

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Philip Morris Products S.A. v. James Bruseklin, Tom William, 林栋
(Lin Dong), 广东秉诚咨询有限公司
(GuangDongBingChengZiXunYouXianGongSi), 林栋(lindong), 广东秉诚咨
询有限公司 (guang dong bing cheng zi xun you xian gong si) and 林栋, 广
东秉诚咨询有限公司
Case No. D2026-2004

1. The Parties

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

The Respondents are James Bruseklin, China; Tom William, China; and 林栋(Lin Dong), 广东秉诚咨询有限公司(GuangDongBingChengZiXunYouXianGongSi), China; 林栋(lindong), 广东秉诚咨询有限公司 (guang dong bing cheng zi xun you xian gong si), China; and 林栋, 广东秉诚咨询有限公司, China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <buyiqosgo.com> and <buyiqosgos.com> are registered with Internet Domain Service BS Corp;

The disputed domain names <fasoul-iqos.com> and <iqos-thome.com> are registered with Cloud Yuqu LLC;

The disputed domain names <iqos-heating.com>, <iqos-ilumashop.com> and <terea-genuine.com> are registered with Bangning Digital Technology Co.,Ltd;

The disputed domain names <shome-iqos.com> and <shoping-iqos.com> are registered with Xin Net Technology Corp.; and

The disputed domain name <twshop-iqos.com> is registered with Chengdu West Dimension Digital Technology Co., Ltd.

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 8, 2026. On May 11, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On May 11 and May 12, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (N/A) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 22, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar(s), requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) 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 in English on May 27, 2026.

On May 22, 2026, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain names <twshop-iqos.com>, <shome-iqos.com>, <shoping-iqos.com>, <fasoul-iqos.com> and <iqosthome.com> is Chinese (the remainder being English). On May 27, 2026, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding. The Respondents 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 Respondents in English and Chinese of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 28, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 17, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents’ default on June 18, 2026

The Center appointed Deanna Wong Wai Man as the sole panelist in this matter on June 23, 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, Philip Morris Products S.A., is a Swiss company and part of the Philip Morris International group of companies (“PMI”). PMI is an international company offering both tobacco and smoke-free products, whose products are sold in approximately 180 countries. Among its smoke-free products is the IQOS tobacco heating system, which was first launched in Japan in 2014, together with related consumable products marketed under, among others, the TEREA brand. The IQOS system is available in numerous markets worldwide, including Taiwan Province of China.

The Complainant owns a substantial global portfolio of trademark registrations for the IQOS, TEREA and ILUMA marks in numerous jurisdictions. These include, among others:

- International Trademark Registration No. 1218246 for the mark IQOS (word), registered on July 10, 2014, in Classes 9, 11, and 34;
- Taiwan Province of China Trademark Registration No. 01718976, IQOS (word), registered on July 16, 2015;

- Taiwan Province of China Trademark Registration No. 02079403, TEREА (word), registered on August 16, 2020; and
- Taiwan Province of China Trademark Registration No. 02077219 for ILUMA (word), registered on August 1, 2020.

The disputed domain names were registered between November 24, 2025 and March 28, 2026. The Complainant states that the disputed domain name <buyiqosgo.com> was inactive at the time the Complaint was filed, while the remaining disputed domain names resolved to websites offering IQOS-branded products and related tobacco products for sale. The websites generally presented themselves as official online stores for IQOS and/or TEREА products in Taiwan Province of China, were presented in traditional Chinese characters used in Taiwan Province of China (among other places), displayed prices in TWD, and several of the disputed domain names redirected users to the website associated with the disputed domain name <buyiqosgos.com>. As at the date of this Decision, the Panel has verified that all of the disputed domain names, with the exception of <shoping-iqos.com>, resolve to inactive pages or error pages.

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 are confusingly similar to the Complainant's IQOS, TEREА and ILUMA trademarks. The disputed domain names wholly incorporate one or more of the Complainant's trademarks, together with dictionary, descriptive or geographical terms such as "buy", "heating", "shop", "genuine", "go", "home", "shopping" and "tw", as well as hyphens or minor misspellings. According to the Complainant, these additional elements do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" should be disregarded for the purpose of the comparison.

The Complainant contends that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. The Complainant states that it has not licensed, authorized or otherwise permitted the Respondents to use the IQOS, TEREА, or ILUMA trademarks or to register any domain name incorporating those trademarks. The Complainant contends that Respondents are not commonly known by the disputed domain names, and there is no evidence that they own any corresponding trademark rights. The disputed domain names have been used to resolve to websites purporting to be official online stores for IQOS and TEREА products in Taiwan Province of China, while also offering competing third-party products for sale. The Complainant submits that such use is neither a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain names.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. The Complainant contends that, given the reputation of its IQOS, TEREА, and ILUMA trademarks and the content of the websites to which the disputed domain names resolved, the Respondents were aware of the Complainant and its trademarks when registering the disputed domain names. According to the Complainant, the Respondents intentionally sought to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the associated websites. The Complainant also submits that the passive holding of one of the disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of bad faith.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 First Preliminary Issue: Language of the Proceeding

The Center informed the Parties that the language of the registration agreements for the disputed domain names <twshop-iqos.com>, <fasoul-iqos.com>, <shome-iqos.com>, <shopping-iqos.com>, and <iqos-thome.com> is Chinese. The language of the Registration Agreement for the other disputed domain names is English. Pursuant to paragraph 11(a) of the Rules, unless otherwise agreed by the Parties or specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint and amended Complaint were filed in English. The Complainant requested that English be the language of the proceeding notwithstanding the language of the relevant registration agreements. The Complainant submitted, among other things, that the disputed domain names are composed of Latin-script terms, several of which incorporate English words; that the websites to which the disputed domain names resolved also contained English words and phrases, demonstrating that the Respondents are capable of understanding English; and that the Complainant, being a Swiss entity, has no knowledge of Chinese, such that requiring it to translate the Complaint and its supporting evidence into Chinese would impose an unnecessary burden and cause undue delay.

