

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Care & Bloom Pte. Ltd. v. 吴海龙 (Hai Long Wu), 林周红 (Zhou Hong Lin)
Case No. D2026-0836

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Care & Bloom Pte. Ltd., Singapore, represented by Accolade IP Limited, China.

The Respondents are 吴海龙 (Hai Long Wu), China and 林周红 (Zhou Hong Lin), China, both self-represented.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <hellonency.com> and <lemnancytoy.com> are registered with Chengdu West Dimension Digital Technology Co., Ltd. The disputed domain names <nancylem.com> and <nancylems.com> are registered with Cloud Yuqu LLC (Chengdu West Dimension Digital Technology Co., Ltd. and Cloud Yuqu LLC are collectively referred to as the "Registrars").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 26, 2026. On February 26, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars requests for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On February 27, 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 (Undisclosed / Registration Private) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 2, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all disputed domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint in English on March 5, 2026.

On March 2, 2026, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreements for the disputed domain names is Chinese. On March 3, and March 5, 2026, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding. The Respondents objected to the Complainant's request and requested Chinese be the language of the proceeding on March 7 and 11, 2026, respectively.

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 Respondents in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 9, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 29, 2026. On March 7 and March 11, 2026, the Respondents respectively provided comments regarding the consolidation. The Complainant sent an email communication to the Center on March 12, 2026, indicating that the requests submitted by the Respondents are identical which further supports the fact that the disputed domain names are under common control. The Responses in Chinese were respectively filed by the Respondents with the Center on March 28, 2026. On April 2, 2026, the Complainant submitted an unsolicited supplemental filing. The Center notified the Parties that it would commence its panel appointment process on April 4, 2026. On April 7 and April 8, 2026, the Respondents respectively submitted their unsolicited supplemental filings.

The Center appointed Deanna Wong Wai Man as the sole panelist in this matter on April 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

The Complainant is Care & Bloom Pte. Ltd., a company incorporated in Singapore, engaged in the promotion and sale of personal wellness products. The Complainant operates its business primarily through its official website at "www.hellonancy.com", which was created on July 22, 2011, and serves as its principal online platform for marketing and selling products under the NANCY brand and related designations. The Complainant asserts that, through continuous use, marketing, and consumer engagement, it has developed recognition in its branding, including HELLO NANCY, NANCY, NANCY LEM, and LEM.

The Complainant has an international trademark portfolio, including but not limited to the following registrations: Hong Kong, China Trademark Registration No. 305969116 for the word mark NANCY, registered from May 26, 2022; Hong Kong, China Trademark Registration No. 307012476 for HELLO NANCY, registered from August 29, 2025; Hong Kong, China Trademark Registration No. 307012566 for a NANCY device mark, registered from August 29, 2025; and Singapore Trademark Registration No. 40202250321P for NANCY, registered on March 10, 2023. The Complainant also relies on additional trademark applications in Hong Kong, China and mainland China.

The disputed domain names <nancylem.com> (registered July 28, 2025), <hellonancy.com> (registered November 5, 2025), <nancylems.com> (registered September 11, 2025), and <lemnancytoy.com> (registered January 27, 2026). The record indicates that all disputed domain names were linked to active websites purportedly offering similar products and displaying comparable branding and presentation. As of the date of this Decision, <hellonancy.com> and <nancylem.com> resolve to inactive websites.

The Respondents are identified as 吴海龙 (Hai Long Wu) and 林周红 (Zhou Hong Lin), apparently both located in China. The Complainant provides evidence that both individuals are shareholders of the company 福州花道木影信息科技有限公司 (Fuzhou Huadao Muying Information Technology Co., Ltd.), with 吴海龙 (Hai Long Wu) holding 70 percent and 林周红 (Zhou Hong Lin) holding 30 percent of the shares.

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 names. Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names form part of a deliberate scheme to target its NANCY, HELLO NANCY, and NANCY LEM marks, to divert Internet users, and to sell competing or counterfeit products by creating a false impression of affiliation.

