

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Philip Morris Products S.A. v. Tom William, Wong Frank, Chen Junbin
Case No. D2026-1845

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Philip Morris Products S.A., Switzerland, represented by D.M. Kisch Inc., South Africa.

The Respondents are Tom William, China, Wong Frank, Taiwan Province of China, and Chen Junbin, China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names are <hnbpods.com>, <hnbtw.com>, <iluma-club.com>, <iluma-hk.com>, <iqosdzy.com>, <iqospod.com>, <terea-duty.com>, <terea-dutyfree.com>, <terea-jp.com>, <terea-kim.com>, <terea-kin.com>, <terea-line.net> and <terea-online.com> are registered with Internet Domain Service BS Corp (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 29, 2026. On April 30, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On May 1, 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 (The RDAP server redacted the value) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 4, 2026, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaints 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 domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on May 11, 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 May 15, 2026. In accordance with the Rules paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 4, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 15, 2026.

The Center appointed Knud Wallberg as the sole panelist in this matter on June 22, 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 a company which is part of the group of companies affiliated with Philip Morris International Inc., which is a leading international tobacco and smoke-free products company, with products sold in approximately 180 countries.

As part of its transition from combustible cigarettes to Reduced Risk Products ("RRPs"), PMI developed and commercialized the IQOS system, a controlled heating device used with specially designed tobacco sticks sold under trademarks including such as DELIA, LEVIA, and TEREA (the "IQOS System"). The IQOS System was first launched in 2014 and is now available in markets worldwide.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous registrations for the IQOS trademark worldwide including International Registration No. 1218246 registered on July 10, 2014, Chinese trademark registration No. 16314286 registered on May 14, 2016, and Chinese trademark registration No. 49264074 registered on May 7, 2021, and Taiwanese trademark registration No. 1718976 registered on July 16, 2015. The Complainant also holds registration of the trademarks TEREA, ILUMA and HNB on a worldwide basis, including Taiwanese registration No. 02079403 registered on August 16, 2020 of the TEREA mark; Taiwanese registration No. 02077219 registered on August 1, 2020 of the ILUMA mark and Taiwanese registration No. 01766175 registered on April 16, 2016 of the HNB mark.

The disputed domain names were registered between June 30, 2025, and April 15, 2026. When the Complaint was filed all the disputed domain names were either used for an active website under the disputed domain names or were used to redirect to an active website displaying the Complainant's products under one of the other disputed domain names.

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 <hnbpods.com>, <hnbtw.com>, <iluma-club.com>, <iluma-hk.com>, <iqosdzy.com>, <iqospod.com>, <terea-duty.com>, <terea-dutyfree.com>, <terea-jp.com>, <terea-kim.com>, <terea-kin.com> <terea-line.net> and <terea-online.com> are confusingly similar to its HNB, ILUMA, IQOS and TEREA trademarks, as each disputed domain name incorporates the relevant mark in its entirety. The addition of the non-distinctive elements, such as "dzy" and "kin", or of descriptive elements such as "pods" and "online" or of geographical indicators such as "tw" or "jp" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant furthermore contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names for purposes of Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy. The Complainant has not licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use any of its trademarks or to register domain names incorporating its IQOS, TEREA, ILUMA or HNB trademarks or to register domain names

which will be associated with these trademarks. In addition, the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names since the Respondent's behavior shows a clear intent to obtain an unfair commercial gain, with a view to misleadingly diverting consumers or to tarnish the trademarks owned by the Complainant. Firstly, the Respondent is not an authorized distributor or reseller of the IQOS System. Secondly, the websites sell competing tobacco products of other commercial origin and thirdly, the websites provided under the disputed domain names do not meet the requirements set out in the Oki Data decision, *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#) for a reseller or distributor to be making a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Complainant finally contends that it is evident from the Respondent's use of the disputed domain names that the Respondent knew of the Complainant's IQOS, TEREА, ILUMA and HNB trademarks when registering the disputed domain names. It is also evident from the Respondent's use of the disputed domain names that the Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain names with the intention to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's registered IQOS, TEREА, ILUMA or HNB trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website or location or of a product or service on its website or location, which constitutes registration and use in bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, the Panel shall decide the Complaint in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable and on the basis of the statements and documents submitted by the Parties.

