

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Space NK Limited v. 林明龙 (Lin Ming Long)
Case No. D2025-5360

1. The Parties

Complainant is Space NK Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Carpmaels & Ransford, United Kingdom (“UK”).

Respondent is 林明龙 (Lin Ming Long), China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <uk-spacenk.com> (the “First Domain Name”) and <uk-spacenk.com> (the “Second Domain Name”) (collectively, the First and Second Domain Names will be referred to as the “Domain Names”) are registered with July Name Limited (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 22, 2025, regarding the First Domain Name. On December 23, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the First Domain Name. On December 24, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the First Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on December 24, 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 29, 2025.

On January 6, 2026, Complainant filed the first amended Complaint adding the Second Domain Name to the proceedings. On January 6, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Second Domain Name. On January 7, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming Respondent is the registrant for the Second Domain Name and providing registrant and contact information. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on January 7, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed the second amended Complaint in English on the same day.

On December 24, 2025, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the Domain Names is Chinese. On January 7, 2026, 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 and amended Complaints 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 January 8, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 28, 2026. Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on December 26, 2025. Accordingly, the Center notified the Parties of the Commencement of Panel Appointment Process on January 30, 2026.

The Center appointed Kimberley Chen Nobles as the sole panelist in this matter on February 4, 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

Complainant is a retailer of luxury beauty products with a website at "www.spacenk.com". Complainant owns numerous registered trademarks for the SPACE NK mark, including:

- United States of America registered trademark number 76543124 for the SPACE NK word mark, registered on October 11, 2005;
- European Union registered trademark number 003329364 for the SPACE NK word mark, registered on February 7, 2005; and
- United Kingdom registered trademark number 2341330 for the SPACE NK word mark, registered on January 23, 2004.

The Domain Names <uk-spacenk.com> and <uk-spacens.com> were respectively registered on December 20, 2025 and December 23, 2025. The Domain Name <uk-spacenk.com> resolved to a website using Complainant's trademark and logo and purportedly offering clothing and footwear for sale. The website also had a footer "SPACE NK offers a curated selection of luxury skincare, makeup, and wellness products" and featured the photos of Complainant's advent calendar. Respondent's website was also accessible via a different domain name, which is a misspelling of another well-known retailer's brand.

Complainant's representative filed the original complaint on December 22, 2025 and on the same day contacted the Internet Service Provider associated with the Respondent's website "www.uk-spacenk.com" requesting blocking of the website. In response, the Registrar blocked access to the Respondent's website via the First Domain Name. The next day, December 23, 2025, the Second Domain Name was registered. The Second Domain Name is almost identical with the First Domain Name, with the exception of an addition of the letter "s" at the following "spacenk" – and the same website redirected by the First Domain Name was reactivated via the Second Domain Name.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Names.

Notably, Complainant contends that: (i) the Domain Names are confusingly similar to Complainant's trademark; (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names; and (iii) Respondent registered and is using the Domain Names in bad faith.

In particular, Complainant contends that it has trademark registrations and rights for SPACE NK and that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Names, with the intention to confuse Internet users looking for bona fide and well-known SPACE NK products and services.

Complainant notes that it has no affiliation with Respondent, nor authorized Respondent to register or use a domain name which includes Complainant's trademark, and that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the registration and use of the Domain Names. Rather, Complainant contends that Respondent has acted in bad faith in acquiring and setting up the Domain Names, when Respondent clearly knew of Complainant's rights.

B. Respondent

On December 25, 2026, Respondent sent an email communication to the Center indicated that it understood that the Registrar had deactivated the First Domain Name, and it had removed any infringing content from the website at the First Domain Name. Respondent requested that the First Domain Name be activated again. Respondent did not formally reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Preliminary Issue: Language of Proceedings

The Rules, in paragraph 11(a), provide that unless otherwise agreed by the parties or specified otherwise in the registration agreement between the respondent and the registrar in relation to the disputed domain name, the language of the proceedings shall be the language of the registration agreement, subject to the authority of the panel to determine otherwise, having regard to the circumstances of the administrative proceedings.

Complainant submitted its original Complaint, its amendment to the Complaint and its amended Complaints in English. According to the information received from the Registrar, the language of the Registration Agreements for the Domain Names is Chinese.

Complainant requested that the language of the proceedings be English for several reasons, including the fact that the websites that the Domain Names resolved to, was written entirely in English, with the product prices quoted in GBP, showing that Respondent is familiar with English and targeting UK based English-speaking customers.

Respondent did not comment on Complainant's request for the language of the proceedings be English.

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).

The Panel accepts Complainant's submissions regarding the language of the proceedings. The Panel notes that the Domain Names do not have any specific meaning in the Chinese language, and that the Domain Names are each formed using Latin characters, contains Complainant's SPACE NK trademark in its entirety and the websites to which they have resolved include content published in English. The Panel further notes that the Center notified the Parties in Chinese and English of the language of the proceedings as well as notified Respondent in Chinese and English of the Complaint. Respondent chose not to comment on the language of the proceedings, nor did Respondent choose to file a formal Response in Chinese or English.

Having considered all the circumstances of this case, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceedings shall be English.

6.2 Substantive Issues

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed Complainant must satisfy the Panel that:

- (i) the Domain Names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights;
- (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Names; and
- (iii) the Domain Names were registered and is being used in bad faith.

Section 4.3 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) states that failure to respond to the complainant's contentions would not by itself mean that the complainant is deemed to have prevailed; a respondent's default is not necessarily an admission that the complainant's claims are true.

Thus, although in this case Respondent has failed to respond to the Complaint, the burden remains with Complainant to establish the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy by a preponderance of the evidence.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Complainant has provided evidence of its rights in the SPACE NK trademark, as noted above.

