

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Dr. Brown's Company v. 邢华龙 (Hua Long Xing)
Case No. D2026-2967

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Dr. Brown's Company, United States of America, internally represented.

The Respondent is 邢华龙 (Hua Long Xing), China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <bestdrbrowns.com>, <drbrownsoutlet.com>, <drbrownsshop.com>, <drbrownsvip.com>, and <saledrbrowns.com> are registered with Cloud Yuqu LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 6, 2026. On July 7, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On July 8, 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 (Registration Private / REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 12, 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 July 14, 2026.

On July 12, 2026, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreements for the disputed domain names is Chinese. On July 14, 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 July 21, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 10, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 15, 2026.

The Center appointed Rachel Tan as the sole panelist in this matter on August 18, 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 recognized pioneer in infant feeding technology. The Complainant has used the Dr. Brown's brand since introducing its first fully vented baby bottle in 1997. The Complainant's Dr. Brown's baby bottles have received numerous awards from various trade organizations and entities.

The Complainant owns multiple trademark registrations for DR. BROWN'S trademark, including:

- United States of America trademark  Registration No. 5073441, registered on November 1, 2016, in classes 3 and 21;
- United States of America trademark DR. BROWN'S Registration No. 5591735, registered on October 23, 2018, in class 11;
- United States of America trademark DR. BROWN'S Registration No. 5835538, registered on August 13, 2019, in classes 20 and 24.

The Complainant owns the domain name <drbrownsbaby.com> and operates an official e-commerce website at that domain name, through which consumers can learn about and purchase the Complainant's products.

The Respondent is purportedly based in China. All five disputed domain names were registered on June 5, 2026. Presently, all the disputed domain names resolve to inactive websites. According to the Complainant's evidence, all the disputed domain names previously resolved to websites that mimicked the Complainant's official website, displayed the Complainant's  trademark, used images taken from the Complainant's official website, and allegedly offered the Complainant's DR. BROWN'S products at discounted prices.

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 DR. BROWN'S trademark. Each of the disputed domain names incorporates "drbrown's" as its dominant element, which is effectively identical to the Complainant's DR. BROWN'S trademark. The addition of terms such as "best", "outlet", "shop", "vip", or "sale" does not negate the confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the Complainant's DR. BROWN'S trademark.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Respondent has no affiliation or connection with the Complainant, and the Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use the DR. BROWN'S trademark. The Respondent is neither making legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names nor using the disputed domain names in

connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Rather, the Respondent is making illegitimate commercial use of the disputed domain names for commercial gain by featuring on the associated websites the Complainant's DR. BROWN'S trademark, together with a layout, colour scheme, product images, and product descriptions that are nearly identical to those on the Complainant's official website, thereby misleading consumers seeking the Complainant's official website into believing that the disputed domain names and the associated websites are connected with the Complainant.

The Complainant finally contends that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. The disputed domain names were registered long after the Complainant began using and had obtained registrations for the DR. BROWN'S trademark. Given the reputation of the Complainant and its DR. BROWN'S trademark, it is implausible that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names without knowledge of the Complainant and the DR. BROWN'S trademark. In light of the similarity between the disputed domain names and the Complainant's DR. BROWN'S trademark, together with the use on the associated websites of the Complainant's DR. BROWN'S trademark and a colour scheme and images nearly identical to those on the Complainant's website, it is clear that the Respondent intended to mislead consumers into believing that the disputed domain names and the associated websites are affiliated with the Complainant for commercial gain.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Procedural Issues – Language of the Proceedings

The language of the Registration Agreements 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 several reasons, including the fact that 1) all of the disputed domain names contain Latin characters and the websites associated with the disputed domain names previously contained English content; 2) using Chinese as language of the proceeding would unfairly disadvantage and burden the Complainant and delay the proceedings and adjudication of this matter.

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 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. 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. See *Williams-Sonoma, Inc. v. Junhao Luo*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-1049](#).

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 trademark and the disputed domain names. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the DR. BROWN'S trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The generic Top Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" as a standard registration requirement should be disregarded in the assessment of confusing similarity under the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

The disputed domain names incorporate the entirety of the textual element of the Complainant's DR. BROWN'S trademark. While the punctuation marks, namely the full stop after "Dr" and the apostrophe in "Brown's" are omitted and the terms "best", "outlet", "shop", "vip", or "sale" are added, the Complainant's DR. BROWN'S trademark remains clearly recognizable in the disputed domain names. The Panel finds that the omitted punctuation marks and the extra terms do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the DR. BROWN'S trademark. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's DR. BROWN'S trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 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.

The information in the case file shows that:

- the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has not been authorized to use the Complainant's DR. BROWN'S trademark in any form;
- there is no evidence proving that the Respondent holds any trademark rights corresponding to the disputed domain names, or has been commonly known by the disputed domain names;
- all the disputed domain names previously resolved to websites that mimicked the Complainant's official website, displayed the Complainant's  trademark, used images taken from the Complainant's official website and allegedly offered the Complainant's DR. BROWN'S products at discounted prices, without any prominent and accurate explanation of the relationship (or lack thereof) between the Parties. Such use of the disputed domain names indicates the Respondent's intention to divert Internet traffic to the websites associated with the disputed domain names by misleading Internet users into believing that the websites associated with the disputed domain names are connected with the Complainant, which cannot be deemed as a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use;

- the nature of the disputed domain names incorporates the entirety of the textual element of the Complainant's DR. BROWN'S trademark, together with the terms "best", "outlet", "shop", "vip", or "sale" which relate to the sale of the Complainant's DR. BROWN'S products. When considered alongside the Respondent's previous use of the disputed domain names, it supports to affirm the Respondent's intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain names and the Complainant as to the origin or affiliation of the websites associated with the disputed domain names; and
- no other factors demonstrate any rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in 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 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 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 Complainant obtained the trademark registration for DR. BROWN'S as early as November 1, 2016, which significantly predates the registration date of the disputed domain names (June 5, 2026). According to the Complainant's evidence, the Panel accepts that the Complainant and its DR. BROWN'S trademark have gained a certain degree of reputation and recognition in the relevant industry through continuous use. The Respondent registered the disputed domain names that fully incorporate the textual element of the Complainant's DR. BROWN'S trademark and resolved them to the websites that mimicked the Complainant's official website, displayed the Complainant's  trademark, used images taken from the Complainant's official website and allegedly offered the Complainant's DR. BROWN'S products at discounted prices. Given these circumstances, the Panel determines that the Respondent had actual knowledge of the Complainant and its DR. BROWN'S trademark at the time of registering the disputed domain names, and bad faith is found.

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 disputed domain names resolved to inactive websites at the time of the Decision but were once used for hosting websites that mimicked the Complainant's official website, displayed the Complainant's  trademark, used images taken from the Complainant's official website and allegedly offered the Complainant's DR. BROWN'S products at discounted prices. The Panel holds that by selecting domain names confusingly similar to the Complainant's DR. BROWN'S trademark, and using them in the manner as described, the Respondent intentionally to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the disputed domain names and the associated websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's DR. BROWN'S trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the websites associated with the disputed domain names, which constitutes bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Given the circumstances above, the current non-use of the disputed domain names does not prevent the Panel's finding of the Respondent's bad faith.

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 <bestdrbrowns.com>, <drbrownsoutlet.com>, <drbrownsshop.com>, <drbrownsvip.com>, and <saledrbrowns.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Rachel Tan/

Rachel Tan

Sole Panelist

Date: September 1, 2026