

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Nexperia B.V. v. 安世半导体（上海）有限公司 (an shi ban dao ti shang hai you xian gong si)

Case No. D2026-1518

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Nexperia B.V., Netherlands (Kingdom of the) (“Netherlands”), represented by Norton Rose Fulbright US LLP, United States of America (“United States”).

The Respondent is 安世半导体（上海）有限公司 (an shi ban dao ti shang hai you xian gong si), China, represented by Saelink Law, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <nexperia-semi.com> is registered with Alibaba Cloud Computing Ltd. d/b/a HiChina (“www.net.cn”) (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 9, 2026. On April 10, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 13, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name that differed from the named Respondents (one or more of the following entities: Nexperia Semiconductors (China) Ltd. / Nexperia Technology (Shanghai) Ltd. / Nexperia Wuxi Ltd / Wingtech Technology Co. Ltd) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on the same day, 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 April 15, 2026.

On April 13, 2026, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. On April 15, 2026, the Complainant confirmed its request that English be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent objected to the Complainant’s request and instead requested that Chinese be the language of the proceeding.

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 proceedings commenced on April 21, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5(a), the original due date for Response was May 11, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5(b), the due date for Response was extended to May 15, 2026 at the request of the Respondent. The Response was filed in Chinese with the Center on May 15, 2026.

The Complainant made an unsolicited supplemental filing in English on May 21, 2026. The Respondent made an unsolicited supplemental filing in Chinese in reply on May 27, 2026.

The Center appointed Matthew Kennedy, Willem J. H. Leppink and Chiang Ling Li as the panel in this matter on June 10, 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.

On June 16, 2026, the Respondent made a further unsolicited supplemental filing in Chinese. On June 18, 2026, the Complainant made a further unsolicited supplemental filing in reply in English.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant, based in the Netherlands, is a semiconductor company. It serves a global customer base, shipping more than 110 billion products annually. The Complainant holds trademark registrations in multiple jurisdictions, including the following:

- European Union trade mark registrations number 15992589 for a figurative NEXPERIA mark claimed in colors (“the NEXPERIA logo”), registered on February 23, 2017, and number 15523509 for NEXPERIA, registered on September 28, 2016, both specifying goods that include semiconductors;
- Chinese trademark registrations number 20305403 for NEXPERIA, registered on August 7, 2017, and number 22147289 for the NEXPERIA logo, registered on January 21, 2018, both specifying goods that include semiconductors; and
- United States trademark registrations number 2649896 for NEXPERIA, registered on November 12, 2002, number 5530804 for NEXPERIA, registered on July 31, 2018; and number 5612479, registered on November 20, 2018 for the NEXPERIA logo, all specifying goods that include semiconductors.

The above trademark registrations are all current, although the European Union trademark registrations have been subject to cancellation proceedings based on applications for revocation since October 2025. The Complainant operates a website associated with the domain name <nexperia.com> where it provides information about itself and its products. According to archived screenshots presented by the Complainant, the website prominently displayed the NEXPERIA mark and the NEXPERIA logo [but no longer shows the logo as registered] as early as 2017. Prior to that, the website of the Complainant’s prior parent company, associated with the domain name <nxp.com>, displayed the NEXPERIA mark in product information since at least 2006. The Complainant’s name is translated in Chinese as “安世有限公司”, in which “Nexperia” is translated as “安世” (pronounced “Ān shì”).

The Respondent is a Chinese wholly-owned subsidiary of the Complainant, established in 2020. Its foreign trade operator registration shows its English name as “Nexperia (Shanghai) Ltd”. Another Chinese wholly-owned subsidiary of the Complainant 安世半导体（无锡）有限公司 was established in 2022. Its foreign trade operator and customs broker registrations show that its English name is “Nexperia (Wuxi) Ltd”. The domain

name <nexperiastore.cn> was registered in 2023, and the Respondent organized the Internet Content Provider (ICP) filing for the associated website. The Respondent also launched a Nexperia “official mall” WeChat account in 2023 that announced the launch of that website in January 2024. The publicity showed the NEXPERIA mark and NEXPERIA logo. Another related company, 安世半导体（中国）有限公司 (Nexperia (China) Ltd), adopted that name in 2017. The three companies are referred to below collectively as “Nexperia China”.

