

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Infineon Technologies Americas Corp. v. 李亮 (li liang)
Case No. D2026-3332

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Infineon Technologies Americas Corp., United States of America ("United States"), internally represented.

The Respondent is 李亮 (li liang), China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <cypress-micro.com> is registered with Alibaba Cloud Computing Ltd. d/b/a HiChina (www.net.cn) (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint in English was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 28, 2026. On July 28, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 29, 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 (Unknown, Privacy service/redacted for privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 3, 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 August 4, 2026.

On August 3, 2026, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. On August 4, 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 August 14, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 3, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 10, 2026.

The Center appointed Douglas Clark as the sole panelist in this matter on September 17, 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 part of the Infineon Group, with its headquarter situated in Neubiberg, Germany. The Infineon Group is a provider of semiconductor solutions for power systems and the Internet of Things (IoT).

Cypress Semiconductor Corporation ("Cypress") was founded in 1982. The company specializes in the development and manufacturing of semiconductor solutions. Cypress was known for its product portfolio, which includes microcontrollers, sensors, wireless communication solutions, and memory solutions. In 2020, Cypress was acquired by Infineon Technologies AG, an affiliate of the Complainant, for approximately USD 10 billion.

The Complainant is the current registrant of the following trademark registrations for CYPRESS:

- Chinese trademark registration 1782670, in class 9, registered with effect from June 7, 2002;
- Japanese trademark registration 4578320, in class 9, registered with effect from June 21, 2002;
- Korean trademark registration 40-0510591, in class 9, registered with effect from January 15, 2002;
- Singapore trademark registration T0013714J, in class 9, registered with effect from March 21, 2000; and
- United States trademark registration 2455127, in class 9, registered with effect from May 29, 2001.

According to the Registrar's verification, the Respondent is an individual apparently based in China.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 28, 2024. The website under the disputed domain name resolves to a page in English which appears to be an official page of Cypress. The front page prominently displays the following text:

"Cypress Semiconductor (Infineon Technologies)

Integrated Circuits (ICs) - CPLDs (Complex Programmable Logic Devices) FPGAs (Field Programmable Gate Array) Microcontrollers, Microprocessor, FPGA Modules System On Chip (SoC)

Your Reliable Partner for Sourcing High-Quality Cypress Semiconductor (Infineon Technologies) Electronic Components - Cypress-Micro.com - Cypress-Micro Limited"

The contact information on the webpage under the disputed domain name provides an address in Hong Kong, China ("Hong Kong") and a Hong Kong phone/fax number.

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 as follows.

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark CYPRESS. The disputed domain name <cypress-micro.com> consists of the elements "cypress", "micro", and ".com". The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's CYPRESS trademark in its entirety and adds the descriptive or generic term "micro." Based on this alone, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the CYPRESS trademark. The element ".com" is irrelevant when comparing the disputed domain name to trademarks as a Top-Level Domain is a required element in a domain name.

The Complainant has not granted the Respondent any license, permission, or authorization by which it could own or use any domain name registrations that are confusingly similar to the CYPRESS trademark, nor the Respondent is an authorized reseller of the Complainant. The Respondent does not have an interest in the disputed domain name and does not have a valid reason for registering or using the disputed domain name.

The Respondent has attempted to profit from the confusion between its website and the Complainant's trademark by using a similar domain name. By using a domain name incorporating the Complainant's trademark, the Respondent has intentionally created a likelihood of confusion among Internet users, leading them to mistakenly visit its site instead of the Complainant's. Further, the Respondent's website offers thousands of the Complainant's products, making the Complainant's datasheets available without obtaining the necessary consent. Notably, all the products offered on the websites are those of the Complainant. Moreover, the Respondent calls itself "Cypress-Micro Limited" and gives the impression of being an affiliated company of Cypress acquired by the Complainant's group company.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name 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:

- (i) The webpages at the disputed domain name are in English, without any selection options for other languages, showing that the Respondent can understand the language of the Complaint.
- (ii) The disputed domain name itself is composed entirely of Latin characters and English-language terms and not in Chinese characters. Therefore, the Respondent is used to English terminology.

- (iii) The Respondent selected a domain name targeting an internationally known technology trademark and appears to operate in a sector (semiconductor and electronic industry) where English is the standard language of communication.
- (iv) Requiring translation of the Complaint and supporting evidence into Chinese would result in significant costs and unnecessary delay, while conducting the proceeding in English will cause no unfair prejudice to the Respondent, who remains free to communicate with the Center in Chinese.
- (v) English is the language most widely used in international relations.

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 (see 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. The Panel, in particular, relies on the fact that the website under the disputed domain name is all in English.

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

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy.

Although the addition of other terms here, "micro", 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 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 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.

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.

As described under Section 4. above, the website under the disputed domain name is designed to appear to be a website of the Complainant. It has clearly been established that by using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark.

Further, the CYPRESS mark was registered years before the registration of the disputed domain name. Considering the composition of the disputed domain name, which incorporates the CYPRESS mark in its entirety, together with a term "micro", closely related to the Complainant's business, the Panel finds that the Respondent knew or should have known of the CYPRESS mark at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name.

Its registration and use is clearly in bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

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 <cypress-micro.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Douglas Clark/

Douglas Clark

Sole Panelist

Date: October 7, 2026