

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

W Galaxy Pte Ltd v. yabo ya
Case No. D2026-3431

1. The Parties

The Complainant is W Galaxy Pte Ltd, Singapore, represented by Adlex Solicitors, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is yabo ya, China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <wgbaowang.net> and <wgbaowang.org> are registered with NameSilo, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 3, 2026. On August 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On August 4, 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 #3727bce8 Privacy / See PrivacyGuardian.org) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 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 amendment to the Complaint on August 12, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 August 13, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 2, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 3, 2026.

The Center appointed William F. Hamilton as the sole panelist in this matter on September 10, 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 company incorporated in Singapore on March 7, 2025 (Annex 3 to the Complaint). The Complainant states that since 2016 it and its predecessors have provided technology services, including support and consultancy, to suppliers of online games under the names WIN GAMING and WG, and that the business was originally carried out by the Complainant's controller, who incorporated the Complainant to take over the business. The Complainant relies on unregistered rights in WG (the "Mark").

The Complainant states that it acquired the domain name <wg.com> in 2020 and began trading from the associated website in 2022. Archived captures show a "WG Coming Soon" page on January 19, 2022, and, on February 26, 2022, a website displaying a shield-shaped logo with the letters "WG" and referring to the business as "Win Gaming (WG)" (Annex 4 to the Complaint). The Complainant's website as captured on May 21, 2026, in English and in traditional Chinese, displays a "WG" logo and the names "WG" and "Win Gaming" (Annexes 5 and 6 to the Complaint). The English version describes a white label platform and game interfaces for online games and lists sales contacts with email addresses at <wg.com> (Annex 5 to the Complaint). The Complainant states that "baowang" is a Chinese term meaning "full package" or "full bundle" (Annex 14 to the Complaint).

The disputed domain names were registered on December 9, 2024 (Annex 7 to the Complaint). Archived captures made that day show both disputed domain names resolving to pages displaying text that includes "WG Package Network" and "WG Official Website" (Annex 8 to the Complaint).

On February 5, 2026, the disputed domain name <wgbaowang.net> resolved to a website in Simplified Chinese displaying a "WG" logo with "www.wgbaowang.com" in place of "www.wg.com," introductory text, product descriptions, game listings, partner logos, and a list of sales contacts (Annex 9 to the Complaint). These elements correspond to those on the Complainant's website (Annexes 5 and 6 to the Complaint). The sales contacts on the website at <wgbaowang.net> closely resemble those on the Complainant's website, with variations in spelling, messaging handles, and telephone numbers, and with email addresses at <wg.com>. For example, the Complainant's contact "Jinna" appears on the website at <wgbaowang.net> as "Jina" with a different messaging handle, telephone number, and email address (Annex 10 to the Complaint).

On February 5, 2026, and May 21, 2026, the disputed domain name <wgbaowang.org> resolved to a text page in Chinese, addressed to website administrators, containing a hyperlink to <wgbaowang.net> (Annexes 11 and 13 to the Complaint). The English text of the page describes fee, rebate, and maintenance terms for sites on a "WG" platform (Annex 13 to the Complaint).

On May 21, 2026, the disputed domain name <wgbaowang.net> displayed a message stating that access was blocked (Annex 12 to the Complaint). Screenshots taken by the Center on August 13, 2026, show <wgbaowang.net> displaying a website with content corresponding to that shown in Annex 9 to the Complaint, and <wgbaowang.org> displaying the text page described above.

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.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are under common control. It points out that they are identical apart from the ".net" and ".org" generic Top-Level Domains ("gTLDs"), were registered on the same date with the same Registrar and have been used together in a common campaign to impersonate the Complainant. The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name <wgbaowang.net> hosted a website that was virtually a complete copy of the Complainant's website, and that the disputed domain name <wgbaowang.org> promoted and linked to the services offered at the other disputed domain name <wgbaowang.net>.

The Complainant contends that it has unregistered rights in the Mark, acquired through extensive trading and marketing under WG in addition to WIN GAMING. It states that its website is prominently branded "WG," that it consistently refers to its business as "WG," and that it uses "wg" in its domain name and email addresses. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent's targeting of the Mark is additional evidence that the Mark has achieved significance as a source identifier, because the Respondent incorporated "WG" into the disputed domain names, copied the Complainant's website, and used "WG" extensively on its own websites. The Complainant contends that the disputed domain names wholly incorporate the Mark and differ only by the addition of "baowang," a descriptive Chinese term meaning "full package" or "full bundle," which reinforces the connection with the Complainant because it corresponds to the Complainant's one-stop, fully integrated service model.