With respect to the first element, the Complainant submits that it has established registered trademark rights in NANCY and HELLO NANCY in multiple jurisdictions, as well as common law rights in HELLO NANCY, NANCY LEM, and LEM through longstanding use, marketing, and consumer recognition. It argues that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its marks, as <hellonency.com> constitutes a clear typographical variation ("typosquatting") of "hellonancy", while <nancylem.com> and <nancylems.com> directly reproduce its alleged product identifier "Nancy Lem", and <lemnancytoy.com> merely rearranges its distinctive elements with the addition of a descriptive term. According to the Complainant, these minor variations do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity but instead increase the likelihood of confusion, particularly as <hellonency.com> redirects to <nancylems.com>, demonstrating an intentional effort to capture and redirect traffic intended for the Complainant.

As to the second element, the Complainant contends that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names, as they have not been authorized to use the Complainant's marks and are not commonly known by the disputed domain names. The Complainant submits that the Respondents are not engaged in any bona fide offering of goods or services, but are instead operating websites that imitate the Complainant's branding, product names, imagery, and overall trade dress, and that offer products which closely resemble or counterfeit the Complainant's goods. In the Complainant's view, such use is inherently deceptive and constitutes a parasitic commercial strategy designed to mislead consumers and capitalize on the Complainant's goodwill, and therefore cannot confer rights or legitimate interests.

With respect to the third element, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith, as the Respondents must have been aware of the Complainant's marks given their prior registration and use, and the highly specific nature of the disputed domain names. The Complainant argues that the disputed domain names represent classic typosquatting and deliberate appropriation of its branding, reinforced by the redirection from <hellonency.com> to <nancylems.com>, the similarity of the associated websites, and the offering of competing or counterfeit products. The Complainant further submits that it has previously prevailed against the Respondent, namely Hai Long Wu, in several UDRP proceedings involving typographical variations of its NANCY brand. According to the Complainant, these prior decisions evidence a pattern of abusive domain name registrations targeting its marks. Taken together, the Complainant submits that the Respondents have intentionally attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to source, affiliation, or endorsement, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Finally, in its unsolicited supplemental filing, the Complainant essentially states that the Respondents' submissions are coordinated, legally flawed, and factually inaccurate, and reiterates that all elements of the Policy are satisfied. The Complainant opposes the Respondents' request to conduct the proceeding in Chinese, arguing that the Respondents clearly operate in English, as evidenced by their English-language websites and submissions, and that any change of language would cause delay and prejudice.

It further maintains that consolidation is appropriate, pointing to the similarity of the domain names, their close registration dates, the Respondents' commercial relationship, and the near-identical structure of their Responses as evidence of common control. On the first element, the Complainant rejects the Respondents' arguments that its marks are generic or lack protection in China, asserting that its registered and unregistered rights are sufficient under the Policy and that the disputed domain names constitute clear cases of typosquatting and imitation. On the second element, the Complainant denies that the Respondents have any rights or legitimate interests, arguing that there is no evidence of independent brand creation and that the Respondents' use of the domain names to replicate its branding, products, and marketing materials is inherently deceptive and cannot constitute a bona fide offering. On the third element, the Complainant contends that the Respondents had actual or constructive knowledge of its rights, emphasizing in particular prior UDRP decisions against Respondent 吴海龙 (Hai Long Wu) involving similar conduct, which it argues demonstrate a pattern of bad faith. The Complainant concludes that the Respondents' conduct amounts to typosquatting, impersonation, and deliberate exploitation of its goodwill, and requests that the Panel reject the Respondents' arguments, maintain English as the language of the proceeding, allow consolidation, and order transfer of the disputed domain names.

B. Respondents

The Respondents contend that the Complainant has not satisfied the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain names. In light of the Panel's findings under section 6.1.C below regarding consolidation, the Panel considers it appropriate to summarise the Respondents' submissions collectively.