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the three following elements are satisfied:

- (i) the disputed domain names are 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 names; and
- (iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy states that the burden of proving that all these elements are present lies with the Complainant. At the same time, in accordance with paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, if a party, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, does not comply with any provision of, or requirement under, the Rules, or any request from the Panel, the Panel shall draw such inferences there from as it considers appropriate.

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 merely 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.

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 of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ([“WIPO Overview 3.1”](#)), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel finds that the below-mentioned facts and arguments presented by the Complainant supports the finding of common control:

- each of the respective websites associated with the disputed domain names contain the identical generic Top-Level Domain,
- the websites that are linked to the disputed domain names are, in their entirety, substantially identical
- the disputed domain names were registered in two separate clusters near one another, namely: three disputed domain names were registered between June and August 2025 and the remaining disputed domain names were registered between December 2025 – April 2026;
- when accessing the following disputed domain names <terea-jp.com>, <tereaduty.com>, <terea-line.net>, <terea-dutyfree.com> and <terea-kin.com> the user is redirected to the same website for the disputed domain name <terea-kim.com>. Furthermore, when accessing the disputed domain name <hnbpods.com> the user is redirected to the same website for the disputed domain name <ilumaclub.com>;
- the websites linked to the disputed domain names all make use of the “LINE” messenger application to process orders placed by consumers;
- the tab interface for each website linked to the disputed domain names makes use of an identical iteration of the Complainant’s registered logo;
- the name servers of the respective disputed domain names are all registered as Cloudflare;
- the Registrar for all the disputed domain names is the same; and
- the email addresses and ZIP Codes listed for each of the Respondents are identical.

The Panel notes that the Respondents did not comment on or object to the Complainant’s request.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

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.

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.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds that Complainant has established rights in the IQOS, TEREA, ILUMA and HNB trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that these marks are recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to these marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of non-distinctive elements, such as “dzy” and “kin,” or of descriptive elements such as “pods” and “online” or of geographical indicators such as “tw” or “jp” may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

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.

The Panel thus notes that the Complainant’s registered trademarks IQOS, TEREIA, ILUMA and HNB are recognizable within the disputed domain names. Coupled with their use to host e-commerce platforms purportedly offering the Complainant’s products and using the Complainant’s trademarks without authorization, the composition of the disputed domain names cannot constitute fair use as they effectively impersonate or suggest sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant.

Furthermore, the Panel finds that the Respondent cannot be considered as making a bona fide offering of goods and services and thus having a legitimate interest in the disputed domain name as a reseller. The record shows that the websites under the disputed domain names not only offer products bearing the Complainant’s trademarks but also competing third-party tobacco and related products. In addition, the websites do not accurately disclose the Respondent’s lack of relationship with the Complainant and instead prominently display the Complainant’s trademarks and product imagery in a manner that suggests affiliation or authorization.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain names for hosting websites which, inter alia by reproducing the Complainant’s trademarks and product images, gives Internet users the impression that the websites are official websites of the Complainant or its licensee and that the Respondent is an authorised reseller of the Complainant’s products. This is not the case, and the Panel therefore finds that the Respondent by registering and using the disputed domain names intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website as per paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

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 <hnbpods.com>, <hnbtw.com>, <iluma-club.com>, <iluma-hk.com>, <iqosdzy.com>, <iqospod.com>, <terea-duty.com>, <terea-dutyfree.com>, <terea-jp.com>, <terea-kim.com>, <terea-kin.com>, <terea-line.net>, and <terea-online.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Knud Wallberg/

Knud Wallberg

Sole Panelist

Date: July 6, 2026