The parent company of the Parties is Wingtech Technology Co. Ltd. (“Wingtech”) of China, via shareholdings in Yuching Holding Limited of Hong Kong, China (“Yuching”) and Nexperia Holding B.V. of the Netherlands. On December 5, 2024, Wingtech was added to the United States government’s Bureau of Industry and Security (“BIS”) Entity List, as a result of which Wingtech became subject to trade restrictions under the United States Export Administration Regulations.¹ On September 30, 2025, the BIS published an Affiliates Rule, according to which the Complainant would in principle be subject to the same trade restrictions as Wingtech.² On the same day, the Netherlands Ministry of Economic Affairs issued an administrative order under the Availability Goods Act, intervening in the management of the Complainant and Nexperia Holding B.V. By decisions of October 1 and October 7, 2025 (complemented by decisions of October 8 and October 13, 2025), the Amsterdam Court of Appeal Enterprise Chamber issued provisional measures removing the Complainant’s Chinese CEO and placing all voting rights attached to the shares held by Yuching in Nexperia Holding B.V. (except one) under the management of a Court-appointed administrator.³ On October 4, 2025, the Chinese government imposed trade restrictions, as a result of which exports of Nexperia products from China ceased.

A dispute arose between the Complainant and Nexperia China and intercompany transactions came to a halt in both directions. The delivery of finished products to the Nexperia global supply center came to a standstill. The Complainant informed customers and suppliers that it could no longer guarantee the quality of products from the Nexperia China plant. Nexperia China’s customers pay for their products to a bank account managed by Wingtech. Nexperia China uses Chinese communication platforms. Access to Chinese IT infrastructure for Nexperia employees outside China was blocked. Local Chinese teams have been instructed to download important data from SAP, Workday, Outlook and OneDrive to local storage facilities. [According to a statement by Nexperia China of October 17, 2025, all workers should continue to follow Nexperia China’s work instructions; any instructions not approved by Nexperia China may be denied.] Deliveries of wafers from the Complainant in Europe to Nexperia China were suspended.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 24, 2025. It does not resolve to any active website but has been used in email addresses. By letter dated December 8, 2025 to Wingtech, the Complainant expressed its concerns relating to the registration of the disputed domain name and the domain name <nexperia-semi.cn>, and use thereof for email addresses. In January 2026, certain Nexperia employees in Asia received sales quotations from a member of the Nexperia Automotive Team in China, sent from an address that used a <nexperia.com> domain name, copied to two addresses that used the disputed domain name. On February 4, 2026, a customer of the Complainant in Europe received a Product Change Notification (“PCN”) by email from an employee of Nexperia China, sent from an address using the disputed domain name. The notification displayed the NEXPERIA logo, referred to Nexperia (China) Ltd and the Respondent, raised supply chain issues, and was titled “Export Control Mitigation PCN”. The contact email address used the disputed domain name.

Further, from at least February 10, 2026, the disputed domain name also appeared in a contact email address on the website associated with the domain name <nexperiastore.cn>. The website prominently displays the NEXPERIA logo and offers diodes, transistors, and other products for sale, displaying images of Nexperia products. The website is mostly in Chinese but product information is in English. The homepage prominently displayed a notice that may be translated as: “Dear customer, please contact [email address using the disputed domain name] before placing an order to confirm the product, price, and other transaction

¹ Additions and Modifications to the Entity List, 89 FR 96830.

² Expansion of End-User Controls to Cover Affiliates of Certain Listed Entities, 90 FR 47201.

³ Case Number 200.359.769/01 OK.

information; orders placed without prior confirmation will not be shipped.” The Respondent’s name is shown in fine print in the payment details, product sales agreement, privacy policy and conditions of use. A QR Code connects to the Nexperia “official mall” WeChat account. On January 6, 2026, it was announced via that WeChat account that Nexperia had launched a new generation of 74HCS products (a type of integrated circuit).

On February 11, 2026, the Amsterdam Court of Appeal Enterprise Chamber ordered an investigation into the Complainant and maintained its provisional measure regarding voting rights attached to shares in Nexperia Holding B.V. pending the outcome of that investigation.

By a letter dated February 17, 2026 to Nexperia China, the Complainant gave notice that it held intellectual property rights, including its European Union and Chinese trademark registrations for NEXPERIA, and stated that these rights may only be used in connection with (i) authentic NEXPERIA products that have been assembled and tested in accordance with the Complainant’s instructions, that comply with its specifications, containing genuine semi-finished products (die) manufactured by front-end manufacturers that have been qualified and authorized by Nexperia and as authorized by Nexperia; and (ii) communications via the Complainant’s official channels (e.g. <nexperia.com>). The Complainant reserved its right to take action against infringement.

