

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Wolfspeed, Inc. v. 黄琮淮 (huangconghuai)
Case No. D2026-1797

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Wolfspeed, Inc., United States of America (“United States” or “US”), represented by SafeNames Ltd., United Kingdom.

The Respondent is 黄琮淮 (huangconghuai), China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <ewolfspeed.cloud>, <ewolfspeed.info>, <ewolfspeed.ink>, <ewolfspeed.online>, <ewolfspeed.tech>, <ewolfspeed.top>, <ewolfspeed.xin>, <ewolfspeed.xyz>, <iwolfspeed.cloud>, <iwolfspeed.info>, <iwolfspeed.ink>, <iwolfspeed.online>, <iwolfspeed.tech>, <iwolfspeed.top>, <iwolfspeed.xin>, <iwolfspeed.xyz>, <wolfspeed.space>, <wolfspeed.top> and <wolfspeed.xin> are registered with Xin Net Technology Corp. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 27, 2026. On April 28, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On April 29, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 30, 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 in English on May 1, 2026.

On April 30, 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 May 1, 2026, the Complainant confirmed its request that English be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant’s submission.

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 May 6, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 26, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 29, 2026.

The Center appointed Joseph Simone as the sole panelist in this matter on June 5, 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, Wolfspeed, Inc., is a US-based company founded in 1987. The Complainant is one of the global leaders in silicon carbide technology and production, and it is engaged in the marketing and manufacturing of lighting-class LEDs, lighting products and products for power and radio frequency applications.

Since 2015, the Complainant has operated its main website under the domain name <wolfspeed.com> to promote its services and provide relevant information to investors. The Complainant has also registered multiple other domain names which feature the WOLFSPEED trade mark with various generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") and country code Top-Level Domain ("ccTLD") extensions. These other domain names include but are not limited to <wolfspeed.co>, <wolfspeed.cn>, <wolfspeed.org>, and <wolfspeed.us>.

The Complainant has a portfolio of trademark registrations for WOLFSPEED marks, including the following:

- China Trademark Registration No. 18188712 for WOLFSPEED in Class 9, registered on December 7, 2016;
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 014730683 for WOLFSPEED in Classes 9, 40, and 42, registered on April 15, 2016;
- United States Trademark Registration No. 5530599 for WOLFSPEED in Classes 9, 40, and 42, registered on July 31, 2018; and
- India Trademark Registration No. 3087239 for WOLFSPEED in Classes 9, 40, and 42, registered on October 27, 2015.

The Respondent is purportedly an individual based in China. The Respondent registered all 19 disputed domain names on March 13, 2026. At the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain names did not resolve to any active 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 names.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain names registered by the Respondent are identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's WOLFSPEED marks.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names, as the Respondent does not possess registered or unregistered trademark rights in the term "Wolfspeed", and has not received a license from the Complainant to use domain names featuring the WOLFSPEED trade mark. The Respondent has not used or prepared to use the disputed domain names in

connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, as all the disputed domain names were inactive at the time of filing the Complaint. The Complainant further contends that the configuration of the disputed domain names to potentially receive emails via mail exchange (“MX”) records does not constitute evidence of bona fide activities, particularly given the similarity between the disputed domain names and the Complainant’s WOLFSPEED marks. The Respondent is not known by the term “Wolfspeed” and is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names.

The Complainant further contends that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. The Complainant’s trade mark registrations for WOLFSPEED predate the registration date of the disputed domain names by 11 years. The Respondent failed to respond to the Complainant’s cease and desist letter. Given the Complainant’s well-established reputation in the WOLFSPEED mark, the Respondent’s registration of the 19 disputed domain names reproducing that mark demonstrates a pattern of bad faith conduct aimed at preventing the Complainant from reflecting its trade mark in corresponding domain names. Furthermore, the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of abusive conduct by registering other domain names that encompass the marks of a third party.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Preliminary Issue: 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 the following reasons, including:

- The disputed domain names are solely composed of Latin characters rather than Chinese script, and clearly incorporate the Complainant’s WOLFSPEED trade mark in its entirety. Additionally, the gTLDs are comprised of the English words: “cloud”, “info”, “ink”, “online”, “space”, “tech”, and “top”; and
- Neither the Complainant nor its representatives are familiar with the Chinese language, and the commission of a translator would add considerable costs to the Complainant, who already bears the cost of filing, and will cause delay to the commencement of proceedings.