With respect to the first element, the Respondents dispute that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's marks. In particular, they argue that the Complainant does not hold trademark registrations in mainland China and that its marks lack recognition in that jurisdiction. They further contend that the terms "Nancy", "Hello", and "Lem" are common, descriptive, or generic elements, noting that "Nancy" is a common personal name, "Hello" is a widely used greeting, and "Lem" is descriptive or derived from common terminology. The Respondents assert that the disputed domain names are based on independently conceived combinations of such terms, including the creation of the "nancylem" name as an original brand, and that differences in spelling, structure, and arrangement are sufficient to distinguish the disputed domain names from the Complainant's marks. In their view, any similarity is coincidental and does not give rise to a likelihood of confusion.

As to the second element, the Respondents assert that they have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. They submit that the disputed domain names were registered through legitimate channels in compliance with applicable registration procedures and based on independently developed business concepts. The Respondents state that they conducted trademark searches in China prior to registration and did not identify any conflicting rights, and therefore proceeded in good faith. They further argue that they have undertaken preparatory steps and/or engaged in commercial activities associated with the disputed domain names, including the development of branding, product design, and online platforms, which they characterize as bona fide use. The Respondents deny that their activities are intended to mislead consumers or to trade off the Complainant's goodwill, and reject any suggestion that they are impersonating the Complainant or operating deceptive websites.

With respect to the third element, the Respondents deny that the disputed domain names were registered or are being used in bad faith. They assert that they had no knowledge of the Complainant or its alleged rights at the time of registration, and argue that any assessment of trademark rights should be limited to those existing in mainland China. The Respondents further contend that the disputed domain names were registered before the Complainant established any rights or reputation in mainland China, and that they were under no obligation to investigate trademark rights in other jurisdictions. They maintain that the domain names were selected based on independent business considerations and deny any intention to target the Complainant, divert Internet users, or create confusion for commercial gain. They also submit that their conduct does not fall within any of the circumstances of bad faith set out in paragraph 4(b) of the Policy.

In their unsolicited supplementary filings, the Respondents reiterate and expand on these arguments, further challenging the Complainant's claims regarding the scope, validity, and distinctiveness of its trademark rights, as well as the alleged reputation of its marks. They also dispute the Complainant's evidence of consumer recognition and confusion, and maintain that they operate independently, denying any coordinated conduct or common control. Overall, the Respondents submit that the Complaint seeks to extend the Complainant's claimed rights beyond their proper scope and should therefore be denied.

Finally, The Panel notes, on the basis of its limited investigation of matters of public record¹ and its review of the text of the Response, that a substantial portion of the Responses appear likely to have been generated, at least in part, using artificial intelligence tools.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Preliminary Issues

A. Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement 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 that the disputed domain names are composed of Latin characters forming English words, the associated websites resolve to English-language content, and requiring translation would result in unnecessary delay and expense.

The Respondents requested that the language of the proceeding be Chinese, relying in particular on the fact that the Registration Agreements are in Chinese and that they are Chinese nationals and that conducting the proceeding in English would impose an unfair burden.

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 Select UDRP Questions ("[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. For this assessment, the Panel attached specific importance to the fact that certain of the disputed domain names resolve to websites in English and therefore target an English-speaking public, that the Respondents' email communications with the Center were bilingual (Chinese/English), and that the Respondents were able to provide their counterarguments in Chinese to the Complaint and amended Complaint filed in English. Additionally, previous proceedings involving one of the Respondents have been conducted in English, see for instance *Care & Bloom Pte. Ltd. v. 吴海龙 (Hai Long Wu)*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-5160](#).

¹ Noting in particular the general powers of a panel articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the UDRP Rules, it has been accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record if it would consider such information useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision, in particular to affirm or corroborate a party's contention. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.8.