On March 3, 2026, Nexperia (China) Ltd announced that on that same day, the Complainant had implemented a mass disabling of office accounts for all employees in China, which resulted in their inability to access key office computing environments and resulted in significant disruption to Nexperia operations in China. Certain production processes were interrupted but certain orders that had already been placed were not affected. The IT and business departments in China had initiated an emergency response plan. Nexperia (China) Ltd was making every effort to minimize potential impacts on future production.

On April 7, 2026, Nexperia (China) Ltd (安世半导体 (中国) 有限公司) obtained Chinese trademark registrations numbers 88320241 and 88320236, both for NEXPERIA, specifying services in classes 35 and 42, respectively, as well as trademark registrations numbers 88320240 and 88320234, both for the NEXPERIA logo, specifying services in classes 35 and 42, respectively. These trademark registrations are current. The applications for these trademarks were filed on October 30, 2025.

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.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar and nearly identical to the Complainant’s NEXPERIA marks and domain name <nexperia.com>.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant has been solely in control of its registered trademarks and its domain name <nexperia.com>. The effect of the provisional measures from the Amsterdam Court of Appeal Enterprise Chamber is that decision-making for the Complainant rests with the Dutch arm of the business. Since those orders were issued, the Complainant has lost operational and legal control over its Chinese subsidiaries. The local management of these subsidiaries has systematically ignored instructions from the Complainant and the company seals have been taken out of the Complainant’s control. A parallel commercial operation was quickly established, whereby the Chinese subsidiaries have opened new bank accounts, diverted customer payments to these accounts, amended contractual terms, taken control of sales channels, disrupted the Complainant’s relationships with its customers and suppliers, and cut off all payments to the Complainant. The Respondent uses the disputed domain name to create unauthorized email addresses to send unauthorized letters with false information to the Complainant’s customers, subcontractors, third-party

suppliers and employees (and holding itself out as the Complainant). These can only be considered attempts by the Respondent to divert the Complainant's customers for financial gain. Such use is not a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the [Complainant's] rights in the trademarks. The Respondent is using the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant's business – by having a domain name that is nearly identical to the Complainant's domain name, sending emails using the disputed domain name to the Complainant's customers advising of product and management changes due to export control measures, and holding itself out as the Complainant. It is clear from the product change notifications that the Respondent's intent is for the email recipient to communicate via the email addresses using the disputed domain name. It is also clear that the Respondent makes no effort to explain the change of relationship with the Complainant. Further, a website formerly associated with the related domain name <nexperiastore.cn> offered NEXPERIA-branded products for sale and displayed a contact email address that used the disputed domain name. With these actions, the Respondent is taking advantage of the Complainant's customer relationships to divert and disrupt the Complainant's business for commercial gain. Such use demonstrates bad faith registration and use.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied any of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Respondent contends that this is not an ordinary case of bad faith cybersquatting by a third party. The Parties belong to the same group and their trademarks, trade names, and domain names were originally subject to internal coordination. This is based on a long-standing stable internal management structure known to the relevant public. Based on these internal group arrangements, the Respondent has prior rights and independent interests, after registering numerous prior rights and legally and continuously using the “安世” and NEXPERIA trademarks for a long period of time, to which the Complainant never raised any objection. The current dispute arises from a conflict of interest regarding the Complainant's control over its affiliates. This dispute involves numerous complex issues, including contracts, authorizations, corporate governance, and the company's will under temporary circumstances. It is unsuitable to determine domain name ownership simply by judging whether trademark rights have been authorized, nor can it be properly resolved through domain name dispute proceedings.

The Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name will not cause confusion with the Complainant's prior rights for the following reasons: (1) the disputed domain name is held by an internal entity of the group with long-term and genuine operations, not an external opportunist, preemptive registrant, or free-rider; (2) the Respondent's registration and use of the 安世 / Nexperia name, the disputed domain name and trademarks are part of an internal arrangement within the group, and through its long-term public use, the Respondent has already acquired its own identification interest; (3) the Complainant has been clearly aware of such arrangements for many years and never raised any objection, and the relevant public has long been able to accurately distinguish them; and (4) the Respondent uses the disputed domain name jointly with the domain name <nexperiastore.cn>, and both clearly point to the Respondent and its specific business operations, never impersonating the Complainant, and they will not cause confusion.

