides records showing that it has processed payments in USD and shipped products to addresses in the United States of America (“United States”).

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 it holds enforceable rights, both registered and unregistered, in NANCY, HELLO NANCY, and NANCY LEM. It submits screenshots of its website; marketing materials and product listings; consumer reviews and online discussions; and sales and marketplace evidence. The disputed domain name is a colorable imitation of the Complainant's mark.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant confirms that it has never authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its marks. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant, and is not commonly known by the name "Hellos Nancy". Further, it is not making any bona fide noncommercial or fair use of the mark. The Respondent uses the disputed domain name to sell the Lem air suction vibrator and identical goods that directly compete with the Complainant's established product line.

The disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent uses the disputed domain name with a deliberate and calculated intention to defraud the public. It is a textbook case of typosquatting. The Respondent has positioned itself as a direct copycat competitor by offering the same category of goods as the Complainant. The overwhelming likelihood of confusion leads consumers to believe that the Respondent's site is either an official affiliate, a new product line, or the legitimate successor of the Complainant's brand.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied any of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name. The Respondent contends that the Complaint is fundamentally defective and should be dismissed in its entirety primarily because the Complainant lacks any enforceable trademark rights in the United States, the only relevant jurisdiction where the Respondent conducts business. Under well-established principles of trademark territoriality, foreign trademark registrations confer no rights in the United States. Therefore, the Complainant cannot satisfy the first element of the Policy, and its entire case fails at the threshold. The Respondent operates an e-commerce business solely targeting United States consumers. The Complainant has provided no evidence of possessing any enforceable trademark rights for HELLO NANCY in the United States. The Complainant has no registered rights and its allegations of common law use in the United States are insufficient. A Complainant must prove trademark rights in the relevant jurisdiction and timeframe. See *TRANS SESÉ, S.L. v. 陈财贵 (Chen Cai Gui)*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-4283](#). The disputed domain name is not confusingly similar to "Hello Nancy" due to material visual, phonetic, and semantic differences.

The Respondent has rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. It is making a bona fide offering of goods in the United States market. It has a clear pattern of commercial activity. The Respondent has developed a distinctive brand identity around "hellosnancy.com", including a unique logo and brand aesthetic tailored for United States consumers. The disputed domain name was chosen as a creative, brandable name, not to reference the Complainant or any third party mark but as a unique and proprietary identifier for the Respondent's own venture. The Respondent did not merely register the disputed domain name but integrated it into a bona fide commercial venture. The Respondent's expenditure on United States-targeted advertising (such as Google Ads) represents a substantial investment of resources to build goodwill around the "hellosnancy.com" brand.

The disputed domain name was not registered, and is not being used, in bad faith. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name for a legitimate United States business venture. At the time of registration, there was no enforceable HELLO NANCY trademark right in the United States to target,

circumvent, or free-ride upon. The Respondent's actions do not correspond to any indicia of bad faith: the disputed domain name has never been offered for sale to the Complainant; the Respondent is not a competitor blocking the Complainant; the Respondent is not disrupting the Complainant's business; and there is no evidence of intentional confusion; the Respondent's business succeeds on its own merits.

The Complaint constitutes an abuse of process. Filing a UDRP complaint while knowing (or recklessly disregarding) that one lacks trademark rights in the respondent's jurisdiction is an abuse of the Policy. It suggests an improper motive to harass a competitor rather than to protect legitimate rights. The Respondent's conduct - from domain name registration to website launch and advertising investment within a short timeframe - demonstrates a clear pattern of good faith business development. The Complaint appears to be an attempt to gain through the Policy what was not secured in the marketplace.

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.

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. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.5.1.

In the present dispute, the Complainant requested that English be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not comment on that request. Both Parties' respective submissions were all filed in English.

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

6.2 Substantive Issues

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that a complainant must demonstrate each of the following elements:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The burden of proof of each element is borne by the Complainant.

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. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown registered rights in respect of a NANCY trademark for the purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1. Given that finding and the Panel's findings below, it is unnecessary to consider its claims to unregistered, common law rights in HELLO NANCY.