Further, in line with section 4.5.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), the Panel notes that in this case, the Parties appear to reasonably understand the nature of the proceedings and each other's arguments, and the Panel, being familiar with both Chinese and English, therefore allows each Party to submit its pleadings and evidence in its own preferred language. Accordingly, the Panel accepts the Parties' submissions in both English and Chinese and determines that no translation of any document is required.

B. Acceptance of Unsolicited Supplemental Filings

With regard to the filing of unsolicited supplemental submissions by the Parties, the Panel notes that such filings are generally discouraged unless specifically requested by the Panel (see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.6). Panels will typically admit such filings only where they address new facts or arguments that could not reasonably have been anticipated by the Parties.

In the present case, the Panel does not identify any compelling justification for any of the Parties to have submitted unsolicited supplemental filings, nor does it consider that these filings introduce materially new arguments or evidence that could not have been presented earlier.

Nevertheless, given that all Parties submitted such filings and that they respond, at least to some extent, to issues raised in the course of the proceeding, the Panel has exercised its discretion to admit and consider them, to the extent relevant, in reaching this Decision, in order to safeguard the Parties' rights of defense and ensure the equality of the Parties in this proceeding.

C. Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The Respondents object to consolidation, asserting that they are separate individuals with independent identities and business operations. They contend that the disputed domain names were registered separately, that there is no evidence of unified control, and that consolidation would be inappropriate and prejudicial as it would improperly merge distinct factual and legal positions.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel finds that the totality of the evidence in this case points to a coordinated operation under common control. In particular, the Complainant has provided evidence that the Respondents are shareholders in the same company, thereby establishing a clear commercial relationship and shared economic interest between them. This corporate linkage constitutes a strong indicator that, on the balance of probabilities, the Respondents are engaged in common business conduct rather than acting independently. The Panel further notes that the disputed domain names were registered within a relatively short period of time, namely between July 2025 and January 2026, which supports an inference of coordinated activity. In addition, the disputed domain names follow a highly similar naming pattern, incorporating the same distinctive elements "nancy" and "lem" in slightly varied combinations (whereby some of the disputed domain names of the Respondents only differ in a single letter e.g., <nancylem.com> and <nancylems.com>), which suggests a deliberate and systematic approach to registration rather than independent conduct or mere coincidence. The Panel also attaches significance to the fact that the associated websites display closely aligned content, product offerings, and overall presentation, reinforcing the conclusion that they form part of a unified commercial strategy.

Taken together, these factors support, on the balance of probabilities, a finding that the disputed domain names are subject to common control and were registered and used as part of a coordinated scheme, rather than as independent and unrelated acts.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party. The Respondents have both been given a fair opportunity to present their respective arguments at length, including their Responses (including objections to consolidation) and even their unsolicited supplementary filings.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as “the Respondent”) in a single proceeding.

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 trademark and the disputed domain names. [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. The Respondent’s contention that the Complainant lacks trademark rights due to the absence of registration in mainland China is irrelevant under the first element, as it is the settled view of panels applying the Policy that, given the global nature of the Internet, complainants do not need to own trademark rights in the respondent’s jurisdiction to satisfy the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.1.2.

The Panel finds that the Complainant’s NANCY mark is clearly recognizable within each of the disputed domain names. In particular, the disputed domain names incorporate either a direct reproduction of the Complainant’s mark (e.g. <nancylem.com>, <lemnancytoy.com> and <nancylems.com>), or constitute a seemingly deliberate typographical variation of the Complainant’s HELLO NANCY mark (e.g., <hellonency.com>). Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant’s marks for the purposes of the Policy (see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.9).

Although the addition of other terms, namely “lem”, “lems”, or “toy”, may bear on the assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that the inclusion of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the Complainant’s mark for the purposes of the Policy (see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8).

