

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

The Associated Board of the Royal Schools of Music Limited v. 孟天帅 (meng tian shuai)

Case No. D2026-0499

### 1. The Parties

The Complainant is The Associated Board of the Royal Schools of Music Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Com Laude Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is 孟天帅 (meng tian shuai), China.

### 2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <abrsn.host> is registered with Xin Net Technology Corporation, and the disputed domain name <abrsn.pro> is registered with Alibaba Cloud Computing Ltd. d/b/a HiChina (www.net.cn) (the “Registrars”).

### 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 5, 2026. On February 6, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On February 9, 2026 and February 10, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Respondent sent an email to the Center on February 18, 2026. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 10, 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 in English on February 16, 2026.

On February 10, 2026, the Center informed the parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain names is Chinese. On February 16, 2026, the Complainant confirmed its request that English be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant’s submission.

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 Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceeding commenced on February 18, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 10, 2026. The Respondent sent an email to the Center on February 18, 2026. However, the Respondent did not submit any formal response. Accordingly, the Center notified the commencement of the panel appointment process on March 11, 2026.

The Center appointed Sebastian M.W. Hughes as the sole panelist in this matter on March 18, 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**

The Complainant is a musical examination board and global musical education charity established in 1889, based in the United Kingdom, and operating in 93 countries worldwide under the trade mark ABRSM (the “Trade Mark”)

The Complainant is the owner of registrations in jurisdictions worldwide for the Trade Mark, including United Kingdom registration No. 00002422405, with a registration date of November 3, 2006; and International registration No. 1761270 (designation including China), with a registration date of July 13, 2023.

The Complainant operates its website at “www.abrsm.org”, providing, amongst other things, validation services for its music examination certificates (the “Complainant’s Website”).

##### **B. Respondent**

The Respondent is an individual located in China.

##### **C. The Disputed Domain Names**

The disputed domain names <abrsm.host> and <abrsm.pro> were registered on January 7, 2026 and September 26, 2025, respectively.

##### **D. Use of the Disputed Domain Names**

The disputed domain names have been used in respect of the same website in Chinese and English, impersonating the examination certificate validation page from the Complainant’s Website (the “Respondent’s Website”). The Complainant discovered a counterfeit certificate created by the Respondent that includes a QR code. When scanned, this QR code directs users to the Respondent’s website, which is designed to fraudulently validate the fake certificate and make it appear legitimate.

#### **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 Respondent has used the disputed domain names illegitimately in respect of the Respondent's Website, in order to impersonate the Complainant, by scraping the Complainant's certificate validation page from the Complainant's website, in order to provide counterfeit validation certificates.

## **B. Respondent**

The Respondent did not formally reply to the Complainant's contentions. However, the Respondent sent an email to the Center on February 9, 2026 stating: "Could you please inform me of the reason for my domain being blocked? I intend to rectify the issue promptly. abrsm.pro." On February 18, 2026, the Respondent sent an email to the Center stating that this was the Complainant's own link, which was just a redirection and had no commercial purpose. The Respondent stated that all links and trademarks would be removed. The QR code was also for testing and had no commercial purpose. Currently, it was a holiday, and all content would be removed.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **6.1 Preliminary Issue: Language of the Proceeding**

The language of the Registration Agreements for the disputed domain names 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.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including the fact that the Respondent's Website is in the English language.

The Respondent did not make any specific 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 3.1](#)), section 4.5.1).

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**

#### **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 trade mark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, claimed as applicable to this case: copycat sites, providing counterfeit goods, or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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 Complainant has rights in the Trade Mark, established long before the registration of the disputed domain names. The disputed domain names are identical to the Trade Mark. The Panel finds that the Respondent knew or should have known of the Complainant’s Trade Mark when registering the disputed domain names. The Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, claimed as applicable to this case: copycat sites, providing counterfeit goods, or other types of fraud) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under 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 names <abrsm.host> and <abrsm.pro> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Sebastian M.W. Hughes/*

**Sebastian M.W. Hughes**

Sole Panelist

Date: April 1, 2026