After Wingtech acquired the Complainant, they reached an agreement regarding the NEXPERIA and 安世 trademarks, trade names, and domain names, and regional operations among affiliated companies to facilitate their management and operation. The Nexperia group arranged for the Complainant to register the NEXPERIA trademarks globally and also to register the <nexperia.com> domain name. However, it also arranged for the Respondent to register Nexperia in a company name as early as 2020, for Nexperia (Wuxi) Ltd to register the domain name <nexperiastore.cn> for an online store with a related WeChat account, and for Nexperia (China) Ltd to register and use the domain name <nexperia.cn> with a website in 2017 and register Nexperia's official WeChat account “Nexperia_China”. These affiliated companies have consistently and extensively used the Nexperia sign in their business activities, including exhibition promotion, marketing,

production and sales, actual transactions, product packaging, and supply chain management. The Complainant, as the trademark holder, can represent the Nexperia group in asserting its trademark rights against third parties but has no right to prohibit the Respondent, as an affiliated company within the group, from registering and using the disputed domain name for normal business operations, or from continuing to use related marks normally. The Complainant has never denied the existence of these arrangements, never claimed confusion with the Respondent, and never raised any objection. Relevant customers, suppliers, and other members of the relevant public can thus accurately identify the Respondent as a Chinese entity within the group. The online store associated with the domain name <nexperiastore.cn> and related WeChat official account both clearly identified the Respondent and its affiliated company. The disputed domain name was clearly displayed in the contact information, pointing to the Respondent. There is no intention to mislead or confuse the public into identifying the Respondent as the Complainant.

The Respondent has rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Based on the group's internal arrangements, the Chinese affiliated companies, including the Respondent, have since their establishment registered and used “安世” and “Nexperia” as their trade names to conduct business. Prior to receiving the Complaint, Nexperia (China) Ltd obtained Chinese trademark registrations for NEXPERIA and the NEXPERIA logo. Nexperia (Wuxi) Ltd registered and continuously used the domain name <nexperiastore.cn> with an online store and an official WeChat account, as approved by affiliated companies. The Respondent has rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name as it has become an independent commercial identifier through long-term use.

The disputed domain name has not been registered and is not being used in bad faith. Although the disputed domain name was registered after the dispute arose regarding control of the Nexperia group, it was needed for the Respondent to continue operating its business because the Complainant had prevented it from using the company systems. The Respondent used the disputed domain name in normal business operations, clearly pointing to itself, without any intention to mislead. Faced with a global semiconductor supply chain crisis, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name to maintain the normal operations of its pre-existing business, ensure supply chain stability, and protect the jobs of tens of thousands of employees. The disputed domain name was used as a work email address for daily use and as a contact address for the online store associated with the domain name <nexperiastore.cn>. The Respondent and its parent company, Wingtech, have repeatedly issued official announcements clarifying the reasons for the dispute and informing the public of their response measures, including the fact that they registered and used <nexperia-semi.com> as a transitional email suffix.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Procedural Issues

A. Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name 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, subject to the authority of the Panel to determine otherwise, having regard to the circumstances of the administrative proceeding.

The Complainant's submissions were filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including that the Parties and their representatives are very proficient in English; the disputed domain name includes an English language component (“semi”); the website of the Respondent's parent company (Wingtech Technology Co. Ltd) has an English version, and the Respondent sent emails in English prior to this dispute, which are evidence of the Respondent's ability to communicate in that language, while the use of English avoids the need for expensive and time-consuming translations [for the Complainant].

The Respondent's submissions were filed in Chinese. The Respondent requested that the language of the proceeding be Chinese and that the Complainant provide translations of its submissions for several reasons, including that the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is in Chinese, the website associated with the related domain name <nexperiastore.cn> was primarily in Chinese with only some words in English, the Complainant has not shown that the Respondent is capable of conducting a dispute settlement proceeding in English, and it would be procedurally efficient to conduct this UDRP proceeding and the concurrent China ccTLD Dispute Resolution Policy ("CNDRP") proceeding in the same language.

The Panel notes from the detailed Response that the Respondent has in fact understood the Complaint.

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, but that the Panel will accept both Parties' submissions as filed in their original language, without translation.

B. Unsolicited Supplemental Filings

On May 21, 2026, after the Response was filed, the Complainant made an unsolicited supplemental filing. On May 27, 2026, the Respondent made an unsolicited supplemental filing in reply. On June 16, 2026, after the appointment of the Panel, the Respondent made a further unsolicited supplemental filing. On June 18, 2026, the Complainant made an unsolicited supplemental filing in reply.