The Respondent did not make any specific submissions with respect to the language of the proceeding.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel is obligated to do so judiciously 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, and the desirability of avoiding unnecessary delays 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 decides under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

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 trade mark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Panel acknowledges that the Complainant has established rights in the WOLFSPEED trade marks. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The applicable gTLD in a domain name (e.g., ".com") is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded when assessing whether a disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a complainant's trade mark. Thus, the Panel disregards gTLDs in its application of the confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

The Complainant's trade mark is reproduced in its entirety within the disputed domain names <wolfspeed.space>, <wolfspeed.top>, and <wolfspeed.xin>. Accordingly, these disputed domain names are identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The rest of the disputed domain names <ewolfspeed.cloud>, <ewolfspeed.info>, <ewolfspeed.ink>, <ewolfspeed.online>, <ewolfspeed.tech>, <ewolfspeed.top>, <ewolfspeed.xin>, <ewolfspeed.xyz>, <iwolfspeed.cloud>, <iwolfspeed.info>, <iwolfspeed.ink>, <iwolfspeed.online>, <iwolfspeed.tech>, <iwolfspeed.top>, <iwolfspeed.xin>, and <iwolfspeed.xyz> incorporate the Complainant's WOLFSPEED trade mark in its entirety with the addition of either the letter "e" or "i" before the trade mark. The Panel finds that the Complainant's WOLFSPEED mark is still recognizable in the disputed domain names, and that the disputed domain names are therefore confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.9.

The Panel therefore finds that the Complainant has satisfied the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy in establishing their rights in the WOLFSPEED trade mark and in showing that the disputed domain names are either identical or confusingly similar to their mark.

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.

In this case, the Complainant asserts that it has not licensed or authorized the Respondent to use its WOLFSPEED mark and there is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent has used, or undertaken any demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Having reviewed the available records, 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.

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.

There is nothing on the record to suggest that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain names, which could demonstrate its rights or legitimate interests (see, e.g., *World Natural Bodybuilding Federation, Inc. v. Daniel Jones, TheDotCafe*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-0642](#)).

Taking into account the reputation of the Complainant's trade mark, and the composition of the disputed domain names, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names resolving to inactive websites (see, e.g., *Philip Morris USA Inc. v. Daniele Tornatore*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-1302](#)).

Based on the foregoing as well as the Panel's findings below, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The third and final element that a complainant must prove is that the respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy states that any of the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, shall be considered as evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith:

- (i) circumstances indicating that the respondent registered or acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant (the owner of the trademark or service mark) or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or
- (ii) circumstances indicating that the respondent registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) circumstances indicating that the respondent has registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) circumstances indicating that the respondent is using the domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the respondent's website or location or of a product or service on its website or location.

The examples of bad faith registration and use set forth in paragraph 4(b) of the Policy are not meant to be exhaustive of all circumstances in which bad faith may be found. Other circumstances may also 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.

In the present case, the Panel finds that the registration of the 19 disputed domain names, each identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's WOLFSPEED trade marks, indicates the Respondent's awareness of the Complainant and its trade mark rights. The disputed domain names were registered more than a decade after the Complainant established rights in its marks. A cursory Internet search would have revealed the WOLFSPEED mark and the Complainant's products and trading names. The Panel finds it improbable that the Respondent was not aware of the WOLFSPEED mark at the time it registered the disputed domain names.

The disputed domain names resolve to inactive websites. Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of

passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the fame of the Complainant's trade mark, and the composition of the disputed domain names, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

The evidence indicates that MX records are present in the Domain Name System ("DNS") configuration of the disputed domain names. The presence of MX records in the zone files suggests the possible use of the disputed domain names in connection with the receipt as well as the sending of emails from email addresses based on the disputed domain names. There is therefore a possibility that the disputed domain names may be used in connection with the sending of email communications purporting to be sent from the Complainant or one of its affiliated entities, which is further evidence of the Respondent's bad faith.

Based on the foregoing, the Panel finds that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain names in bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(iii) 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 <ewolfsspeed.cloud>, <ewolfsspeed.info>, <ewolfsspeed.ink>, <ewolfsspeed.online>, <ewolfsspeed.tech>, <ewolfsspeed.top>, <ewolfsspeed.xin>, <ewolfsspeed.xyz>, <iwolfsspeed.cloud>, <iwolfsspeed.info>, <iwolfsspeed.ink>, <iwolfsspeed.online>, <iwolfsspeed.tech>, <iwolfsspeed.top>, <iwolfsspeed.xin>, <iwolfsspeed.xyz>, <wolfsspeed.space>, <wolfsspeed.top>, and <wolfsspeed.xin> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Joseph Simone/

Joseph Simone

Sole Panelist

Date: June 19, 2026