

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Midea Group Co. Ltd v. Jehan Zada, Digital Firm
Case No. D2026-0355

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Midea Group Co. Ltd, China, represented by Kolster Oy Ab, Finland.

The Respondent is Jehan Zada, Digital Firm, Pakistan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <mideaservicecenter.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on January 28, 2026. On January 28, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 28, 2026, 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 (Redacted for privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 29, 2026, 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 February 3, 2026.

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 February 6, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 26, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on February 27, 2026.

The Center appointed William A. Van Caenegem as the sole panelist in this matter on March 11, 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 technology group operating globally, established in 1968 and headquartered in Guangdong, China. The Complainant's business covers more than 200 countries and regions, and its MIDEA brand has been ranked for multiple years in inter alia the Fortune Global 500 and Forbes Global 2000 list.

The Complainant has a number of trademark registrations, including European Union trademark registration no. 001792605 for MIDEA, registered on August 28, 2001 in classes 7, 9, and 11; European Union trademark registration No. 002408375 for MIDEA, registered on November 5, 2002 in class 37; United States of America trademark registration No. 6443539 for MIDEA, registered on August 10, 2021, in classes 7, 9, 11 and 42; and International trademark registration (basic registration China, designation to multiple countries) No. 751860 for MIDEA, registered on December 19, 2000, in classes 7, 9, and 11.

The Complainant operates its website at "www.midea.com".

The disputed domain name was created on January 9, 2025. At the time of writing of this decision the disputed domain name resolves to a page stating that the domain is "parked free, courtesy of GoDaddy.com" and displays unrelated third-party editorial content syndicated from an external website. Previously the disputed domain name resolved to a website that falsely claimed to be the "Official Midea Service Center".

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 the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's MIDEA trademark in its entirety as its dominant and leading element. The Complainant argues that the mere addition of the descriptive terms "service" and "center", together with the generic Top-Level Domain ".com", do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The trademark MIDEA is clearly recognizable and remains the dominant element of the disputed domain name, the Complainant says.

The Complainant asserts that to the best of its knowledge the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests whatsoever in respect of the disputed domain name. That the disputed domain name now resolves to a page stating that the domain is "parked free, courtesy of GoDaddy.com", and also displays unrelated third-party editorial content syndicated from does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. The Complainant adds that this current configuration must be assessed in light of the Respondent's prior use of the disputed domain name to operate a website falsely presenting itself as the "official Midea Service Center" and offering commercial appliance repair services.

The Complainant goes on to say that the disputed domain name was registered and has been used in bad faith. By using the disputed domain name <mideaservicecenter.com>, the Respondent seems to have intentionally attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's MIDEA trademark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement, the Complainant alleges. Additionally, as evidenced by the Respondent's prior website as captured on January 12, 2026, the

Respondent has falsely represented itself as the “official Midea Service Center”, offering appliance repair services, and claiming exclusive expertise and genuine Midea parts, despite having no authorization from the Complainant to do so. The Complainant contends that such impersonation demonstrates clear knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark at the time of registration. The Respondent’s subsequent removal of the infringing content and current use of the disputed domain name for parking or third-party syndicated content cannot cure this bad faith, the Complainant concludes

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), section 1.7.

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

Although the addition of other terms, here “service center” may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8. The MIDEA registered trademark of the Complainant is replicated in its entirety in the disputed domain name and clearly recognizable within it.

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 that 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 3.1](#), 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.

Currently the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website which means there is nothing to support a finding of rights or legitimate interests vesting in the Respondent. Additionally, the present configuration was preceded by a prior use of the disputed domain name for the operation of a website falsely presenting itself as the “official Midea Service Center” and offering commercial appliance repair services. That site was unauthorized and tended to deceive consumers as to the existence of a link with the Complainant.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered a disputed domain name which combined the distinctive registered trademark MIDEA with the terms “service center”. Since the Complainant’s trademark is used in relation to electrical appliances of various kinds, and such goods commonly need to be serviced from time to time, it appears highly likely that the Respondent was aware of the nature of the Complainant’s business activities and of its exclusive rights in the mark MIDEA.

Further, the disputed domain name previously resolved to a website that presented itself as an “official MIDEA service center”, something that was manifestly false and apt to deceive consumers. This clearly amounts to use in bad faith of the disputed domain name pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The present lack of use of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of the Respondent’s bad faith use under the circumstances of this case. Panels have found that under the doctrine of passive holding the non-use of a domain name would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3.

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 <mideaservicecenter.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/William A. Van Caenegem/

William A. Van Caenegem

Sole Panelist

Date: March 25, 2026