ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Xiayi Changxing Network Technology Co., Ltd. v. Wei BRother
Case No. D2026-3022

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Xiayi Changxing Network Technology Co., Ltd., China, represented by Ruyuan IP Agency, China.

The Respondent is Wei BRother, Albania.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <duotu.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 9, 2026. On the same day, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 12, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name that differed from the named Respondent (Unknown / Registered Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 14, 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 18, 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 29, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 18, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 21, 2026.

The Center appointed Matthew Kennedy as the sole panelist in this matter on August 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.

On September 2, 2026, the Panel issued Administrative Panel Procedural Order No. 1 (the "Panel Order") pursuant to paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, in which the Panel requested the Respondent to indicate the precise date on which it acquired the disputed domain name, and to provide supporting evidence (*e.g.,* related correspondence with the Registrar etc.). The due date for the Respondent's submission in response to the Panel Order was September 7, 2026. The Panel noted that it may make an inference, as appropriate in the full circumstances of the case, in the absence of such evidence or suitable explanation in response to this request. The due date for the Complainant's comments on any submission provided by the Respondent was September 12, 2026. The due date for the Decision was extended to September 17, 2026. The Respondent did not make any submission in response to the Panel Order.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant, incorporated in 2017, provides IT technical services, in particular, cybersecurity protection services. It delivers core network acceleration and protection solutions for individual developers, small and medium-sized enterprises and large corporations, streamlining cloud deployment and enabling secure cloud migration for users. The Complainant holds multiple Chinese trademark registrations, including the following:

- registration number 53954161 for "多途云", registered on October 7, 2021 (application filed on March 1, 2021), specifying services in class 42;

- registration number 53937198 for "多途云", registered on October 21, 2021 (application filed on March 1, 2021), specifying services in class 38; and

- registration number 55452981 for "多途", registered on November 21, 2021(application filed on April 22, 2021), specifying services in class 38.

The above trademark registrations are current. The Complainant has also registered domain names, including <duotu.cn>, registered on March 9, 2007, and <duotuyun.com> on February 26, 2021, the latter of which it uses with email and a website in Chinese that prominently displays the "多途云" mark, offering cybersecurity protection services, including high-defense CDN, bare metal servers, and other distributed denial-of-service ("DDoS") mitigation solutions. Since at least February 2024, its website has displayed a blue "dt" logo alongside the "多途云" mark (meaning "Duotu Cloud") on a white background.[1]

The Respondent is identified in the Registrar's database by the pseudonym "Wei BRother", which matches his contact email username (where "brother" is translated as "哥" and transliterated as "ge"). His other contact information is manifestly false and incomplete.

The disputed domain name was created on March 14, 2006 but historical WhoIs data presented by the Complainant shows that the registrant was a third party as recently as May 9, 2020, which implies that the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name at a later date. However, the exact date is not disclosed in the record.

---

[1] The Panel notes its general powers articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules and has searched for archived Web pages in the Internet Archive (www.archive.org), which is a matter of public record, to verify that the current appearance of the Complainant's website, including its logo, pre-dates that of the Respondent. 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.

On October 8, 2022, the Complainant reconnected with a broker who had previously quoted an asking price for the disputed domain name. However, the broker advised that the disputed domain name had been sold and that the new owner intended to use it personally. The Complainant made an offer but the owner declined. In March 2024, the broker advised that the owner was willing to sell the disputed domain name for a much higher price. In April 2024, the Complainant advised that it was not interested, even at the original asking price.

The disputed domain name has resolved to a website in Chinese since no later than December 15, 2024, offering cybersecurity protection services, including a gaming protection SDK (software development kit), along with protection against DDoS and Challenge Collapsar ("CC") attacks. The website operator was first identified as "香港速盾科技有限公司" (meaning "Hong Kong Sudun Technology Co., Ltd") but, by March 8, 2025, as "多途網絡科技有限公司" (meaning "Duotu Network Technology Co., Limited"). The latter is a Hong Kong, China company incorporated on February 13, 2025 that has been dormant since December 18, 2025. The website now prominently displays a blue "d" logo alongside "多途网络" (meaning "Duotu Network") on a white background, offering cybersecurity protection services, including high-defense SDKs, high-defense SCDN, and high-defense Hong Kong, China servers with DDoS protection.

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 name is confusingly similar to its "多途" (transliteration: "duotu") and "多途云" (transliteration: "duotuyun") marks.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent's scheme is consistent with an intent to create confusion and divert Internet traffic to another cybersecurity platform. The Complainant has never issued or granted any written trademark license or brand authorization to the Respondent.