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 that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. In response, the Respondent essentially argued that it had independently conceived the disputed domain names based on allegedly common or descriptive terms, including “Nancy”, “Hello”, and “Lem”, and that it had conducted trademark searches limited to mainland China, which revealed no conflicting rights. The Respondent further asserted that it has developed its own business, branding, and products in connection with the disputed domain names, and that any use made of the disputed domain names was in connection with bona fide commercial activities. The Respondent denies any intention to mislead consumers, impersonate the Complainant, or trade on the Complainant’s goodwill, and maintains that any similarities were coincidental.

The Panel does not accept the Respondent’s arguments. First, the Respondent has failed to provide any credible evidence supporting its claim of independent creation of the disputed domain names or of its claimed business. In contrast, the evidence shows that the disputed domain names closely replicate or imitate the Complainant’s trademarks and product identifiers, including combinations and variations that correspond to the Complainant’s branding. Second, although the Respondent claimed that its trademark searches limited to mainland China did not reveal any conflicting rights, such claim does not automatically confer rights or legitimate interests under the Policy, nor does it justify the adoption of domain names that targets another party’s established marks. Third, the evidence submitted by the Complainant indicates that the disputed domain names were used to resolve to websites offering highly similar and competing products and were reproducing the Complainant’s product imagery, and overall presentation, which is inconsistent with a bona fide offering of goods or services and instead suggests impersonation or passing off.

The Panel also notes that the record contains no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain names, or that it is making any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of them. To the contrary, the evidence shows that the disputed domain names resolved to websites that sought to impersonate the Complainant by closely imitating its product offerings (including highly overlapping products), and imagery (with product images appearing substantially indistinguishable from those of the Complainant), as well as its overall presentation, including color schemes and design elements such as lemon-themed logos etc.

As to the fact that two of the disputed domain names, namely <hellonency.com> and <nancylem.com>, currently direct to an inactive webpage, the Panel finds that holding a domain name passively, without making any use of it, also does not confer any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name on the Respondent in the circumstances of this case (see in this regard earlier UDRP decisions such as *Bollore SE v. 赵竹飞 (Zhao Zhu Fei)*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-0691](#); and *Vente-Privee.Com and Vente-Privee.com IP S.à.r.l. v. 崔郡 (jun cui)*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-1685](#)).

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 notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names, which are confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademarks, years after those trademarks had been registered and used intensively by the Complainant. Furthermore, the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain names in a manner that attempted to pass off its websites and products as those of, or affiliated with, the Complainant. Moreover, the disputed domain name <hellonency.com> is a typosquatted version of the Complainant’s HELLO NANCY trademark and its domain name <hellonancy.com>. Therefore, the Panel finds that it is more likely than not that the Respondent targeted the Complainant’s trademarks when registering the disputed domain names. In the Panel’s view, the above elements indicate bad faith on the part of the Respondent, and the Panel therefore finds that it has been demonstrated that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain names in bad faith.

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 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

As stated above, the Panel considers that the Respondent has attempted to impersonate the Complainant through its use of the disputed domain names by reproducing its product offerings and images, and overall presentation. The Panel further finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the websites and the products offered thereon. Such conduct falls squarely within the circumstances of bad faith set out in paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

As to the disputed domain names <hellonency.com> and <nancylem.com> which are currently inactive, panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the prior use of these disputed domain names, and the composition of these disputed domain names, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of these disputed domain name does not change the Panel's finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Finally, the Panel has reviewed prior UDRP cases involving very similar bad faith registration and use of typosquatted domain names by the Respondent (see, for example, *Care & Bloom Pte. Ltd. v. 吴海龙 (Hai Long Wu)*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-5160](#) and *Care & Bloom Pte. Ltd. v. 吴海龙 (Hai Long Wu)*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-5162](#)) and finds that, in the circumstances of this case, such decisions support a finding of a pattern of bad faith registration and use by the Respondent, involving the systematic registration of typographical variations of the Complainant's marks.

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 names <hellonency.com>, <lemnancytoy.com>, <nancylem.com>, and <nancylems.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Deanna Wong Wai Man/

Deanna Wong Wai Man

Sole Panelist

Date: April 24, 2026