ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

瑞幸咖啡（中国）有限公司(Luckin Coffee Group Co., Ltd.), Luckin Coffee Intellectual Property (SGP) Pte. Ltd. v. SHABA SADIQ, Luckin Coffee
Case No. D2026-3614

1. The Parties

The Complainants are 瑞幸咖啡（中国）有限公司(Luckin Coffee Group Co., Ltd.), China, and Luckin Coffee Intellectual Property (SGP) Pte. Ltd., Singapore, represented by Rouse Consultancy (Shanghai) Ltd., China.

The Respondent is SHABA SADIQ, Luckin Coffee, Nigeria.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <luckincoffeefranchise.com> is registered with Realtime Register B.V. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 13, 2026. On August 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 13, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 13, 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 August 14, 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 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 4, 2026.

The Center appointed Ganna Prokhorova as the sole panelist in this matter on September 4, 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 Complainants, 瑞幸咖啡（中国）有限公司 (Luckin Coffee Group Co., Ltd.) (hereinafter the “First Complainant”), China, and LUCKIN COFFEE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY (SGP) PTE. LTD. (hereinafter the “Second Complainant”), Singapore, are affiliated companies within the Luckin Coffee Group.

Founded in China in 2017, the First Complainant offers coffee and other food and beverage products in multiple jurisdictions. As of 2026, the First Complainant operated 36,310 stores, including self-operated and partnership stores, in China, Singapore, Malaysia, and the United States of America. The Complainants also maintain a significant presence on social media platforms both in China and internationally.

The First Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations incorporating the mark LUCKIN COFFEE, including, inter alia:

- International trademark registration LUCKIN COFFEE (fig.), No. 1500202, registered on September 4, 2019, in classes 30 and 43;
- International trademark registration LUCKIN COFFEE (fig.), No. 1679061, registered on June 10, 2022, in classes 11, 30, 35 and 43; and
- International trademark registration LUCKIN COFFEE (fig.), No. 1886618, registered on March 14, 2025, in classes 7, 9, 11, 18, 21, 30, 32, 35 and 43.

The Complainants have operated the domain name <luckincoffee.com> since 2017.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 9, 2026.

At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website prominently displaying the Complainants’ LUCKIN COFFEE trademarks, presenting content relating to the “Luckin Coffee” brand and purporting to offer official “Luckin Coffee” franchise opportunities. The footer of the website contained the copyright notice “©2026 Luckin Coffee Franchise Strategic Platform. All rights reserved”.

The “Contact Us” page of the website displayed the First Complainant’s address and included an enquiry form requesting Internet users to provide information including their full name, email address, telephone number, and available capital.

According to the evidence submitted with the Complaint, two entities submitted enquiries through the website associated with the disputed domain name and subsequently received emails from an email address using the disputed domain name. The emails included purported Luckin Coffee franchise documentation and requested payment of a “Commitment Franchise Fee” ranging from USD 25,000 to USD 30,000.

As of the date of this Decision, the disputed domain name no longer resolves to an active website.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainants

The Complainants contend that they have satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainants contend that:

(1) the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainants' trademark, since it incorporates the LUCKIN COFFEE mark, and the addition of the term "franchise" and the ".com" extension does not prevent confusion. The term "franchise" refers to the business model of the Complainants, therefore the Respondent's inclusion of the word "franchise" increases confusing similarity;

(2) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainants, has no license or authorization to use the LUCKIN COFFEE mark, and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name resolves to a website displaying the Complainants' trademarks and content relating to the LUCKIN COFFEE brand. The website includes a copyright notice referring to "©2026 Luckin Coffee Franchise Strategic Platform", displays the First Complainant's address, and solicits personal and financial information from Internet users through an online enquiry form. This creates a misleading impression of affiliation with the Complainants' LUCKIN COFFEE brand, which is not a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Respondent is using the disputed domain name as part of a fraudulent scheme designed to impersonate the Complainants, mislead Internet users, and solicit personal and financial information. Furthermore, the Respondent cannot satisfy the Oki Data criteria for a bona fide reseller. Finally, two companies provided information through the website of the disputed domain name and subsequently received emails from "[…]@luckincoffeefranchise.com" attaching purported Luckin Coffee franchise documents and requesting payment of a "Commitment Franchise Fee" of USD 25,000 to USD 30,000. Such conduct negates any claim of legitimate interest.

