

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

NetEase Interactive Entertainment Pte. Ltd. v. Mihai Claudiu
Case No. D2026-1781

1. The Parties

The Complainant is NetEase Interactive Entertainment Pte. Ltd., Singapore, represented by Stobbs IP Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Mihai Claudiu, Romania.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <wherewindsmeetcheat.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc.

The disputed domain name <wherewindsmeetcheat.net> is registered with Porkbun LLC (all together the "Registrars").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on April 24, 2026. On April 28, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On April 28 and 29, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that the 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 May 4, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 24, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 27, 2026.

The Center appointed Marina Perraki as the sole panelist in this matter on June 8, 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 active in the gaming sector and offers, among others, a game called “where winds meet”. It is an online role-playing game, first announced at Gamescom 2022, launched by Complainant in China in December 2024, prior to the worldwide release in November 2025. Following the worldwide release, Complainant’s game reached 2 million players within a day and over 15 million players in the first month. The game has strong social media presence, including 14 million views and more than 83,000 subscribers on YouTube, more than 675,000 Members on Discord, 241.6K followers and 1.8M Likes on TikTok, more than 127,000 followers on X, more than 164,000 followers on Facebook and more than 78,000 followers on Instagram.

Complainant is the owner of WHERE WINDS MEET trademark registrations, including the European Union trademark registration No. 019014945, WHERE WINDS MEET (word), filed on April 17, 2024 and registered on July 31, 2024 for goods and services in international classes 9 and 41.

Complainant is also the owner of the domain name registration <wherewindsmeetgame.com>.

The disputed domain name <wherewindsmeetcheat.com> was registered on November 28, 2025 and the disputed domain name <wherewindsmeetcheat.net> was registered on February 21, 2026.

Per Complaint, at the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain names resolved to the website at “www.wherewindsmeetcheat.net”, where Complainant’s trademarks were used prominently and software intended to hack Complainant’s game was distributed, while Internet users were invited to hack Complainant’s game with this software (the “Website”). The Website promoted the “cheat” software for Complainant’s game, with a 30-day subscription costing USD 14,99 and a lifetime subscription costing USD 49,99.

The disputed domain names currently lead to inactive websites.

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.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists the three elements which the Complainant must satisfy with respect to the disputed domain names:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;

- (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.

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.

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

Although the addition of other terms, here, "cheat" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

The generic Top-Level Domains ("gTLDs") ".com" and ".net" are disregarded in the case, as gTLDs typically do not form part of the comparison on the grounds that they are required for technical reasons (*Rexel Developpements SAS v. Zhan Yequn*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-0275](#); *Hay & Robertson International Licensing AG v. C. J. Lovik*, WIPO Case No. [D2002-0122](#), see also [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1).

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

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving that a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the difficult task of "proving a negative", requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

On the contrary, as Complainant demonstrated, the disputed domain names were used to promote and distribute a "cheat" software for hacking Complainant's popular WHERE WINDS MEET game.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here, claimed distributing malware, unauthorized access/hacking, or other types of fraud, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

The Panel concludes that Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain names in bad faith. Because the WHERE WINDS MEET mark had been widely used with great success and registered at the time of the disputed domain names' registrations by the Respondent, the Panel finds it more likely than not that Respondent had Complainant's mark in mind when registering the disputed domain names (*Tudor Games, Inc. v. Domain Hostmaster, Customer ID No. 09382953107339 dba Whois Privacy Services Pty Ltd / Domain Administrator, Vertical Axis Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-1754](#); *Parfums Christian Dior v. Javier Garcia Quintas and Christiandior.net*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0226](#)). This is also confirmed by the use of the word "cheat" in the disputed domain names along with Complainant's trademark and the fact that the Website promoted software for hacking the Complainant's popular game WHERE WINDS MEET. Therefore, Respondent knew very well of Complainant, its game and its trademark.

As regards bad faith use of the disputed domain names, Complainant has demonstrated that the disputed domain names were used to resolve to the Website, where Complainant's trademarks were used prominently and software intended to hack Complainant's game was distributed, while Internet users were invited to hack Complainant's game with this software. The Website promoted the "cheat" software for Complainant's game, with a 30-day subscription costing USD 14,99 and a lifetime subscription costing USD 49,99.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed malware distribution, invitation for hacking and promotion of hacking software for Respondent's own commercial gain, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 names <wherewindsmeecheat.com> and <wherewindsmeecheat.net> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Marina Perraki/

Marina Perraki

Sole Panelist

Date: June 22, 2026