The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant has operated nationally in China under the "duotuyun" brand since March 2021 and has a stable customer base. It has promoted the brand online since 2022. It infers from historical WhoIs records and archived screenshots of the associated website that the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name in or about August 2022. The primary purpose of the website is to divert Internet traffic to another cybersecurity platform by free-riding on the reputation and consumer goodwill of the Complainant's "多途" and "多途云" trademarks. An exorbitant transfer price was also communicated to the Complainant through a domain broker, plus the Respondent uses false registrant contact information. The Complainant provides evidence of instances of actual consumer confusion between the Respondent's website and itself. The Respondent's website is under common control with certain other cybersecurity websites.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that the Complainant must prove each of the following elements:

(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 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 name. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a "多途" mark and a "多途云" mark for the purposes of the Policy. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name contains a transliteration of the "多途" mark (i.e., "duotu"). It also contains a transliteration of the distinctive part of the "多途云" mark (i.e., "duotu yun"), omitting the word (i.e., "云", transliterated as "yun" meaning "cloud" as in "cloud computing"). Its only additional element is a generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") extension (".com") which, as a standard requirement of domain name registration, may be disregarded for the purposes of assessing identity or confusing similarity under the Policy. Given that the trademark is recognizable through transliteration in the disputed domain name, the Panel finds the disputed domain name confusingly similar to the marks for the purposes of standing under the Policy. See WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 1.7, 1.8, 1.11.1 and 1.14.

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 name contains a transliteration of the Complainant's "多途" mark, and the distinctive part of the Complainant's "多途云" mark, with nothing added but a gTLD extension. The disputed domain name resolves to a website that looks similar to the Complainant's website, displaying a similar logo and offering the same type of cyberprotection services. This gives rise to the confusing impression that it may be operated by, or affiliated with, the Complainant. Indeed, the Complainant provides evidence of instances of actual consumer confusion. The Complainant submits that it has never issued or granted any written trademark license or brand authorization to the Respondent. These circumstances indicate that the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services for the purposes of the Policy. Nor is this a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

Further, the Registrar has indicated that the Respondent is identified in its database by the pseudonym "Wei BRother", which does not resemble the disputed domain name. While the website associated with the disputed domain name indicates in fine print that it is operated by "多途網絡科技有限公司" (in which the first two characters are the same as in the Complainant's "多途" mark), there is no evidence that the operator has

been known by this name in practice. Indeed, evidence presented by the Complainant shows that that company is dormant. Nothing on the record indicates that the Respondent (as an individual, business, or other organization) has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Panel also notes that the two characters transliterated in the disputed domain name ("多途") can be translated as "multi-path". One early archived screenshot of the Respondent's website used those characters as part of a title. However, in the context of the website, that literal meaning appears inapposite.

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 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 Respondent was not the original registrant of the disputed domain name but it is clear from the record that he acquired it no earlier than 2020. There is no record of any website associated with the disputed domain name from that time until December 2024, when a version of the current website was live. Prior to that, the last update to the WhoIs record occurred on August 4, 2022. The Panel also notes changes in the WhoIs record, e.g. to the registrant state and country, between 2020 and 2022. The website reserves the copyright of "多途网络" (i.e., Duotu Network) from "20022-2026" (presumably a typographical error for "2022"). A domain name broker informed the Complainant in early October 2022 that the disputed domain name had been sold. The Complainant inferred that the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name in or about August 2022. Having reviewed this evidence, the Panel Order requested the Respondent to indicate the precise date on which it acquired the disputed domain name, and to provide supporting evidence. The Panel expressly noted that it might make an inference, as appropriate in the full circumstances of the case, in the absence of such evidence or suitable explanation in response to this request. The Respondent did not make any submission in response to the Panel Order. Accordingly, based on the record, the Panel draws the inference that the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name no earlier than August 2022. The Panel will assess bad faith registration in light of the circumstances prevailing at that time.

The Complainant's trademark rights accrued in 2021. The evidence shows that it has used and publicized its "多途云" brand, including online, since that same year. The disputed domain name incorporates a transliteration of the distinctive part of that brand (i.e., "多途", transcribed as "duotu"), omitting the descriptive term (i.e., "云", meaning "cloud" as in "cloud computing"). Even though "duotu" is also a transliteration of other Chinese characters, the website associated with the disputed domain name prominently features the first two characters in the Complainant's mark in its title. Further, the website looks very similar to the Complainant's website and offers the same type of cyberprotection services as the Complainant. In view of these circumstances, the Panel finds it likely that the Respondent knew of the Complainant's mark at the time when he registered the disputed domain name.

As regards use, the disputed domain name resolves to a website that looks similar to the Complainant's website, displaying a similar logo, and offering the same type of cyberprotection services that the Complainant offers. The record includes instances of actual consumer confusion between the Respondent's website and the Complainant. In view of all the circumstances, the Panel finds that by using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website, 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 of the services offered on that website, within the terms of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of 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 name <duotu.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Matthew Kennedy/
Matthew Kennedy
Sole Panelist
Date: September 11, 2026