

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Signify Holding B.V. v. guozheng xie, NeoHue
Case No. D2025-5245

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Signify Holding B.V., Netherlands (Kingdom of the), represented by Signify Intellectual Property, Netherlands (Kingdom of the).

The Respondent is guozheng xie, NeoHue, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <neo-hue.com> is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 16, 2025. On December 16, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 16, 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 (Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0174378935, Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0174378935) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 18, 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 on December 18, 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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on December 22, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 11, 2026. The Respondent sent two email communications to the Center on December 22, 2025. The Center commenced the panel appointment process on January 27, 2026.

The Center appointed Pablo A. Palazzi as the sole panelist in this matter on January 29, 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 is a limited liability company organized and existing under the laws of the Netherlands (Kingdom of the), specializing in lighting for professionals, consumers and “the Internet of Things”. The Complainant is a global company with sales of EUR 6.1 billion in 2024, approximately 29,000 employees, and a presence in over 70 countries.

The Complainant and its predecessors have been involved in lighting for more than 125 years. The Complainant split from Koninklijke Philips N.V. in 2016 and between then and 2019 was named Philips Lighting Holding B.V. The Complainant continues to use the Philips brand for its lighting systems under license from Koninklijke Philips N.V., including a proposition for multi-colored lighting and control systems which uses the name and trademark HUE. The Complainant also offers a system named “Philips Hue Play HDMI Sync Box” which allows the user to synchronize smart lights to video content.

The Complainant has several registrations for the HUE trademark around the world, including for example, Benelux registered trademark for the word mark HUE, registered under no. 994289 on July 1, 2016, in International Classes 9 (control apparatus, computer software programs and electronic lighting components for LED lighting) and 11 (lighting installations controlled by various apparatus); and International registered trademark for a figurative mark consisting of the word “hue” in lowercase stylized multi-colored typeface, registered under no. 1344544 on January 20, 2017, with designation to Australia, China, the European Union, India, Japan, Mexico, Russian Federation, Türkiye, and the United States of America, in International Classes 9 and 11 (similar goods and services to said Benelux mark).

The disputed domain name was registered on March 15, 2025. Prior to the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website that purportedly offered third-party lighting products for sale, and also displayed a product image of the Complainant’s lighting products. At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name redirected to a website located at “www.thl.com.cn” that contained an online store offering various electronics and a blog located at “www.thl.com.cn/blogs/news” where there was information about lighting products of competitors of the Complainant.

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.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not substantively reply to the Complainant’s contentions.

On December 22, 2025, the Respondent sent an email to the Center stating: “We would like to inform you that our relevant site is merely a test platform, and all related materials have already been deleted. Given this situation, we choose not to amend the Complaint and confirm this decision in accordance with your notice. Please feel free to contact us if you require any further information or clarification. Sincerely,”

On the same date, another email was sent to the Center stating:

“Dear Sir/Madam,

We appreciate your notification regarding the settlement proposal. We would like to clarify that the domain name in question is associated with a store registered on Shopify, and we no longer uses this domain name and can't un-connect the store. For any inquiries related to this domain name, you may contact Shopify directly. Please let us know if there are any further steps we need to take to move forward with the process.

Sincerely”.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that the Complainant must prove each of the following elements with respect to each disputed domain name:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (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. The Respondent’s default does not by itself mean that the Complainant is deemed to have prevailed. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ([“WIPO Overview 3.0”](#)), section 4.3.

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

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, like here “neo” and a hyphen may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

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

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.

Moreover, the disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's trademark in its entirety and resolves to a website featuring electronics products—the field in which the Complainant operates. This combination carries a risk of implying affiliation with or endorsement by the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1. In its two communications, the Respondent did not assert rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and rather stated that the related site was a test that was no longer used.

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 Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The evidence demonstrates that the disputed domain name redirects users to a website where products unrelated to and/or competing with those of the Complainant are displayed and offered for sale. Additionally, the website previously displayed a blog about lighting featuring products manufactured by the Complainant's competitors.

The focus on competing lighting products demonstrates that the Respondent likely registered the disputed domain name with actual knowledge of the Complainant's trademark rights and for the specific purpose of capitalizing on the goodwill associated with the Complainant's mark to divert traffic and customers to competitor products. No plausible good faith explanation has been offered for this conduct.

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 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

By using the disputed domain name to redirect Internet users to a commercial website offering competing products, the Respondent is intentionally attempting to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website and the products offered therein. This conduct falls squarely within the scope of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

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 <neo-hue.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Pablo A. Palazzi/

Pablo A. Palazzi

Sole Panelist

Date: February 7, 2026