

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Solv Wellness, Inc. v. xiao wen and dsdfw xiao
Case No. D2026-3098

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Solv Wellness, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Greenberg Traurig, LLP, United States.

The Respondents are xiao wen, China, and dsdfw xiao, China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <solvwelnes.com> is registered with Gname.com Pte. Ltd.

The disputed domain name <solvwellness.com> is registered with NameSilo, LLC.

(collectively referred as the "Registrars").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 14, 2026. On July 15, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On July 15 and July 16, 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 (User #625d387c Privacy See PrivacyGuardian.org / Redacted for privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 22, 2026, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file a separate complaint for the disputed domain name associated with a different underlying registrant or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint in English on July 23, 2026.

On July 22, 2026, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for one of the disputed domain names is Chinese. On July 23, 2026, the Complainant requested that English be the language of the proceedings. The Respondents 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 Respondents in English and Chinese of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 24, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 13, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents’ default on August 14, 2026.

The Center appointed Rachel Tan as the sole panelist in this matter on August 24, 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, founded in 2010 and headquartered in Atlanta, Georgia, United States, is a women’s health company. The Complainant states that it is dedicated to developing science-backed solutions for women in perimenopause, menopause, and beyond, and also leads educational initiatives such as Menopause Made Clear, which seeks to address gaps in menopause awareness and treatment guidance for women and healthcare professionals.

The Complainant is the owner of United States trademark SOLV WELLNESS Registration No. 6720145, registered on May 3, 2022, in class 5.

The Complainant also owns the domain name <solvwellness.com> and operates it as an official website to promote its products.

The first Respondent, xiao wen, is reportedly based in China and registered the disputed domain name <solvwelnes.com> on September 20, 2025. The second Respondent, dsdfw xiao, is reportedly based in China and registered the disputed domain name <solvwellness.com> on September 11, 2025.

Presently, both disputed domain names resolve to inactive websites as a result of the Complainant’s earlier complaint to the Registrars. According to the Complainant’s evidence, both disputed domain names previously resolved to websites that mimicked the Complainant’s official website, displayed the Complainant’s SOLV WELLNESS trademark, and allegedly offered the Complainant’s SOLV WELLNESS products while collecting Internet users’ financial information for the purpose of placing orders and making payments.

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 incorporate its SOLV WELLNESS trademark and differ only by minor typographical omissions. Specifically, the disputed domain name <solvwelnes.com> omits the letters “l” and “s” from the word “wellness,” while the disputed domain name <solvwellness.com> omits the letter “l.” In each case, the domain name otherwise reproduces the mark together with the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.com”. The disputed domain names are misspellings of the Complainant’s SOLV WELLNESS trademark and constitute typosquatting. Therefore, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant’s SOLV WELLNESS trademark.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondents have no affiliation or connection with the Complainant, and the Complainant has not authorized the Respondents to use the SOLV WELLNESS trademark. The Respondents are 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 Respondents use the disputed domain names to impersonate the Complainant's official website and divert Internet traffic to the websites associated with the disputed domain names for commercial gain. Therefore, the Respondents lack rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

The Complainant finally contends that the Respondents used the disputed domain names to host websites that impersonated the Complainant's official website and collected Internet users' financial information purportedly for the purpose of placing orders and making payments, thereby facilitating potentially fraudulent transactions. Such conduct demonstrates that the Respondents had actual and constructive knowledge of the Complainant and its SOLV WELLNESS trademark at the time of registering the disputed domain names, and further establishes that the Respondents' use of the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith use. Therefore, the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

B. Respondents

The Respondents 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 Agreement for one of 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 proceedings shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceedings be English for several reasons, including the fact that 1) both 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 proceedings would unfairly disadvantage and burden the Complainant and delay the proceedings and adjudication of this matter.

The Respondents did not make any submissions with respect to the language of the proceedings.

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

6.2. Procedural Issues – 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 mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the disputes 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.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that (i) both disputed domain names were previously used to host identical websites displaying the Complainant's trademark and purportedly offering the Complainant's products; (ii) the websites previously associated with the disputed domain names displayed the same email address "[...]@gmail.com" and the same copyright notice "© 2025 gannaMD™" at the bottom. These facts satisfy the criteria of a finding of common control under [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.11.2.

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.

6.3 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 SOLV WELLNESS trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The generic Top-Level Domain ".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 name <solvwelnes.com> incorporates the Complainant's SOLV WELLNESS trademark, differing only in that the letters "l" and "s" are omitted from "wellness". The disputed domain name <solvwellness.com> incorporates the Complainant's SOLV WELLNESS trademark, differing only in that the letter "l" is omitted from "wellness". Despite the omission of the letters, "l" and "s", the Complainant's SOLV WELLNESS trademark remains clearly recognizable in the disputed domain names. The Panel finds that the omitted letters does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the SOLV WELLNESS trademark. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's SOLV WELLNESS trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.9.

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 SOLV WELLNESS 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;
- both disputed domain names previously resolved to websites that mimicked the Complainant's official website, displayed the Complainant's SOLV WELLNESS trademark, and allegedly offered the Complainant's SOLV WELLNESS products while collecting Internet users' financial information for the purpose of placing orders and making payments, 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;
- 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 SOLV WELLNESS as early as May 3, 2022, which predates the registration dates of the disputed domain names (September 20, 2025, and September 11, 2025). According to the Complainant's evidence, the Panel accepts that the Complainant and its SOLV WELLNESS trademark are well established. The Respondent registered the disputed domain names that incorporate the Complainant's SOLV WELLNESS trademark with

only one or two letters omitted and configured the disputed domain names to resolve to the websites that mimicked the Complainant's official website, displayed the Complainant's SOLV WELLNESS trademark, and allegedly offered the Complainant's SOLV WELLNESS products while collecting Internet users' financial information for the purpose of placing orders and making payments. Given these circumstances, the Panel determines that the Respondent had actual knowledge of the Complainant and its SOLV WELLNESS 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 resolve to inactive websites at the time of the Decision as a result of the Complainant's earlier complaint to the Registrars. Prior to the Complainant's complaint, the disputed domain names were used to host websites that mimicked the Complainant's official website, displayed the Complainant's SOLV WELLNESS trademark, and allegedly offered the Complainant's SOLV WELLNESS products while collecting Internet users' financial information for the purpose of placing orders and making payments. The Panel holds that by selecting domain names confusingly similar to the Complainant's SOLV WELLNESS trademark, and using them in the manner as described, the Respondent intentionally attempted 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 SOLV WELLNESS 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. In addition, the previous websites associated with the disputed domain names collected Internet users' financial information, thereby creating a potential risk of personal data leakage and financial loss to Internet users.

Given the Respondent's previous use of the disputed domain names, 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 <solvwelnes.com> and <solvwellness.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Rachel Tan/

Rachel Tan

Sole Panelist

Date: September 7, 2026