

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

HYTTO PTE. LTD v. wang xun

Case No. D2026-3001

1. The Parties

The Complainant is HYTTO PTE. LTD., Singapore, self-represented.

The Respondent is wang xun, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lovenseball.store> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 8, 2026. On July 8, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 8, 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 Contact Redacted) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 9, 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 July 13, 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 14, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 3, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Alvaro Loureiro Oliveira as the sole panelist in this matter on August 13, 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, HYTTO PTE. LTD., is a Singapore company that markets adult wellness products under the LOVENSE brand. According to the evidence submitted with the Complaint, the LOVENSE mark has been used since 2010, and the Complainant markets its products internationally, including through its official website at the domain name <lovense.com>.

The Complainant owns trademark registrations for LOVENSE in numerous jurisdictions. Among the registrations evidenced in the record are:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 4722591 for LOVENSE, registered on April 21, 2015, in International Class 10;
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 013811484 for LOVENSE, registered on July 31, 2015, in International Class 10; and
- China Trademark Registration No. 61108258 for LOVENSE, registered on June 7, 2022, in International Class 10.

The disputed domain name <lovenseball.store> was registered on September 9, 2025. The Registrar disclosed the Respondent as wang xun, located in China.

According to the evidence submitted with the Complaint, the disputed domain name has resolved to a Japanese-language website prominently displaying the LOVENSE mark and containing adult-product listings with prices, shop-search functionality, and information concerning third-party adult-product shops. There is no evidence in the record that the website is operated or authorized by the Complainant.

On July 5, 2026, a Japanese Internet user contacted the Complainant seeking confirmation as to whether the website at the disputed domain name was owned, operated, or authorized by the Complainant. The user reported having been informed by a third party that the website was an official LOVENSE-related platform or an international branch of the Complainant and having transferred substantial amounts in cryptocurrency in connection with the platform.

The Complainant informed the user that the disputed domain name was not owned, operated, hosted, or authorized by the Complainant and that the Complainant did not operate the cryptocurrency deposit or withdrawal scheme described by the user.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its LOVENSE trademark. It incorporates the mark in its entirety, and the addition of the term "ball" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not been authorized to use the LOVENSE mark, there is no affiliation or business relationship between the Parties, and the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant, the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name for a website displaying the LOVENSE mark and offering adult-product related content does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

Finally, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The disputed domain name was registered many years after the Complainant began using and obtained trademark registrations for the LOVENSE mark. The Complainant argues that the composition of the disputed domain name and the content of the corresponding website demonstrate that the Respondent was aware of and deliberately targeted the Complainant and its trademark.

The Complainant further submits that the Respondent has intentionally used the disputed domain name to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the LOVENSE mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website. The Complainant also relies on the inquiry received from the Japanese user as evidence of actual confusion.

The Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be cancelled.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

The Policy, in its paragraph 4(a), determines that three elements must be present and duly proven by a complainant to obtain relief. These elements are:

- i. the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- ii. the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect to the disputed domain name; and
- iii. the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Respondent has not submitted a Response. Nevertheless, the Complainant must establish each of the three elements required under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy on the basis of the evidence submitted.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has established registered trademark rights in the LOVENSE mark for purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name <lovenseball.store> incorporates the Complainant's LOVENSE trademark in its entirety. The LOVENSE mark is therefore clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name.

The addition of the term "ball" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's mark. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

Likewise, the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".store" is viewed as a standard registration requirement and is disregarded for purposes of the comparison under the first element. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the LOVENSE trademark and that the Complainant has established the first element of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings rests with the complainant, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating such rights or legitimate interests. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

The Complainant has not licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the LOVENSE trademark or to register a domain name incorporating it. There is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, the evidence shows that the disputed domain name has been used for a website prominently displaying the LOVENSE mark and offering content relating to adult products, thereby creating an impression of association with the Complainant. Such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services under paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use under paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy.

The Complainant has therefore established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted that showing.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the second element of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The circumstances of this case demonstrate that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its LOVENSE trademark when registering the disputed domain name.

The Complainant's trademark rights substantially predate the registration of the disputed domain name. Moreover, the disputed domain name incorporates the LOVENSE mark in its entirety, and the corresponding website prominently displays the mark and contains content relating to the same field of activity as the Complainant.

The composition of the disputed domain name, together with the content of the website, therefore demonstrates that the Respondent specifically targeted the Complainant and its trademark when registering the disputed domain name.

The manner in which the disputed domain name has been used also supports a finding of bad faith. By using the Complainant's mark in the disputed domain name and on the corresponding website in connection with adult-product related content and commercial functionalities, the Respondent created a likelihood that Internet users would believe that the website was operated, sponsored, endorsed, or otherwise authorized by the Complainant.

The inquiry received by the Complainant from a Japanese user provides further support for this conclusion. The user contacted the Complainant specifically to ascertain whether the website at the disputed domain name was an official or authorized LOVENSE platform, having reportedly been informed that it was associated with the Complainant. The correspondence thus evidences the type of confusion which the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name were apt to create. The Complaint records that the user reported having transferred funds in cryptocurrency in connection with the platform. The evidence is sufficient to establish that the disputed domain name was being used in a manner that created an impression of affiliation with the Complainant.

The Panel therefore finds, on the balance of probabilities, that by using the disputed domain name the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's LOVENSE mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website. Such conduct constitutes evidence of registration and use in bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith and 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 <lovenseball.store> be cancelled.

/Alvaro Loureiro Oliveira/

Alvaro Loureiro Oliveira

Sole Panelist

Date: August 27, 2026