

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Care & Bloom Pte. Ltd. v. 吴海龙 (Hai Long Wu)  
Case No. D2025-5162

### 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 <hallonancy.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 December 12, 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 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 Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on January 12, 2026.

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.

#### **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". According to website analytic data, a significant proportion of visitors to the Complainant's website since August 1, 2024 used the search terms "hello nancy" or "hello nancy lemon". The evidence also shows that a customer review, a press article and two social media posts refer to the Complainant's brand as "Hello Nancy", while another social media post uses the hashtag #hellonancy.

The Respondent is an individual based in China.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 31, 2025. It does not resolve to any active website; rather, it is passively held.

#### **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, in addition to its registered trademark rights in NANCY, it holds common law trademark rights in HELLO NANCY, NANCY LEM, and LEM. This is a classic case of typosquatting. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's NANCY, and HELLO NANCY marks.

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 "Halo Nancy". Further, it is not making any bona fide noncommercial or fair use of the mark.

The disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent could not have independently conceived the disputed domain name and instead targeted the Complainant's long-established online identity. In the circumstances of this case, passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith. The only plausible purpose of registering the disputed domain name is to misdirect and deceive users who mistype the Complainant's own domain name.

## **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, the amended Complaint and the amendment to the Complaint were filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including the fact that the disputed domain name is in English.

Despite the Center having sent an email regarding the language of the proceeding and the notification of the Complaint, in Chinese and English, the Respondent did not comment on the language of the proceeding or express any interest in otherwise participating in this dispute.

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**

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 the Complainant's claims to unregistered, common law rights in HELLO NANCY.

The disputed domain name incorporates the NANCY mark. Despite the addition of the word "hallo", the mark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name. The only other 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 does not resolve to any active website; rather, it is passively held. 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 constitute a use of the disputed domain name 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. 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 "Hallo 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. 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.

Based on the record, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

## **C. Registered and 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. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

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 "hallo" 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 first vowel (an "a" instead of an "e"), as the disputed domain name uses an alternate spelling of the greeting "hello" in the Complainant's domain name. Even though that greeting is a dictionary term, and NANCY is a given name, the combination of the two is not a dictionary term nor a common phrase. The Respondent provides no explanation for his choice of the disputed domain name. The Panel considers that the most likely explanation for the choice of the disputed domain name was to approximate the Complainant's domain name. On balance, the Panel finds that the Respondent knew of the Complainant's NANCY mark when he registered the disputed domain name.

Prior UDRP panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the composition of the disputed domain name, which is an approximation of the Complainant's domain name that contains an alternate spelling of the greeting "hello" in that domain name. The disputed domain name appears to be intended to attract Internet users who misspell the Complainant's domain name and divert them. That inference is confirmed by the fact that the Respondent registered two other similar domain names several weeks earlier that operate in that way with active websites. See *Care & Bloom Pte. Ltd. v. 吴海龙 (Hai Long Wu)*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-5160](#); *Care & Bloom Pte. Ltd. v. 吴海龙 (Hai Long Wu)*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-5166](#). Accordingly, the Panel finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Therefore, 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 <hallonancy.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Matthew Kennedy/

**Matthew Kennedy**

Sole Panelist

Date: January 28, 2026