ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

MiiR Holdings, LLC v. Shanbing Ren, Junxin Fengkuang, Juexin Fengkuang, Jue Xing, Juexin Fengkuan, Juxin Fengkuang
Case No. D2026-3814

1. The Parties

The Complainant is MiiR Holdings, LLC, United States of America ("United States" or "U.S."), represented by K&L Gates LLP, U.S.

The Respondents are Shanbing Ren, China, Junxin Fengkuang, China, Juexin Fengkuang, China, Jue Xing, China, Juexin Fengkuan, China, and Juxin Fengkuang, China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <miair.shop>, <miiegr.shop>, <miiirir.shop>, <miirkk.shop>, <miirp.shop>, <miirus.shop>, <miitre.shop>, <miitr.shop>, <miiure.shop>, <miiur.shop>, <mililr.shop>, <mirir.shop>, <miruri.shop>, <mirxri.shop>, and <mitietsr.shop> are registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 25, 2026. On August 26, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On August 27, 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 (Redacted for Privacy, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 1, 2026, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants 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 on September 4, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 9, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 29, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents' default on September 30, 2026.

The Center appointed Flip Jan Claude Petillion as the sole panelist in this matter on October 7, 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, MiiR Holdings, LLC, is a United States company active in the design and sale of reusable drinkware and related products. The Complainant markets products under the MIIR trademark, including through its website at <miir.com>.

The Complainant owns various registrations for the MIIR trademark, including the following:

- MIIR, international trademark registered with WIPO on October 23, 2019, under No. 1510496 in class 21;

- MIIR, Chinese trademark registered on April 7, 2020, under No. 40209427 in class 18; and

- MIIR, Chinese trademark registered on December 21, 2020, under No. 40209425 in class 21.

The disputed domain names were registered between June 27 and July 27, 2026. The Complainant has provided screenshots showing that the disputed domain names all resolved to websites resembling its official website by including its MIIR mark, product images, descriptions and general layout, and by offering products identical or at least similar to the Complainant's products. According to the Complainant's evidence, the websites linked to at least 13 out of the 15 disputed domain names included a statement indicating that these were "clone" websites using the Complainant's official website as a source reference. Following requests by the Complainant, the Registrar placed certain disputed domain names on ClientHold status, rendering the corresponding websites inaccessible.

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.

It requests consolidation of the proceedings against the nominally different registrants, relying on the similarities in their names and addresses, the same Registrar, the close registration dates, the common naming pattern of the disputed domain names, and the near-identical content and layout of the corresponding websites.

On the merits, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its MIIR trademark because they all are typos or misspellings of the mark.

The Complainant argues that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names as, in summary:

- the Respondents are not commonly known by the disputed domain names;

- the Respondents have not used the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services as these are confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark and used in connection with a website that directly competes with the Complainant for overlapping goods and services;

- the Complainant has never licensed or approved the use of its marks by the Respondents; and

- the Respondents' use of the disputed domain names to resolve to a website prominently displaying the Complainant's marks and appearing to offer products under the marks without authorization, suggests the sale of counterfeit goods and deliberate exploitation of the Complainant's goodwill.

Finally, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. It relies on its marks registered over several years prior to the disputed domain names and the "About Us" page linked to the majority of the disputed domain names acknowledging that the website was a clone of the Complainant's website. According to the Complainant, such an admission eliminates any plausible claim of coincidence or independent adoption and confirms that the Respondents intentionally targeted the Complainant and its online presence. The Complainant also claims that the Respondents deliberately attempted to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's marks.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 Complaint 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. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that:

- all 15 disputed domain names were registered with the same Registrar within one month;

- these follow a similar naming pattern consisting of the addition of a few letters to the four letters of the Complainant's MIIR trademark, rearranged in different ways, under the ".shop" generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD");

- the websites associated with the disputed domain names all had substantially similar content and layouts; and

- the registrant details also display notable similarities, including recurring elements in names and postal addresses, with registrants located in the same general area of China.

Taken together, the Panel finds that these circumstances support the conclusion that, more likely than not, the disputed domain names are subject to common control.

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.

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 a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain names all include the four letters of the Complainant's MIIR mark, start with the first two letters "mi" and then add a few other letters arranged in a different order. The Panel finds that each disputed domain name contains sufficiently recognizable aspects of the MIIR trademark to be considered a variation of that mark, referred to as typosquatting. Such variations do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.9.

The gTLD ".shop" is a standard registration requirement and may be disregarded in the assessment of confusing similarity. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1.

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.

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 notes that the Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use the MIIR trademark. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by any of the disputed domain names or has corresponding trademark rights.

Moreover, the Panel is of the opinion that the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names. According to the Complainant's evidence, the websites associated with the disputed domain names copied the Complainant's official website and purported to offer (sometimes discounted) products under the Complainant's mark. Many of these websites included a statement indicating that these were "clone" websites using the Complainant's official website as a source reference.

Panels have categorically held that use of a domain name for illegitimate or illegal activity, including the sale of counterfeit goods, copycat sites, passing off, or other types of fraud, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1. The Panel considers that the evidence of the websites' appearance and content supports such a finding here. The fact that the disputed domain names currently do not resolve to active websites does not change the Panel's conclusion.

The Respondent had the opportunity to demonstrate its rights or legitimate interests but did not do so. In the absence of a Response from the Respondent, the prima facie case established by the Complainant has not been rebutted.

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. Among these factors demonstrating bad faith registration and use is the use of a domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to a 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 website or location or of a product or service on the website or location.

In the present case, the Panel finds that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its MIIR trademark when registering the disputed domain names. The disputed domain names all follow a similar pattern of misspellings of the Complainant's mark, and the corresponding websites essentially copied the Complainant's official website, including its mark, branding and product presentation. The evidence of an "About Us" page explicitly mentioning the Complainant's website as source reference further supports the inference of deliberate targeting.

The Panel finds that the use of the disputed domain names for websites which resembled the Complainant's official website and purported to offer products under the MIIR trademark, sometimes at discounted prices, indicates that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the websites and products offered thereon.

Moreover, Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate or illegal activity, such as the sale of counterfeit goods, copycat sites, passing off, or other types of fraud constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4.

The fact that the disputed domain names currently do not resolve to active websites is probably due to action taken by the Registrar following a request by the Complainant and, in any event, does not alter the Panel's finding in light of the prior use evidenced in the record.

Finally, by failing to respond to the Complaint, the Respondent did not take any initiative to contest the foregoing. Pursuant to paragraph 14 of the Rules, the Panel may draw the conclusions it considers appropriate.

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 <miair.shop>, <miiegr.shop>, <miiirir.shop>, <miirkk.shop>, <miirp.shop>, <miirus.shop>, <miitre.shop>, <miitr.shop>, <miiure.shop>, <miiur.shop>, <mililr.shop>, <mirir.shop>, <miruri.shop>, <mirxri.shop>, and <mitietsr.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Flip Jan Claude Petillion/
Flip Jan Claude Petillion
Sole Panelist
Date: October 21, 2026