(3) The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Registering the disputed domain name connected to a well-known mark without authorization is itself evidence of bad faith. The Respondent used the disputed domain name to create a misleading association with the Complainant by presenting purported LUCKIN COFFEE franchise opportunities and soliciting personal and financial information from prospective investors. Such conduct aims to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, or affiliation of the website at the disputed domain name. Given the longstanding and well-known nature of the Complainants' LUCKIN COFFEE mark, the Respondent cannot credibly assert that it was unaware of it. The Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name, despite knowledge of the Complainants' rights, prevents the rightful trademark owner from using their mark and constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainants' contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Procedural matter – consolidation of Complainants

The Complaint was filed by two Complainants against a single Respondent. Neither the Policy nor the Rules expressly provides for or prohibits the consolidation of multiple complainants.

In this regard, section 4.11.1 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("WIPO Overview 3.1") states: "In assessing whether a complaint filed by multiple complainants may be brought against a single respondent, panels look at whether (i) the complainants have a specific common grievance against the respondent, or the respondent has engaged in common conduct that has affected the complainants in a similar fashion, and (ii) it would be equitable and procedurally efficient to permit the consolidation".

Both Complainants form part of the same corporate group. Luckin Coffee Group Co., Ltd. is the owner of trademark registrations for LUCKIN COFFEE, while Luckin Coffee Intellectual Property (SGP) Pte. Ltd. is its affiliated entity. As such, the two entities have a sufficient common legal interest in the trademarks reflected in the disputed domain name to file a joint Complaint.

The Panel finds that allowing the consolidation of the Complainants is fair, equitable, and procedurally efficient under the circumstances. Accordingly, the First and Second Complainants are permitted to proceed jointly with the Complaint. They will be referred to jointly as "the Complainant".

6.2. Substantive Issues

Even if the Respondent did not file a Response to the Complainant's contentions, the Panel shall consider the issues present in the case based on the statements and documents submitted by the Complainant.

"A Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable", as indicated in paragraph 15(a) of the Rules.

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainants are required to prove each of the following three elements:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainants have 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 by the Respondent in bad faith.

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 mark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Based on the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the Panel finds that the Complainant has shown rights in respect of its LUCKIN COFFEE mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the Complainant's mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's LUCKIN COFFEE mark in its entirety, with the only difference being the addition of the term "franchise". In accordance with WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8, addition of other terms, whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise, would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element, as the Complainant's mark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name.

The Panel further notes that the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is required only for technical reasons and is generally ignored for the purposes of comparison of the Complainant's mark to the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark and that the first element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is satisfied.

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 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.

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.

The evidence before the Panel shows that the disputed domain name wholly incorporates the Complainant's LUCKIN COFFEE trademark and is used to impersonate the Complainant. The Respondent's website reproduced the Complainant's trademark, logo, offering "Luckin Coffee" franchise opportunities and related expansion services. Consequently, that at least two companies that provided information through the website of the disputed domain name were subsequently contacted through an email address associated with the disputed domain name and asked to pay franchise fees in exchange for purported franchise rights and operating materials, suggesting use of the disputed domain name in furtherance of a fraudulent scheme falsely presenting itself as affiliated with the Complainant. Such use cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services under paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, nor does it qualify as legitimate noncommercial or fair use without intent for commercial gain under paragraph 4(c)(iii). The manner in which the Respondent uses the disputed domain name indicates an intent to mislead consumers and to take unfair advantage of the Complainant's reputation rather than to pursue any legitimate business purpose.

Panels have categorically held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (e.g. phishing/identity theft, , or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1; See *LinkedIn Corporation v. Nanci Nette,* WIPO Case No. D2023-2290.

Furthermore, should the franchise opportunities promoted on the website to which the disputed domain name resolved have been legitimately offered by the Respondent, the question that would arise is whether the Respondent would thereby have legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

According to the current state of UDRP decisions in relation to the issue of resellers as summarized in the WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.8.1, resellers, distributors, or service providers using a domain name containing the complainant's trademark to undertake sales or repairs related to the complainant's goods or services may be making a bona fide offering of goods and services and thus have a legitimate interest in such domain name. Outlined in the Oki Data test, the following cumulative requirements will be applied in the specific conditions of a UDRP case: (i) the respondent must actually be offering the goods or services at issue; (ii) the respondent must use the site to sell only the trademarked goods or services; (iii) the site must accurately and prominently disclose the registrant's relationship with the trademark holder; and (iv) the respondent must not try to "corner the market" in domain names that reflect the trademark.

