

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Hunza G Limited v. 韩晓冬 (xiao dong han), huapusjmn huapusjmn, EMILY JOHNSON, Lisa Roberts, and Tyler Powell
Case No. D2026-2498

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Hunza G Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Briffa Legal Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondents are 韩晓冬 (xiao dong han), China; huapusjmn huapusjmn, United States of America ("United States"); EMILY JOHNSON, United States; Lisa Roberts, United States; and Tyler Powell, United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <hunzaghq.shop>, <hunzagoutlet.com>, and <hunzag1984.com> are registered with Spaceship, Inc.

The disputed domain name <hunzagsales.shop> is registered with Chengdu West Dimension Digital Technology Co., Ltd.

The disputed domain name <hunzagstyle.shop> is registered with Dynadot Inc.

Spaceship, Inc., Chengdu West Dimension Digital Technology Co., Ltd, and Dynadot Inc. are referred to below separately and collectively as the "Registrar".

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 9, 2026. On the following day, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On June 11 and 12, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy Purposes, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf/Registration Private/Redacted for Privacy, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 12, 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 disputed domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint in English on June 17, 2026.

On June 12, 2026, the Center informed the Parties in English and Chinese, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name <hunzagsales.shop> is Chinese. On June 17, 2026, the Complainant confirmed its request that English be the language of the proceeding. The Respondents did not submit any comment on the language of the proceeding.

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 June 19, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 9, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents’ default on July 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Matthew Kennedy as the sole panelist in this matter on July 15, 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 British company incorporated in 2018 to carry on the business of designing and offering for sale swimwear and clothing under the HUNZA and HUNZA G marks. The HUNZA brand was founded by the Complainant’s group in 1984. The Complainant’s products are now sold in the top 250 retail stores in the world and its turnover in the 2024 financial year was over GBP 26 million. The Complainant holds trademark registrations in multiple jurisdictions, including the following:

- United Kingdom trademark registration number UK00003100102 for HUNZA, registered on June 12, 2015, specifying articles of clothing, swimwear, and other goods in class 25; and
- International trademark registration number 1510122 for HUNZA G, registered on October 30, 2019, designating multiple jurisdictions, including China and the United States, specifying articles of clothing, swimwear, and other goods in class 25.

The above trademark registrations are current. The Complainant uses the domain name <hunzag.com> in connection with a website where it offers swimwear and other clothing for sale. The website prominently displays the HUNZA G mark, offers “The Original Crinkle” swimwear, and refers to the Complainant’s London headquarters.

The Respondents are identified as various individuals and an alias. The disputed domain names were registered on the dates and in the names shown in the following table:

Disputed domain name	Date of registration	Registrant
<hunzaghq.shop>	March 15, 2026	huapusjmn huapusjmn
<hunzagsales.shop>	April 22, 2026	韩晓冬 (xiao dong han)
<hunzagoutlet.com>	April 28, 2026	EMILY JOHNSON
<hunzagstyle.shop>	May 12, 2026	Tyler Powell
<hunzag1984.com>	May 21, 2026	Lisa Roberts

The disputed domain names <hunzaghq.shop> and <hunzagstyle.shop> resolve to websites in English that display a circular Hunza G logo and purportedly offer swimwear for sale, displaying images that appear to show the Complainant’s swimwear. The homepages display text that refers to the swimwear as “Crinkle”

and “original British-made” and they identify the websites’ operator as “HUNZA G”.¹ The disputed domain name <hunzagsales.shop> resolves to an “under construction” webpage. The disputed domain names <hunzagoutlet.com> and <hunzag1984.com> do not resolve to any active website.

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 the disputed domain names are similar to the Complainant’s HUNZA G mark visually, aurally, and conceptually save for the addition of the descriptive and banal terms that follow “hunzag” in the disputed domain names.

The Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. The Respondents’ only interest in the disputed domain names is diverting traffic away from the Complainant and illegal use such as phishing, malware attacks and the sale of counterfeit products. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondents to make use of the Complainant’s mark, or make use of the Complainant’s product images.

The disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith. The disputed domain names were registered primarily for the purpose of diverting potential customers of the Complainant to the Respondents’ websites and hence disrupt the business of the Complainant, which is evident by way of the Respondent’s use of the Complainant’s product imagery and the offer to sell the Complainant’s products at low price points. The disputed domain names not only include the Complainant’s trademark but also terms that could be relevant to its core business while the disputed domain names <hunzaghq.shop> and <hunzagstyle.shop> point to websites that appear identical to the Complainant’s own website.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Procedural Issues

A. 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 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.

¹The Panel notes its general powers articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules and has visited the websites associated with these two disputed domain names to verify the Complainant’s allegations. The Panel considers this process of verification useful in assessing the case merits and reaching a decision. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), section 4.8.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or associated 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 disputed domain names were all registered within a relatively short period of about two months, and were registered following the same naming pattern, i.e., <hunzag [other element].[generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") extension]>. Two of the disputed domain names (registered with different registrars) resolve to very similar websites. In view of these circumstances, the Panel finds it more likely than not that the disputed domain names are under common 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.

B. Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name <hunzagsales.shop> is Chinese whereas the language of the Registration Agreements for the other disputed domain names is English. 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 and amended Complaint were filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including the fact that the disputed domain name <hunzagsales.shop> incorporates an English word, it resolves to a webpage displaying the text in English, and it is under common control with the other disputed domain names, for which the Registration Agreements are in English.

Despite the Center having sent the written notification of the Complaint, in both Chinese and English, which includes instructions on the language of the proceeding and filing a response, the Respondent did not make any submission with respect to the language of the proceeding or indicate any interest in participating in this 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 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 Substantive Issues

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that a complainant must prove each of the following elements with respect to each disputed domain name:

- (i) the disputed domain name is 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 name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The burden of proof of each element is borne by the Complainant.

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

The Complainant has shown registered rights in respect of HUNZA and HUNZA G trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1. It is sufficient for the purposes of the first element of the Policy to compare the disputed domain names with the HUNZA G trademark only.

The entirety of the HUNZA G mark is reproduced within each disputed domain name as its initial element. Despite the addition of another element, variously "hq" (meaning "headquarters"), "outlet", "sales", "style", or "1984", the mark remains clearly recognizable within each disputed domain name. The only other element in the disputed domain names is a gTLD extension (either ".shop" or ".com") which, as a standard requirement of domain name registration, may be disregarded in the assessment of confusing similarity for the purposes of the first element of the Policy. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the HUNZA G mark for the purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7, 1.8, and 1.11.1.

Therefore, 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. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

In the present case, the disputed domain names <hunzaghq.shop> and <hunzagstyle.shop> resolve to websites offering for sale what appears to be the Complainant's HUNZA G swimwear. Both websites refer to the swimwear as "Crinkle" and "original British-made", which are references to the Complainant's products. Whether the products offered for sale are genuine or counterfeit, the websites give the impression that they are operated by the Complainant. However, the Complainant submits that it has not authorized the Respondent to make use of its HUNZA G mark. The other disputed domain names (<hunzagsales.shop>, <hunzagoutlet.com>, and <hunzag1984.com>) are passively held (although the former resolves to an "under construction" webpage). None of these uses is a use of the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Further, the Registrar has confirmed that the Respondent is identified in the Whois database by the names shown in the table in Section 4 above, none of which resembles any of the disputed domain names. Nothing on the record indicates that the Respondent has been commonly known by any of the disputed domain names.

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 name. 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.

Based on the record, 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 fourth such circumstance is as follows:

“(iv) by using the [disputed] domain name, [the respondent has] intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [the respondent's] 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 [the respondent's] web site or location.”

In the present case, the disputed domain names were registered in 2026, years after the registration of the Complainant's HUNZA G mark, including in China and the United States, where the Respondent is ostensibly based. The mark has no dictionary meaning yet the disputed domain names all incorporate it as their initial element, in combination with a word, abbreviation or year related to the Complainant's business (including “1984”, when the HUNZA brand was launched). The Complainant has made widespread use of its HUNZA G mark in connection with its swimwear and clothing. Two of the disputed domain names resolve to websites that purportedly offer for sale what is presented as HUNZA G swimwear, giving the false impression that they are operated by the Complainant. In view of these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered all the disputed domain names with the Complainant and its HUNZA G mark in mind.

As regards use, the disputed domain names <hunzaghq.shop> and <hunzagstyle.shop> resolve to websites that purportedly offer for sale what is presented as HUNZA G swimwear, giving the false impression that they are operated by the Complainant. Given the Panel's findings in Section 6.2B above, these circumstances indicate that, by using these disputed domain names, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's HUNZA G mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's websites and of the swimwear on those websites, within the terms of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The disputed domain names <hunzagsales.shop>, <hunzagoutlet.com>, and <hunzag1984.com> are passively held, although the former resolves to an “under construction” webpage. Prior UDRP panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including an “under construction” 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. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness of the Complainant's HUNZA G trademark, the composition of these disputed domain names, and the fact that two other disputed domain names under common control are actively being used in bad faith, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of three disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Therefore, 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 <hunzaghq.shop>, <hunzagoutlet.com>, <hunzagsales.shop>, <hunzagstyle.shop>, and <hunzag1984.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Matthew Kennedy/

Matthew Kennedy

Sole Panelist

Date: July 22, 2026