

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

VKR Holding A/S v. li li

Case No. D2026-2723

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is VKR Holding A/S, Denmark, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is li li, China.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <veluxcn.com> is registered with Cosmotown, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 23, 2026. On June 23, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 25, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (Registrant Information Redacted) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 28, 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 on June 29, 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 July 2, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 22, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 23, 2026.

The Center appointed Daniel Kraus as the sole panelist in this matter on July 28, 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 the parent company of the VELUX Group. Through its subsidiaries, the Complainant offers roof windows, skylights, vertical windows and systems, thermal solar energy systems, decoration and sun screening products, ventilation, and indoor climate products. The mark VELUX is a coined term combining “VE” (from “ventilation”) and “LUX” (from the Latin word for “light”), first used in commerce in 1941. The Complainant’s Group today employs approximately 12,000 people in 37 countries and reported DKK 28.8 billion in revenue in fiscal year 2024.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations for the mark VELUX across various jurisdictions. Of particular relevance to this proceeding are the following registrations:

| Trademark | Jurisdiction / Office                                                  | Reg. No   | Date of Registration | IC Class(es)   |
|-----------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|----------------------|----------------|
| VELUX     | China / China National Intellectual Property Administration (“CNIPA”)  | 211706    | August 15, 1984      | 19             |
| VELUX     | China / CNIPA                                                          | 211707    | August 15, 1984      | 24             |
| VELUX     | International / WIPO                                                   | 928560    | March 28, 2007       | 19, 20, 24, 37 |
| VELUX     | European Union / European Union Intellectual Property Office (“EUIPO”) | 000955609 | March 31, 2000       | 6, 7, 9, 11    |

The Panel notes in particular the two Chinese trademark registrations, which predate the registration of the disputed domain name by over 40 years, and which establish the Complainant’s long-standing trademark rights in the Respondent’s own jurisdiction.

The Complainant promotes and provides information about its VELUX brand and products online at <velux.com> (registered April 19, 1999). It also holds registrations for <velux.cn> (registered March 17, 2003) and <velux.com.cn> (registered July 22, 1999), reflecting its well-established presence in the Chinese market.

The disputed domain name <veluxcn.com> was registered on March 29, 2026, more than 40 years after the Complainant’s earliest Chinese trademark registrations, and well after the Complainant’s first use of the VELUX mark in commerce. According to the Complaint and the supporting annexes thereto, the disputed domain name resolves, when accessed from Hong Kong, China or Taiwan Province of China via geo-restricted access, to a website displaying sexually explicit, pornographic content. At the time of this Decision, the access to the website at the disputed domain name is blocked, consistent with the application of a Cloudflare security filter.

## 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.

In particular, the Complainant contends that: (i) the disputed domain name incorporates the entire VELUX trademark followed by the two-letter geographic code "cn" (the ISO country code for China), a territory in which the Complainant has held trademark registrations since 1984 and actively conducts business, thereby rendering the disputed domain name confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark; (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, having never been affiliated with, licensed by, or authorized by the Complainant, is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and is using the domain to display pornographic content that cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services; and (iii) the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, in that the Respondent, located in China where the Complainant has been active for decades, must have been aware of the internationally well-known VELUX mark, and the use of the disputed domain name for "porno-squatting" (i.e., diverting unsuspecting Internet users to a pornographic website by exploiting confusion with a well-known trademark) constitutes bad faith registration and use, which is particularly egregious given that pornography is illegal in China, the apparent target market of the disputed domain name.

### 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.

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

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark 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.

As per paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant bears the burden of proving that all three requirements are fulfilled, even if a respondent has not substantively replied to the Complainant's contentions. *Stanworth Development Limited v. E Net Marketing Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-1228](#).

Concerning uncontested information provided by a complainant, the panel may, where relevant, accept the provided reasonable factual allegations in a complaint as true. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.3.

The Panel has taken note of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) and, where appropriate, will decide consistently with the consensus views captured therein.

### 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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. The Complainant holds multiple registrations for the VELUX mark across numerous jurisdictions, including two Chinese registrations (Reg. Nos. 211706 and 211707), as well as European Union and International registrations. These registrations, taken together, more than satisfy the threshold requirement of having trademark rights for the purposes of standing to file a UDRP case. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the VELUX mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's trademark in its entirety, combined with the two-letter suffix "cn". Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the VELUX mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of the term "cn" 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 name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8. The Top-Level Domain ("TLD") ".com" is, as is standard practice, disregarded in this analysis. [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 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.

There is no evidence in the case file that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy. The Respondent is identified as "li li", a name that bears no resemblance whatsoever to the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not been licensed, authorized, or permitted by the Complainant to register or use any domain name incorporating the VELUX trademark.