Even if the Respondent was promoting or facilitating "Luckin Coffee" franchise opportunities, the Panel finds that the manner in which the Complainant's trademark and logo are used on the website, combined with the absence of any clear and prominent disclosure of the Respondent's relationship with the Complainant, creates a misleading impression of affiliation. Such use is likely to lead Internet users to believe that the website is operated by, endorsed by, or otherwise affiliated with the Complainant. Accordingly, the Respondent fails to satisfy the third requirement of the Oki Data test.

In addition, although the Respondent registered the disputed domain name using "Luckin Coffee" as its organization name, there is nothing in the record to suggest that the Respondent is actually commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy. The fact that the disputed domain name no longer resolves to an active website reinforces that it is not being used as an identifier for any legitimate enterprise.

The Panel further notes that the Complainant has established trademark rights in LUCKIN COFFEE and has confirmed that it has no relationship with the Respondent. The Respondent has not been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted to use the Complainant's trademark.

In view of the above, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the Complainant has satisfied the requirement of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

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 registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith under paragraph 4(b) of the Policy.

The Complainant is globally recognized as a pioneer of a technology-driven new retail model that offers coffee and other food and beverage products of high quality, affordability, and convenience under the "Luckin Coffee" name. The Complainant is best known for leveraging big data analytics and AI across various aspects of its business, from customer engagement and storefront operations to supply chain management.

Given the Complainant's international reputation and the distinctive nature of its LUCKIN COFFEE mark and the website resolving to the Complainant's products, the Panel finds it implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's rights.

Furthermore, the choice of the term "franchise" in combination with the Complainant's LUCKIN COFFEE trademark is further indicative of the Respondent's bad faith. Given that the term is directly related to the Complainant's business and commercial activities, including its extensive network of partnership stores operated under the "Luckin Coffee" brand, its inclusion in the disputed domain name does not appear coincidental. Rather, it reinforces the Panel's finding that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its trademark and deliberately targeted the Complainant when registering the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name previously resolved to an unauthorized website prominently displaying the Complainant's trademarks and content, featuring a fake copyright notice, reproducing the Complainant's address, and soliciting sensitive personal data through an enquiry form. Furthermore, third parties submitting inquiries through the site received emails from "[…]@luckincoffeefranchise.com" with purported franchise documentation soliciting "Commitment Franchise Fees" of USD 25,000 to USD 30,000. This conduct falls squarely within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, as the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users, for presumed commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website. By using the disputed domain name to operate an unauthorized franchise scam, the Respondent created a false impression of legitimacy and attempted to exploit users' trust associated with the Complainant's well-known LUCKIN COFFEE trademark.

At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name no longer resolves to an active website, which further demonstrates that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name does not correspond to any legitimate purpose and reinforces the conclusion that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith pursuant to the Policy.

Additionally, the Panel notes that the Respondent was previously subject to an adverse decision in *Starbucks Corporation v. Shaba Sadiq,* WIPO Case No. D2026-2508 regarding <starbucksfranchiseandlicense.com>, where the Respondent similarly targeted a famous coffee brand with fraudulent franchise offerings. This supports a finding that the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of abusive domain name registrations targeting well-known trademarks. In line with section 3.1.2 of the WIPO Overview 3.1, such conduct establishing a pattern of bad faith conduct is further indicative of bad faith.

Considering the totality of circumstances, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

Accordingly, the third element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been established.

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 <luckincoffeefranchise.com> be transferred to the Complainants.[1]

/Ganna Prokhorova/
Ganna Prokhorova
Sole Panelist
Date: September 4, 2026

[1]The Panel notes that the two Complainants did not specify to whom the disputed domain name should be transferred in their submitted Complaint. Accordingly, the Panel leaves it to the Complainants to inform the concerned Registrar of the Complainant to which the disputed domain name should be transferred to in order to facilitate the implementation of the Decision.