ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Philip Morris Products S.A. v. yun chen
Case No. D2026-0549

1. The Parties

Complainant is Philip Morris Products S.A., Switzerland, represented by D.M. Kisch Inc., South Africa.

Respondent is yun chen, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <iqosttw.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 February 10, 2026. On February 10, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 10, 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 named Respondent (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC / Iqosttw) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on February 11, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed amended Complaints on February 16, and 20, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the 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 of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on February 20, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 12, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Gabriel F. Leonardos 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

Complainant is part of the group of companies affiliated to Philip Morris International Inc., one of the leading international tobacco and smoke-free products companies, with products sold in approximately 180 countries.

One of Complainant's products is its IQOS System, a precisely controlled heating device into which specially designed tobacco sticks are inserted and heated to generate a flavorful nicotine-containing aerosol. This product was launched in Nagoya, Japan, in 2014, and today is available in 84 markets.

As shown in the examples below, Complainant owns several trademark registrations for IQOS:

Registration Number	Trademark	Jurisdiction	International Class	Registration Date
1329691	IQOS	International Registration (designated jurisdictions include inter alia China and the European Union ("EU"))	9, 11, and 34	August 10, 2016
1338099	IQOS	International Registration (designated jurisdictions include inter alia Japan and the EU)	35	November 22, 2016
1218246	IQOS	International Registration (designated jurisdictions include inter alia India and the EU)	9, 11, and 34	July 10, 2014

The disputed domain name was registered on September 7, 2025, and resolves to an online shop that displays the IQOS trademarks and allegedly sells Complainant's IQOS System.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, Complainant contends that the disputed domain name reproduces the IQOS trademark in its entirety, with the addition of the letter "t" and the geographical indicator "tw" (which refers to Taiwan Province of China), which would be insufficient to prevent the finding of confusing similarity. Therefore, according to Complainant, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's trademarks, fulfilling paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

Complainant affirms that it has not licensed or consented to the registration or use of the disputed domain name and that there are no circumstances that justify Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name. Complainant states that Respondent is not an authorized distributor or reseller of Complainant's products, and the use of the disputed domain name does not meet the requirements set out

by numerous UDRP panel decisions for a bona fide offering of goods. Therefore, Complainant argues that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, fulfilling paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

Complainant urges that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. According to Complainant, considering the use of the disputed domain name, Respondent must have been aware of Complainant's reputation and trademarks at the time of registration of the disputed domain name.

Complainant states that the disputed domain name was used to offer Complainant's IQOS System and displayed the IQOS trademark as well as official product images and marketing materials. In this sense, it affirms the disputed domain name is being used to take advantage of the IQOS trademark to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion. The use of a privacy protection service to hide its identity would further demonstrate Respondent's bad faith.

Thus, according to Complainant, the requirements for a finding of a bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name have been fulfilled, pursuant to paragraphs 4(a)(iii) and 4(b) of the Policy.

Accordingly, Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to Complainant.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed in a UDRP complaint, Complainant must demonstrate that all the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied, as follows:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights; and
(ii) 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 proving these elements is upon Complainant.

Respondent had 20 days to submit a response in accordance with paragraph 5(a) of the Rules and failed to do so. Paragraph 5(f) of the Rules establishes that if Respondent does not respond to the Complaint, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel's Decision shall be based upon the Complaint.

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 of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("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 entirety of the IQOS trademark 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 3.1, section 1.7.

Although the addition of the letters “ttw” may bear assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that such addition 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.

Therefore, 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.

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 Complainant makes out a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to Respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on Complainant). If Respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, Complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available 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.

Based on the available record, Respondent is not entitled to any trademark, trade name, or any other right associated with the disputed domain name. Additionally, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and has not been authorized by Complainant to use the IQOS trademark, and there is no commercial relationship between the Parties. Further, the website at the disputed domain name seemingly offering for sale Complainant’s IQOS System contains no indication as to its lack of relationship with Complainant.

In light of these circumstances, the Panel finds that no rights or legitimate interests can be found on behalf of Respondent.

Accordingly, 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 Respondent has registered the disputed domain name that is confusingly similar to Complainant’s IQOS trademark. Also, based on the available record, it was established that Respondent has no affiliation with Complainant and its trademarks, nor has it sought authorization or a license to utilize the referred trademarks. Also, Respondent does not own any trademarks containing the mark IQOS neither showed any rights over the trademarks or any related terms corresponding to the disputed domain name.

Respondent evidently knew or should have known of the existence of Complainant’s prior well reputed trademark rights and domain names, which were matters of public record, before registering the disputed

domain name. The registration of the disputed domain name was carried out by Respondent, who had the responsibility to verify the existence of the referred trademark.

Considering Complainant's activities, the composition of the disputed domain name and the manner in which it is used, it is inferred that the registration and use of the disputed domain name was done with the intention to take advantage of the IQOS trademark and attract Internet users for commercial gain.

Also, Respondent's bad faith is evidenced by the prominent use of Complainant's IQOS trademarks, marketing materials, and product images on the website without disclosing its lack of relationship with Complainant, which creates the false impression that Respondent is affiliated with, endorsed by, or otherwise authorized by Complainant, or that the commercialization of such products is conducted by Complainant itself.

Therefore, based on the available record, the Panel finds that 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 <iqosttw.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Gabriel F. Leonardos/
Gabriel F. Leonardos
Sole Panelist
Date: April 8, 2026