Paragraph 10(a) of the Rules provides that "[t]he Panel shall conduct the administrative proceeding in such manner as it considers appropriate in accordance with the Policy and these Rules". Paragraph 10(b) of the Rules provides that "[i]n all cases, the Panel shall ensure that the Parties are treated with equality and that each Party is given a fair opportunity to present its case". Although paragraph 12 of the Rules empowers the Panel, in its sole discretion, to request further statements or documents from either of the Parties, this does not preclude the Panel from accepting unsolicited filings.

Paragraph 18(b) of the Rules provides that "(b) In the event that a Party initiates any legal proceedings during the Pendency of an administrative proceeding in respect of a domain-name dispute that is the subject of the complaint, it shall promptly notify the Panel and the Provider".

In the present case, the Parties' unsolicited supplemental filings concern allegations in the Response regarding judicial proceedings pending in China. According to the Respondent, a provisional order was made in one of those proceedings on the day after the Complaint was filed, while the complaints in the other proceedings were filed after the appointment of the Panel. As such, the Complainant may not have reasonably anticipated either of these proceedings in the Complaint. Moreover, the Respondent was under an obligation to notify the filing of its complaint in the Beijing Internet Court. Each Party's supplemental filings are brief and acceptance of them will not delay this proceeding. Neither Party objects to acceptance of the other's unsolicited supplemental filings.

Therefore, the Panel exercises its discretion to accept both Parties' unsolicited supplemental filings and will take them into account according to their relevance, materiality and weight.

C. Request for Suspension of the Proceeding

The Respondent requests the suspension of this UDRP proceeding, pending final judgements in court proceedings in China.

The Respondent submits that its affiliate, Nexperia (China) Ltd., initiated a proceeding before the Jiangsu Province Higher People's Court against the Complainant claiming tortious liability, and that that Court issued an order on April 10, 2026 restraining the Complainant from making claims of intellectual property infringement during the pendency of that case. The Complainant replied that it received no notice of the action and that no weight should be given to the Respondent's statements due to the lack of evidence in support. The Respondent replied that the Court had confirmed service on the Complainant of the order and, later, it informed the Panel that the Complainant must have been aware of the order because it had applied to the Court on May 8, 2026 for reconsideration. The Complainant then appeared to concede the existence of the order. The Complainant's legal representative alleged that they had been unaware of it due to a lack of internal communication with another of the Complainant's legal representatives.

The Respondent submits that the Complainant's continuance of this UDRP proceeding violates the Court's order and that suspension of this UDRP proceeding will avoid a waste of resources and potential conflicts. The Complainant replies that suspension in this matter is not appropriate and that a decision should be issued based on the evidentiary record before the Panel.

The Respondent also provided evidence that it and a related company, Nexperia (Wuxi) Ltd, filed complaints in the Beijing Internet Court against the Complainant regarding the ownership of three domain names, including the disputed domain name and that the Court accepted them on June 11, 2026.

Paragraph 4(k) of the Policy confirms that this administrative proceeding does not prevent either Party from submitting the dispute to a court of competent jurisdiction. Paragraph 18(a) of the Rules gives the Panel discretion to suspend, terminate, or continue this proceeding where the disputed domain name is also the subject of other pending legal proceedings.

In the present case, there no longer appears to be any dispute regarding the existence of the proceedings before the Jiangsu Province Higher People's Court. The Panel has received confirmation of the filing of complaints in the Beijing Internet Court regarding the disputed domain name. Nevertheless, a suspension of this UDRP proceeding pending final judgements in either or both those court proceedings would create potential for indeterminate delay. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.14.1.

Therefore, the Panel declines to suspend this UDRP proceeding and will turn to the substantive issues.

6.2 Substantive Issues

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that a complainant must prove each of the following elements with respect to the disputed domain name:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the 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 proof of each element is borne by the Complainant

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. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a NEXPERIA trademark and the NEXPERIA logo for the purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the NEXPERIA mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Despite the addition of the term “-semi” (which may be understood as short for “semiconductors”, among other things), the NEXPERIA mark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name. The only additional element in the disputed domain name is a generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) extension (“.com”) which, as a standard requirement of domain name registration, may be disregarded in the assessment of confusing similarity for the purposes of the Policy. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7, 1.8, and 1.11.1.

The Respondent argues that its registration and use of the disputed domain name will not cause confusion with the Complainant’s prior rights because it is a member of the Nexperia group, the disputed domain name allegedly identifies the Respondent due to its long term use, the Complainant allegedly acquiesced in its use, the relevant public is allegedly able to distinguish between the Parties, and due to the way in which the disputed domain name was used on the website associated with the domain name <nexperiastore.cn>. However, while these allegations may be relevant to the second and third elements of the Policy, the Panel does not take them into account in its assessment of confusing similarity under the first element, which is based on a side-by-side comparison between the disputed domain name and the NEXPERIA mark.