With Complainant's rights in the SPACE NK trademark established, the remaining question under the first element of the Policy is whether the Domain Names, typically disregarding the Top-Level Domain ("TLD") in which they were registered (in this case, ".com"), is identical or confusingly similar to Complainant's trademark. See, e.g., *B & H Foto & Electronics Corp. v. Domains by Proxy, Inc. / Joseph Gross*, WIPO Case No. [D2010-0842](#).

Here, the Domain Names are confusingly similar to Complainant's SPACE NK trademark. The SPACE NK trademark is recognizable in the Domain Names. The addition of the letters "uk-" before "space" and absence of a space between "space" and "nk" in the First Domain Name <uk-spacenk.com>, and the further addition of an "s" after "nk" in the Second Domain Name <uk-spacenk.com>, do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Names and the SPACE NK trademark. See section 1.8 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

Thus, the Panel finds that Complainant has satisfied the first element of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, a complainant must make a prima facie showing that a respondent possesses no rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name. See, e.g., *Malayan Banking Berhad v. Beauty, Success & Truth International*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-1393](#). Once a complainant makes such a prima facie showing, the burden of production shifts to the respondent, though the burden of proof always remains on the complainant. If the respondent fails to come forward with relevant evidence showing rights or legitimate interests, the complainant will have sustained its burden under the second element of the UDRP.

From the record in this case, it is evident that Respondent was, and is, aware of Complainant and its SPACE NK trademark and does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names. Complainant has confirmed that Respondent is not affiliated with Complainant, or otherwise authorized or licensed to use the SPACE NK trademark or to seek registration of any domain name incorporating the trademark. Respondent is also not known to be associated with the SPACE NK trademark and there is no evidence showing that Respondent has been commonly known by the Domain Names.

In addition, Respondent has not used the Domain Names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Rather, the record shows that Respondent had used the Domain Names to engage in illegal activity, namely, the attempted impersonation of Complainant.

UDRP panels have consistently held that use of a domain name for illegal activity — here, impersonation or passing off — can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

Rather, Respondent has used the Domain Names to redirect users to the websites that have displayed the SPACE NK trademark and logo in connection with the purported sale of clothing and footwear, citing on the websites that “SPACE NK offers a curated selection of luxury skincare, makeup, and wellness products”, and using the photos of Complainant’s advent calendar, all of which are in an attempt to impersonate Complainant. Internet users or consumers may assume that the Domain Names are legitimately connected to Complainant and any marketing or other promotional material originated from Complainant, and be deceived.

Accordingly, Complainant has provided evidence supporting its prima facie showing that Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names. Respondent has failed to produce countervailing evidence of any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names. Thus, the Panel concludes that Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names and Complainant has met its burden under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel finds that Respondent’s actions indicate that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Names in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides a non-exhaustive list of circumstances indicating bad faith registration and use on the part of a respondent, namely:

“(i) circumstances indicating that you have registered or you have acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of your documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or

(ii) you have registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that you have engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) you have registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the domain name, you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your 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 your website or location or of a product or service on your website or location.”

The Panel finds that Complainant has provided ample evidence to show that registration and use of the SPACE NK trademark long predate the registration of the Domain Names. Complainant is also well established and known; indeed, the record shows that Complainant's SPACE NK trademark and related services are widely known and recognized for the purposes of the Policy. Therefore, and also noting the use analysis below, Respondent was clearly aware of the SPACE NK trademark when it registered the Domain Names.

The Panel therefore finds that Respondent's awareness of Complainant's trademark rights at the time of registration suggests bad faith. See *Red Bull GmbH v. Credit du Léman SA, Jean-Denis Deletraz*, WIPO Case No. [D2011-2209](#); *Nintendo of America Inc v. Marco Beijen, Beijen Consulting, Pokemon Fan Clubs Org., and Pokemon Fans Unite*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-1070](#); and *BellSouth Intellectual Property Corporation v. Serena, Axel*, WIPO Case No. [D2006-0007](#).

As noted above, the record shows that Respondent has used the Domain Names with an attempt to impersonate Complainant in order to fraudulently divert users to Respondent's sites. In particular, Respondent has used the Domain Names to redirect users to websites that have displayed the SPACE NK trademark and logo in connection with the sale of clothing and footwear, citing on the websites that "SPACE NK offers a curated selection of luxury skincare, makeup, and wellness products", and using the photos of Complainant's advent calendar, all of which are in an attempt to impersonate Complainant. Internet users or consumers may assume that the Domain Names are legitimately connected to Complainant and any marketing or other promotional material originated from Complainant, and be deceived.

UDRP panels have consistently held that a respondent's use of a domain name to trade off goodwill in a complainant's well-known trademark and impersonate complainant, as here, constitutes bad faith. See *Philip Morris Products S.A. v. homn mohmoodi*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-4158](#). Moreover, such use of the Domain Names may potentially result in tarnishing Complainant's reputation and goodwill.

Finally, the Panel also notes the failure of Respondent to submit a formal Response, Respondent's registration and use of the Second Domain Name to serve the same purposes as the First Domain Name, a day after the First Domain Name had been deactivated, as noted above. The Panel considers such factors as further evidence of Respondent's bad faith.

In the present circumstances, considering the reputation of the SPACE NK trademark, and the fraudulent use of the Domain Names, the Panel finds that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Names in bad faith.

Therefore, the Panel finds that Complainant succeeds under the third element of paragraph 4(a) 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 Domain Names <uk-spacenk.com> and <uk-spacens.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Kimberley Chen Nobles/

Kimberley Chen Nobles

Sole Panelist

Date: February 13, 2026