

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Graphcore Limited v. 厦门市善医堂贸易商行 (Xiamen Shanyitang Trading Firm)

Case No. D2025-5184

1. The Parties

Complainant is Graphcore Limited, United Kingdom (“UK”), represented by Morrison Foerster (UK) LLP, UK.

Respondent is 厦门市善医堂贸易商行 (Xiamen Shanyitang Trading Firm), China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <graphcorevai.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 December 12, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 15, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (Person or persons unknown / REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on December 15, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint in English on December 26, 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 26, 2025, Complainant confirmed its request that English be the language of the proceeding. Respondent did not submit any comment on Complainant’s submission.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with 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 Respondent in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on December 29, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 18, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on January 19, 2026.

The Center appointed Yijun Tian as the sole panelist in this matter on January 27, 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, Graphcore Limited, is a company incorporated in the UK. It operates as a globally renowned provider of specialised semiconductors and data center hardware designed to drive artificial intelligence innovation. Since its founding in 2016, Complainant has gained substantial goodwill and worldwide recognition as a leading company in the AI semiconductor sector. In 2024, Complainant was acquired by SoftBank Group, further strengthening its global market position.

Complainant has rights in the GRAPHCORE mark. Complainant is the owner of numerous GRAPHCORE trademarks worldwide, including the UK trademark GRAPHCORE registered on October 18, 2018 (UK Trademark Registration No. UK00917919079), the United States of America ("US") trademark GRAPHCORE registered on September 6, 2016 (US Trademark Registration No. 5033790), the European Union (EU) trademark GRAPHCORE registered on October 18, 2018 (EU Trademark Registration No. 017919079), and the International Registration for GRAPHCORE registered on September 14, 2015 (International Registration No. 1272177, designating China, Japan, Republic of Korea, and the US) (Annexes 7–10 to the Complaint).

Complainant operates its website at the domain name <graphcore.ai>.

B. Respondent

Respondent is 厦门市善医堂贸易商行 (Xiamen Shanyitang Trading Firm), China.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 26, 2025. According to the Complaint and the evidence provided by Complainant, the disputed domain name resolves to a website that prominently displays "VAI", falsely claiming that the website operator is "owned by Graphcore" and "authorized by its parent company Graphcore," and otherwise creating the misleading impression of affiliation with or endorsement by Complainant.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its GRAPHCORE trademark, as it incorporates the GRAPHCORE mark in its entirety. The addition of "vai" does not prevent confusing similarity, particularly given the reference to "AI," the industry in which Complainant operates.

Complainant contends that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to 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.

From the evidence presented on the record, no agreement appears to have been entered into between Complainant and Respondent to the effect that the language of the proceeding should be English. Complainant filed initially its Complaint and amendment to the Complaint in English, and has requested that English be the language of the proceeding for the following main reasons:

- (a) the website associated with the disputed domain name is entirely in English;
- (b) the website prominently uses English-language content and references to the UK, including UK locations, UK corporate documentation, and London landmarks; and
- (c) the disputed domain name itself consists of Latin characters and incorporates the English words "graph" and "core".

Respondent did not make any submissions with respect to the language 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 Select UDRP Questions \("WIPO Overview 3.1"\)](#), section 4.5.1).

On the record, Respondent appears to be located in China and thus presumably not a native English speaker, but considering the following aspects, the Panel has decided that the language of the proceeding shall be English:

- (a) the disputed domain name is registered in Latin characters and incorporates the English-language mark GRAPHCORE, composed of the English words "graph" and "core," rather than Chinese script;
- (b) the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") of the disputed domain name is ".com", indicating that it is intended for a global audience, particularly English-speaking Internet users;
- (c) the disputed domain name resolves to a website entirely in English, which prominently contains English-language content and references to the UK (see Annexes 3 and 5 to the Complaint);
- (d) the Center has notified Respondent of the language of the proceeding in both Chinese and English, and Respondent did not comment on Complainant's request that English be the language of the proceeding; and
- (e) the Center also notified Respondent in both Chinese and English of the Complaint, and informed Respondent that it would accept a Response in either English or Chinese, but Respondent chose not to file any Response.

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: 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 name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that Complainant's GRAPHCORE mark is recognizable in its entirety within the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name incorporates the GRAPHCORE mark as its dominant element. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

While the addition of the letters "vai" may bear on the assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that the addition of this term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the GRAPHCORE mark 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 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 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent has not rebutted 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.

More specifically:

(i) there has been no evidence adduced to show that Respondent has used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Respondent has not provided evidence or reasons to justify the choice of the term "graphcore", which is the same as Complainant's GRAPHCORE trademark, in the disputed domain name. There has been no evidence to show that Complainant has licensed or otherwise permitted Respondent to use the GRAPHCORE trademark or to register or use any domain name incorporating the GRAPHCORE marks;

(ii) there has been no evidence adduced to show that Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name. The named Respondent is 厦门市善医堂贸易商行 (Xiamen Shanyitang Trading Firm), China, and there is no evidence that Respondent has been commonly known as “graphcore,” “graphcorevai,” or “vai.” There is also no evidence of any registered trademark rights corresponding to the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name was registered in 2025, many years after Complainant’s GRAPHCORE trademarks were registered internationally; and

(iii) there has been no evidence adduced to show that Respondent was making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. On the contrary, rather than offering any independent goods or services, the disputed domain name resolves to a website that falsely claims that the operator is “owned by Graphcore” and “authorized by its parent company Graphcore,” and otherwise creates a false impression of affiliation with Complainant. The website further includes UK-related references designed to reinforce that misleading association.

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. 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.

In the present case, the Panel finds that Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Based on the information provided by Complainant, the Panel finds that Complainant has established rights and a reputation in the GRAPHCORE mark in connection with artificial intelligence semiconductors and related technology. The GRAPHCORE mark has been registered internationally since at least 2015. The disputed domain name, registered in 2025, incorporates Complainant’s GRAPHCORE mark in its entirety. In these circumstances, it is not conceivable that Respondent was unaware of Complainant’s mark at the time of registration.

This conclusion is reinforced by the content of the website associated with the disputed domain name. The website expressly claims that the operator is “owned by Graphcore” and “authorized by its parent company Graphcore.” The website purportedly provides AI related services, and further includes UK-related references, including references to UK locations and imagery of London landmarks, thereby reinforcing the false impression of affiliation with Complainant, a UK company.

Respondent has no relationship with Complainant and has not been authorized to use the GRAPHCORE mark. By using the disputed domain name in this manner, Respondent has created a likelihood of confusion with Complainant’s mark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement.

The Panel therefore concludes that Respondent is using a confusingly similar disputed domain name with the intention to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to Respondent’s website by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant. Such use constitutes bad faith pursuant to 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 name <graphcorevai.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Yijun Tian/

Yijun Tian

Sole Panelist

Date: February 28, 2026