The Respondent emphasizes the territorial nature of trademark rights and contends that the Complaint is fundamentally defective primarily because the Complainant lacks any enforceable trademark rights in the United States. However, the Panel recalls the global nature of the Internet and Domain Name System and notes that the jurisdictions where a complainant's trademark is valid are not considered relevant to the assessment under the first element of the Policy, although it may be relevant to the assessments under the second and third elements. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.1.2. The Respondent cites the UDRP panel decision in *TRANS SESÉ, S.L. v. 陈财贵 (Chen Cai Gui)*, *supra*. However, that decision is consistent with the Panel's approach in the present dispute as that prior panel found the first element of the Policy was satisfied.¹

Turning to the comparison with the Complainant's NANCY mark, the disputed domain name wholly incorporates that mark. Despite the addition of the word "hello" and the letter "s" before the NANCY mark, the mark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name. The only additional element in the disputed domain name is a generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") extension (".com") which, as a standard requirement of domain name registration, may be disregarded in the assessment of confusing similarity for the purposes of the Policy. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's NANCY mark. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7, 1.8, and 1.11.1.

Therefore, 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. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

In the present case, the disputed domain name resolves to a website offering personal intimate wellness devices. Some of the website content mimics the Complainant's website. At least one of the products offered appears identical to the Complainant's top-selling product. This gives the overall impression that the Respondent's website or the lemon-shaped product on it is sourced from, affiliated with, or endorsed by, the Complainant. Yet the Complainant submits that it has never authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its marks, and that the Respondent is not affiliated with it. These circumstances do not indicate that the disputed domain name is being used in connection with a *bona fide* offering of goods or services. Nor does this constitute a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name for the purposes of the Policy. UDRP panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1. Further, the Registrar has verified that the Respondent's name is "吴海龙 (Hai Long Wu)", which does not resemble the disputed domain name. Nothing on the record indicates that the Respondent has been commonly known as "Hellos Nancy".

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.

¹Although the panel in *TRANS SESÉ, S.L. v. 陈财贵 (Chen Cai Gui)*, *supra* denied the complaint, it did so because the complainant in that dispute did not demonstrate any trademark rights at all as at the date of registration of the domain name at issue, which is not the case in the present dispute. See Section 6.2C below.

Turning to the Respondent, he argues that he has a clear pattern of commercial activity and has developed a distinctive brand identity around the disputed domain name, including a unique logo. However, the Panel observes that some of his website content mimics the Complainant's website and the textual element of his logo is almost identical to the operational element of the Complainant's domain name (adding only an "s" between "Hello" and "Nancy"). While the Respondent presents some evidence of sales and asserts that he has spent on advertising, he does not substantiate this assertion or otherwise show that he (whether as an individual, business, or other organization) is commonly known as the disputed domain name. In summary, the Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's *prima facie* showing.

Based on the 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. The fourth circumstance is as follows:

"(iv) by using the [disputed] domain name, [the respondent has] intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [the respondent's] website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of [the respondent's] website or location or of a product or service on [the respondent's] web site or location."

In the present case, the disputed domain name was registered in 2025, after the registrations of the Complainant's NANCY mark. The disputed domain name incorporates the mark and combines it with the greeting "hello", the letter "s" and the gTLD extension ".com", such that the disputed domain name is almost identical to the Complainant's domain name <hellonancy.com>, which the Complainant uses in connection with its website. The only difference from the Complainant's domain name is in the additional "s". Even though the greeting "hello" is a dictionary term, and NANCY is a given name, the combination of the two is neither a dictionary term nor a common phrase. At least one of the products offered on the Respondent's website appears identical to one of the Complainant's products and some of the content of the Respondent's website mimics that of the Complainant's website. Even though the Complainant's trademark registrations may only have been obtained in Hong Kong, China and in Singapore, these circumstances show that the Respondent was nonetheless aware of the Complainant and its NANCY mark when he registered the disputed domain name.

As regards use, the disputed domain name resolves to a website offering products for sale that gives the false impression that it or at least one of the products on it is sourced from, affiliated with, or endorsed by, the Complainant. The circumstances of this case fall within the terms of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The mere use of the disputed domain name in connection with a business venture does not demonstrate any genuine business purpose because the venture operates by creating a likelihood of confusion. Moreover, prior UDRP panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed passing off, constitutes bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

D. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking

The Respondent requests that the Panel make a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking.

Given that the Panel has upheld the Complaint, the Panel does not find that the Complaint has been brought in bad faith or that it constitutes an attempt at Reverse Domain Name Hijacking.

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 <hellosnancy.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Matthew Kennedy/

Matthew Kennedy

Sole Panelist

Date: January 28, 2026