The Respondents did not make any 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 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.

6.2 Second Preliminary Issue: 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 mere 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.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

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 3.1](#), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that the underlying registrant information disclosed by the Registrars identifies three named registrants, all located in China. The evidence further shows that the disputed domain names were registered within a relatively short period between November 2025 and March 2026, with six of the disputed domain names registered between November 2025 and January 2026 and the remaining four in March 2026. The Panel also notes that the disputed domain names follow a common naming pattern, each incorporating one or more of the Complainant's IQOS, TERE, or ILUMA trademarks together with descriptive or non-distinctive terms suggestive of the Complainant's products, online retail activities, or the Taiwan Province of China market. The Panel also notes that, at

the time the Complaint was filed, all of the disputed domain names except <buyiqosgo.com>, which was inactive, redirected users, directly or through click-through links, to the website associated with the disputed domain name <buyiqosgos.com>. In addition, <buyiqosgo.com> and <buyiqosgos.com> are near-identical domain names registered with the same registrar and using the same nameserver, while the registrar-disclosed information shows identical registrant and organization details for the remaining eight disputed domain names. The evidence also shows that selecting the “product” tab on the website associated with <iqos-heating.com> redirected users to the inactive <buyiqosgo.com> domain name. In the absence of any Response or other evidence to the contrary, the Panel considers that these cumulative circumstances support a finding, on the balance of probabilities, that the disputed domain names are subject to common ownership or control.

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.

6.3 Findings on the Merits

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

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

Although the addition of other terms here, descriptive terms including, “buy”, “heating”, “shop”, “genuine” etc., 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 Complainant states that it has not licensed, authorized or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its IQOS, TEREА, or ILUMA trademarks or to register any domain name incorporating those trademarks. Further, there is no evidence that the Respondent is affiliated with the Complainant in any way, or that it has been commonly known by the disputed domain names within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy. The Panel also notes that there is no evidence that the Respondent has used, or made demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Instead, based on the evidence, the disputed domain names were used to resolve to websites misrepresenting themselves, purporting to be official online stores for IQOS and/or TEREА products targeting consumers in Taiwan Province of China, containing certain of the Complainant's product images while falsely claiming copyright ownership under the related copyright notice on such website and offering what are alleged to be the Complainant's products together with competing tobacco products in a manner that passed off or falsely suggested an affiliation with the Complainant. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed as passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.

As to the fact that one of the disputed domain names directed to an inactive website at the time of filing of the Complaint and that all but one of the disputed domain names currently direct to an inactive webpage, the Panel finds that holding the disputed domain names passively, without making any use of them, does not confer any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names on the Respondent in the circumstances of this case (see in this regard earlier UDRP decisions such as *Bollore SE v. 赵竹飞 (Zhao Zhu Fei)*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-0691](#); and *Vente-Privee.Com and Vente-Privee.com IP S.à.r.l. v. 崔郡 (jun cui)*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-1685](#)).

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 finds that, on balance of probability, the Respondent registered the disputed domain names with knowledge of the Complainant and its trademarks. The IQOS trademark had already been registered and used for many years before the registration of the disputed domain names and has previously been recognised by UDRP panels as being well known, including in *Philip Morris Products S.A. v. 方文翔 (fang wen xiang)*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-1971](#). While each case must be decided on its own facts, the Panel considers that the evidence in the present case likewise supports a finding that the Complainant's IQOS, TEREА, and ILUMA trademarks already enjoyed a very strong reputation at the time the disputed domain names were registered, creating a presumption of bad faith registration on behalf of the Respondent. Additionally, a simple trademark database or Internet search conducted prior to registration would have readily have disclosed the Complainant's longstanding trademark rights. This finding is also further confirmed by the content of the websites to which the disputed domain names resolved, which prominently displayed the Complainant's IQOS, TEREА, and ILUMA trademarks and offered products marketed under those trademarks, further confirming the bad faith of the Respondent in registering the disputed domain names.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may 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.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has used the disputed domain names to intentionally attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the associated websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of those websites and the products offered on them. The websites prominently displayed the Complainant's trademarks, misrepresented themselves as official online stores for IQOS and/or TEREА products for the Taiwan Province of China market, and offered what were purported to be the Complainant's products together with competing tobacco products. In the circumstances of the case, the Panel finds that such conduct falls within the scope of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, which constitutes direct evidence of use in bad faith under the Policy. In addition, panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, including the operation of websites falsely suggesting an affiliation with the Complainant or otherwise passing itself off as the Complainant, constitutes evidence of bad faith. See section 3.4 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

As to the prior or current inactive or error status of the websites at the disputed domain names, panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the well-known nature of the Complainant's trademarks, and the composition of the disputed domain names, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under 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 <buyiqosgo.com>, <buyiqosgos.com>, <fasoul-iqos.com>, <iqos-heating.com>, <iqos-ilumashop.com>, <iqos-thome.com>, <shome-iqos.com>, <shopping-iqos.com>, <terea-genuine.com> and <twshop-iqos.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Deanna Wong Wai Man/

Deanna Wong Wai Man

Sole Panelist

Date: June 29, 2026