Therefore, the Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests, Bad Faith, and Scope of the Policy

The disputed domain name combines the Complainant’s NEXPERIA mark with the term “-semi”, as in “semiconductors”, which is the type of product that the Complainant supplies, and adding the gTLD extension “.com”. The disputed domain name is similar to the Complainant’s mark and its domain name <nexperia.com> as well. The disputed domain name clearly implies an affiliation with the Complainant and the Respondent is in fact affiliated with the Complainant, as a wholly-owned subsidiary. Yet in the present circumstances, the Complainant’s ownership of the Respondent does not imply any operational control and control may be exercised directly by the Complainant’s parent.

The Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name to create contact email addresses. Even though the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website, this use may still be in bad faith. The email addresses appear to have been intended to create a parallel channel of communication with people in the Parties’ supply chain, including employees, sub-contractors, and customers, regarding the group’s operations. This use was clearly commercial. Emails were sent from an existing address that uses the Complainant’s domain name and copied to email addresses created with the disputed domain name. The Complainant alleges that the emails using the disputed domain name were intended to impersonate its business and divert the Complainant’s customers for financial gain. However, the Respondent is part of the Nexperia group, the sales quotation was sent from an email address using the Complainant’s domain name, and the PCN referred to the Respondent and Nexperia (China) Ltd by name, raised supply chain issues, and was titled “Export Control Mitigation PCN”. Given these circumstances, it is not sufficiently clear to the Panel that the email addresses were intended to deceive. Based on the limited record, the same would apply to the contact email address using the disputed domain name displayed on the Chinese website associated with the domain name <nexperiastore.cn>. The Respondent has been offering NEXPERIA products for sale on that website since 2024 and it displayed the contact email address to enable confirmation of orders with itself.

The Respondent was clearly aware of the Complainant’s NEXPERIA mark at all relevant times. While the Respondent may not have had a written license to use the NEXPERIA trademarks, the existence of such a license may be inferred from the Parties’ pre-existing relationship within the same corporate group. That inference appears to be confirmed by the Complainant’s letter of February 17, 2026, sent after the dispute arose regarding control of the Respondent, which confirmed that the Complainant’s trademarks could be used with authentic Nexperia products. However, the Respondent does not allege that it complies with those conditions at the present time.

The Respondent claims that it has an independent reputation in the NEXPERIA marks. However, there is insufficient evidence on the record of its use of those marks to find that any goodwill in them has accrued to the Respondent or that it is commonly known by the disputed domain name. In most instances it uses “安世半导体” in Chinese, including in its company name. The Respondent also points out that Nexperia (China) Ltd recently registered trademarks for NEXPERIA and the NEXPERIA logo in China. However, the existence of trademark rights held by a respondent (or, in this case, its affiliate) does not automatically confer rights or legitimate interests for the purposes of the Policy. Here, the Respondent has confirmed that, within the Nexperia group, it was agreed that the Complainant registered the NEXPERIA trademarks globally. Despite this, the affiliate filed these trademark applications with clear knowledge of the Complainant’s rights in the same marks for related goods in China.

Clearly, this is not a typical case of cybersquatting but, rather, a dispute over corporate governance within a group dealing with the impact of national export controls on a global supply chain and conformity with technical specifications. It is essentially a business and corporate governance dispute with domain name implications. As such, the dispute goes far beyond the scope of the Policy, which establishes a streamlined, inexpensive administrative dispute-resolution procedure intended only for the relatively narrow class of cases of “abusive cybersquatting”. The UDRP is not an appropriate process to adjudicate on a complicated business dispute like this as the Panel does not have the benefit of witness testimony, disclosure of documents, or the other appropriate instruments that are typically available to assist a court to resolve the Parties’ dispute.

The Panel therefore has decided to deny the Complaint, not on the merits, but on the broader grounds that it is a complex business and corporate governance dispute that exceeds the relatively limited “cybersquatting” scope of the UDRP, and would be more appropriately addressed by a court of competent jurisdiction. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.14.6.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Matthew Kennedy/
Matthew Kennedy
Presiding Panelist

/Willem J. H. Leppink/
Willem J. H. Leppink
Panelist

/Chiang Ling Li/
Chiang Ling Li
Panelist
Date: June 24, 2026