The Complainant contends that it has no association with the Respondent and has never authorized or licensed the Respondent to use the Mark. It contends that the Respondent used the disputed domain names to impersonate the Complainant and create a likelihood of confusion, that such use is not bona fide, that the Respondent selected the disputed domain names to target the Mark and so cannot claim to be commonly known by them, and that the Respondent sought commercial gain.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent, a competitor that was aware of the Complainant, registered and used the disputed domain names in bad faith. The Complainant contends that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names to disrupt the Complainant's business by diverting business intended for the Complainant to the Respondent's competing business, and to create a likelihood of confusion with the Mark through impersonation. It points to the registration of domain names reflecting the Mark, the replication of the Complainant's website at the disputed domain name <wgbaowang.net> with altered contact details, and the Respondent's description of itself as "WG" at the disputed domain name <wgbaowang.org>, which links to the other disputed domain name <wgbaowang.net>.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant relies on unregistered rights in the Mark. Unregistered or common law marks are protected under the Policy where the complainant shows that the mark has become a distinctive identifier that consumers associate with the complainant's goods or services. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.3. The Respondent's default does not by itself establish those rights. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.3.

The Complainant's evidence of acquired distinctiveness is limited. It does not include sales figures, advertising expenditures, or third-party recognition. The record does show that the Complainant has used WG as a source identifier at <wg.com> since at least February 2022, in its logo and in the name "Win Gaming (WG)," and that its website, sales contacts, and email addresses continue to use WG (Annexes 4, 5, and 6 to the Complaint). That use predates the registration of the disputed domain names in December 2024. The Complainant states that it succeeded to its predecessors' business.

The Respondent's conduct also supports the Complainant's showing. A respondent's targeting of a complainant's mark may support the assertion that the mark has achieved significance as a source identifier. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.3. On the day the disputed domain names were registered, archived captures show both resolving to pages describing a "WG Official Website" (Annex 8 to the Complaint). The Respondent later reproduced the Complainant's website, including a WG logo, at the disputed domain name <wgbaowang.net> (Annex 9 to the Complaint). The Respondent's reproduction of the Mark and of the website that displays it indicates that the Respondent regarded the Mark as a source identifier of value. On this record, the Panel finds for purposes of the UDRP that the Complainant has unregistered rights in the Mark.

The standing test for confusing similarity is a side-by-side comparison of the disputed domain names and the Mark, and a domain name that incorporates the entirety of a mark is normally considered confusingly similar to it. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7. The Mark is recognizable in each disputed domain name. The gTLDs ".net" and ".org" are disregarded under the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1. The Complainant states that the additional term "baowang" is a Chinese term meaning "full package" or "full bundle." Adding that term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, although its nature may bear on the second and third elements. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8. The Panel finds the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Mark for purposes of the UDRP.

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 Complainant states that it has not authorized or licensed the Respondent to use the Mark, and the Respondent has not contended otherwise. The Registrar identified the registrant as "yabo ya," which does not correspond to the disputed domain names. The Respondent used the disputed domain name <wgbaowang.net> for a website that reproduced the Complainant's website, including sales contacts resembling the Complainant's with altered details (Annexes 9 and 10 to the Complaint), and used the disputed domain name <wgbaowang.org> for a page presenting itself as "WG" and linking to the other disputed domain name <wgbaowang.net> (Annexes 11 and 13 to the Complaint). That use is not a bona fide offering of goods or services and is not a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. A domain name that consists of a mark plus an additional term cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here impersonation and passing off by way of a copy of the Complainant's website, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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 Respondent used the disputed domain names to attract Internet users to its websites for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the unregistered Mark, within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. 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 combine the Mark with "baowang," which the Complainant states means "full package" and which corresponds to the one-stop platform the Complainant offers (Annex 5 to the Complaint). The Complainant's use of the Mark at <wg.com> since at least February 2022 predates the registration of the disputed domain names. On the day of registration of the disputed domain names, archived captures show both disputed domain names resolving to pages describing a "WG Official Website" (Annex 8 to the Complaint). The Respondent therefore targeted the Mark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2.

The Respondent used the disputed domain names to impersonate the Complainant. The website at the disputed domain name <wgbaowang.net> reproduced the Complainant's website, including a WG logo and sales contacts resembling the Complainant's with altered details, and the disputed domain name <wgbaowang.org> resolved to a page presenting itself as "WG," describing fee terms for its platform, and linking to the other disputed domain name <wgbaowang.net> (Annexes 9, 10, 11, and 13 to the Complaint). The websites solicit business for the services they describe, and their content is likely to lead Internet users to believe that they originate with, or are affiliated with, the Complainant. That use falls within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here impersonation and passing off by way of a copy of the Complainant's website, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under 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 names <wgbaowang.net> and <wgbaowang.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

/William F. Hamilton/

William F. Hamilton

Sole Panelist

Date: September 23, 2026