

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Lenovo (Beijing) Limited v.a Tamyn tjhyzat
Case No. D2026-1672

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Lenovo (Beijing) Limited, China, represented by Neal, Gerber & Eisenberg LLP, United States of America (“United States”).

The Respondent is Tamyn tjhyzat, United Arab Emirates.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lenovo-fa.com> is registered with 1API GmbH (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 20, 2026. On April 21, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 22, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (Arman Data Center Equipment Group) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 23, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on April 28, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “UDRP”), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on April 30, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 20, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 22, 2026.

The Center appointed Tommaso La Scala as the sole panelist in this matter on June 2, 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 in this administrative proceeding is one of the world's largest and fastest growing personal computer companies, serving customers in more than 160 countries for nearly 20 years. In addition to personal computers, the Complainant also offers tablets, smartphones, workstations, servers, electronic storage devices, IT management software, and smart televisions.

The Complainant owns several international and national trademarks for LENOVO, including – as a mere example – the international registration No. 824484 LENOVO (word) granted on March 15, 2004 and duly renewed until 2034 in class 9, covering a wide range of jurisdictions. The Complainant also owns many domain names comprehensive of the LENOVO trademark, such as <lenovo.com>, registered in 2002.

The disputed domain name was registered on February 5, 2025, and it has been used to resolve to a website prominently displaying the Complainant's mark, attempting to pass off as a Lenovo authorized partner, and claiming to be an "Official Lenovo Server Dealership". The website purports to sell LENOVO products as well as Supermicro servers — a competitor's products of the Complainant.

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:

- (a) the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks;
- (b) the Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; and
- (c) the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith, namely for impersonating the Complainant in order to mislead Internet users for undue commercial purposes.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 1.7.

The Complainant has established rights in the LENOVO trademark.

The disputed domain name consists of the LENOVO trademark with the sole addition of a hyphen and the suffix “fa” (very likely a reference to Persian/Farsi, the official language of Iran (Islamic Republic of), and the language code for which is “fa”). This Panel agrees with the Complainant’s assertion that the Complainant’s mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name and that such addition does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant’s trademarks. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.8.

Therefore, the Panel finds the disputed domain name to be confusingly similar to the LENOVO trademark in which the Complainant has rights. Accordingly, 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 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.

This Panel finds that the Complainant has made a prima facie case that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. As a matter of fact, the Respondent does not appear to be commonly known by the name “Lenovo” or “Lenovo-fa” and/or any similar name. The Respondent has no connection to or affiliation with the Complainant, and the Complainant has not licensed or otherwise authorized the Respondent to use or register any domain name incorporating the Complainant’s trademark. The Respondent does not appear to make any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, nor any use in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. In particular, even if the Respondent were to claim a right or legitimate interest as a reseller of LENOVO products, it would fail to satisfy the requirements of the so-called *Okidata* test (*Okidata Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#)). Specifically, the Respondent’s website falsely describes it as a “Official Lenovo Server Dealership”, without any accurate and prominent disclaimer of its actual relationship with the Complainant (failing the third *Okidata* factor). Moreover, the website also promotes Supermicro servers — a direct competitor’s products of the Complainant — thereby engaging in a bait-and-switch scheme (failing the second *Okidata* factor). [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.8.1.

Having reviewed the available record and considering that the Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant’s prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise, 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 documented that the Respondent has purposely registered and used the disputed domain name to attempt to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's LENOVO marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website. Specifically, the Respondent's website appears to hold itself out as an authorized Lenovo partner in Iran (Islamic Republic of), while simultaneously offering competing Supermicro products. This conduct is, in the Panel's view, sufficient to show that the Respondent not only knew of the Complainant and its trademarks but intentionally sought to divert Internet users for commercial gain, in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name constitutes a disruption of the Complainant's business and qualifies as bad faith registration and use under the Policy.

The Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 <lenovo-fa.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Tommaso La Scala/

Tommaso La Scala

Sole Panelist

Date: June 16, 2026