

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Care & Bloom Pte. Ltd. v. 吴海龙 (Hai Long Wu)
Case No. D2025-5166

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 <hellonancys.com> is registered with Cloud Yuqu LLC (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 and December 15, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification responses confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 15, 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.

On December 15, 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 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 English and Chinese of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on December 17, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 6, 2026. The Response was filed in English with the Center on January 4, 2026.

On January 6 and January 12, 2026, the Center received email communications from the Complainant enquiring inter alia about the possibility of making a supplemental filing in reply to the Response. The Center replied to each email on the day that it was received.

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 titled “Nancy” where it offers for sale a range of clitoral massagers, including in the shape of a lemon, an avocado, and a lollipop. 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”. 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 September 11, 2025. It resolves to a website in English titled “Hellonancy” offering personal intimate wellness devices. Among other products, the website offers clitoral massagers, including in the shape of a lemon, an avocado, and a lollipop, that appear identical to the Complainant’s products. According to evidence submitted by the Complainant, the promotional photographs, colors, layout, and text of this website are very similar to those of the Complainant’s website. The Respondent provides records showing that it has processed payments in USD.

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. 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 "Hello Nancy", "Nancy" or "Nancy's". Further, it is not making any bona fide noncommercial or fair use of the mark. The Respondent uses the disputed domain name to sell Lem counterfeits and identical goods, namely the Avo Clitoral Massager and Lolly Mini Wand, 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 deliberate inclusion of the superfluous letter "s" is demonstrably arbitrary and non-functional. 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 Complainant has not submitted any valid trademark registration certificates for HELLO NANCY or any variant thereof. Without registered trademark rights, the Complainant's claim fails at the first hurdle. The Complainant's alleged social media promotions are insufficient to meet its burden to prove that HELLO NANCY acquired secondary meaning prior to the disputed domain name registration date. The combination "Hello Nancy" is inherently descriptive. The Respondent recalls the territorial nature of trademark rights. The Respondent operates an e-commerce business solely targeting United States of America ("United States") consumers. The Complainant has provided no evidence of possessing any enforceable trademark rights for HELLO NANCY in the United States. The disputed domain name is not confusingly similar to "Hello Nancy" due to differences in spelling, pronunciation, and meaning. Prior UDRP panels have consistently held that adding a letter, especially a plural "s", to a weak or descriptive mark avoids confusing similarity.

The Respondent has rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. He is using the disputed domain name to operate a fully functional e-commerce website selling adult wellness and lifestyle products. The Respondent has invested in building a distinctive brand associated with the disputed domain name, including an original logo; the plural "Nancys" reflects brand values distinct from the singular "Hello Nancy". As a plural form of a common name, "Nancys" is a descriptive term. The Respondent has the right to use such terms in commerce, since the Complainant has no valid trademark rights in "Hello Nancy".

The disputed domain name was not registered, and is not being used, in bad faith. The Complainant's lack of United States trademark rights precludes any finding of bad faith registration. 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 was legally free to register a domain name containing a descriptive term. The Respondent's immediate and continuous use of the disputed domain name for a functional e-commerce site demonstrates that the registration was for a genuine business purpose. The Respondent's actions do not fall

within any of the bad faith scenarios outlined in paragraph 4(b) of the Policy: the Respondent has never offered to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant or a competitor; the Complainant has not valid trademark to protect; the Respondent focuses on growing its own business, with no intent to interfere with the Complainant's operations, and the Respondent attracts customers through its independent brand, product quality and customer service, not by confusing consumers with the Complainant.

The Complainant's decision to file this Complaint, despite its lack of trademark rights and the clear differences between the identifiers, suggests an improper motive: using the UDRP process to suppress a competitor. The Complainant knew or should have known that it held no registered trademark rights for HELLO NANCY in any relevant jurisdiction; and that establishing common law rights for such a descriptive term requires evidence that it did not and could not possess. The Complainant knew or should have known that the plural "s" creates a substantive distinction. The Complaint is a tactic to eliminate competition via the UDRP process.

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

The Respondent emphasizes the territorial nature of trademark rights and submits that 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 disputed domain name incorporates the NANCY mark. Despite the addition of the word "hello" before the mark and a plural or possessive "s" after the mark, the mark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name. The Respondent alleges that prior UDRP panels have consistently held that adding a letter, especially a plural "s", to a weak or descriptive mark avoids confusing similarity, but it cites no case supporting that allegation.¹ On the contrary, there are numerous decisions finding that the addition of a letter "s" does not avoid confusing similarity.² 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 resolves to a website titled "Hellonancy" offering personal intimate wellness devices. The website mimics the Complainant's website. Some of the products offered appear identical to the Complainant's products. This gives the overall impression that the Respondent's website or the products on it are 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

¹It refers to *Arcelormittal (SA) v. Rui Zhang*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-0501](#) but the decision in that case ordered a transfer. See *Arcelormittal (SA) v. Rui Zhang*, supra.

²See, for example, *Deutsche Telekom AG v. Vision Computer S.L.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-1240](#); *Playboy Enterprises International, Inc. v. Tom Baert*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-0968](#); *M/s Nalli Chinnaasami Chetty v. Nall's Silks Sari Centre*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-0664](#); *LEGO Juris A/S v. Milon Khan, hongbaocomau*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-5240](#).

resemble the disputed domain name. Nothing on the record indicates that the Respondent has been commonly known as “Hello Nancys”.

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.

Turning to the Respondent, he argues that he has invested in building a distinctive brand, including an original logo. However, the Panel observes that his website mimics the Complainant’s website and the textual element of his logo is identical to the operational element of the Complainant’s domain name. The Respondent argues that the plural “Nancys” is distinct from the singular “Hello Nancy” but the Panel notes that the additional “s” does not alter the meaning of “Nancy” in any way besides number. The Respondent argues that the Complainant has no valid trademark rights in “Hello Nancy” but the Panel recalls that the Complainant has valid trademark rights at least in NANCY. 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. Some of the products offered on the Respondent’s website appear identical to those of the Complainant and 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, the 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 the products on it are 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 functional e-commerce site does not demonstrate any genuine business purpose because it 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 <hellonancys.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Matthew Kennedy/

Matthew Kennedy

Sole Panelist

Date: January 28, 2026