The Panel considers that the composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1. The addition of "cn", the universally recognized ISO country code and Internet country-code suffix for China, reinforces the likelihood of confusion. Internet users encountering the disputed domain name would be strongly likely to associate it with the Complainant's Chinese operations, particularly given the Complainant's established presence in China and its registration of both domain names <velux.cn>, and <velux.com.cn>.

With respect to the use of the disputed domain name, the evidence on record confirmed by the annexes to the amended Complaint demonstrates that disputed domain name was used to host sexually explicit, pornographic content, accessible on a geo-restricted basis from Hong Kong, China and Taiwan Province of China. UDRP panels have consistently and firmly held that such use of a domain name confusingly similar to a well-known trademark to attract Internet users to pornographic content cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services and confers no rights or legitimate interests on the registrant. See *MatchNet plc. v. MAC Trading*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0205](#). The use of a disputed domain name to engage in what has aptly been termed “porno-squatting”, trading on the goodwill of a distinctive mark to divert unsuspecting Internet users to adult content, is the very antithesis of legitimate use. See also *Hartsfield Area Transportation Management Association, Inc. v. Max Davidovich*, WIPO Case No. [D2006-0743](#).

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.

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.

Regarding registration in bad faith, the Panel makes the following observations:

First, the VELUX mark is an inherently distinctive coined term that has been in continuous commercial use for over 80 years and is registered as a trademark in dozens of jurisdictions. Its international recognition is substantial. The Complainant’s Chinese trademark registrations date from 1984, and the Complainant has registered the domain names <velux.com.cn> and <velux.cn> since 1999 and 2003 respectively. The Respondent, who is in China, registered the disputed domain name on March 29, 2026, over four decades after the Complainant’s first Chinese trademark registrations. In these circumstances, it is inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant’s VELUX trademark at the time of registration. See *Caesars World, Inc. v. Forum LLC*, WIPO Case No. [D2005-0517](#). The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant’s well-known mark, and with the intent to exploit that recognition.

Second, the specific structure of the disputed domain name combining the VELUX trademark in its entirety with the country code “cn”, leaves no plausible legitimate explanation for the Respondent’s choice. There is no conceivable good-faith reason for a Chinese registrant to combine a foreign company’s distinctive coined trademark with the country code for their own country, unless the purpose is to impersonate or trade upon the Complainant’s identity in the Chinese market. The Panel finds, as submitted by the Complainant, that there is no plausible good-faith reason or logic for the Respondent to have registered the disputed domain name. See *Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0003](#).

Regarding use in bad faith, the Panel notes the following:

First, the record demonstrates that the disputed domain name was used to host sexually explicit, pornographic content on a geo-restricted basis accessible from Hong Kong, China and Taiwan Province of China. This constitutes a clear case of “porno-squatting”, whereby the Respondent has exploited the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant’s VELUX trademark to attract Internet users, who may reasonably believe they are accessing a website affiliated with or operated by the Complainant for the Chinese market, and to expose them instead to pornographic content. UDRP panels have consistently found that such conduct constitutes bad faith use within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, in that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet

users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website. See *Microsoft Corporation v. Paul Horner*, WIPO Case No. [D2002-0029](#); *Sound Unseen, Ltd.*; *Apple Bottoms, LLC*; and *Cornell Haynes p/k/a "Nelly" v. Patrick Vanderhorst*, WIPO Case No. [D2005-0636](#); *Prada S.A. v. Roberto Baggio*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1187](#).

Second, the Panel notes the aggravating circumstances of this case. The disputed domain name, which incorporates the country code "cn" and would naturally be associated by Chinese-speaking users with the Complainant's China-facing operations, has been configured to serve adult content. This indicates the Respondent's intention to tarnish the Complainant's goodwill and reputation in a market that is central to its business.

Third, at the time of this Decision, the access to the disputed domain name was blocked. This does not affect the Panel's analysis. The evidence of prior pornographic use is documented in the Complaint. Moreover, even if the Panel were to treat the current state of the disputed domain name as a form of passive holding, it would reach the same conclusion: given the strength and international reputation of the VELUX mark (a coined term with no generic or descriptive meaning), the Respondent's location in China where the Complainant has held trademark rights since 1984, the structure of the disputed domain name, and the prior use of the disputed domain name in connection with adult content, passive holding does not prevent a finding of bad faith in the circumstances of this case. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3; *Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0003](#); *Jupiters Limited v. Aaron Hall*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0574](#).

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 name <veluxcn.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Daniel Kraus/

**Daniel Kraus**

Sole Panelist

Date: August 11, 2026