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. Don Pedro
Case No. D2026-4129

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 Don Pedro, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <luckincoffeefranchising.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 September 15, 2026. On September 16, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 17, 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 September 17, 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 September 18, 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 September 22, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 12, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Rodrigo Velasco Santelices as the sole panelist in this matter on October 19, 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 2017 in China, is a pioneer of a technology-driven new retail model that offers coffee and other F&B products of high quality, high affordability and high convenience to its customers. The Complainant's vision is to build a world-class coffee brand and become part of everyone's daily life.

Since opening its first physical store in Beijing in 2017, the Complainant has achieved remarkable growth in a relatively short period of time and has developed strong market influence and high brand recognition in China's coffee market. The Complainant has expanded its operations beyond mainland China to Hong Kong, China, Malaysia, Singapore, and the United States, with continued growth in its store network, revenues, and customer base.

In addition to the expansion of its global physical store network, the Complainant has developed substantial recognition and visibility across social media platforms worldwide. In China, as of August 2026 the Complainant has amassed over 7 million followers on Douyin, over 1 million followers on Xiaohongshu (Little Red Book), and over 1 million followers on Weibo. Outside China, the Complainant has attracted more than 170,000 followers on Instagram and more than 26,000 followers on Facebook. Its social media presence has contributed to significant consumer engagement and sales growth, while its co-branding campaigns have repeatedly generated widespread online discussion. These facts further demonstrate the considerable reputation, public recognition, and commercial influence of the LUCKIN COFFEE brand in both domestic and international markets.

The Complainant has registered LUCKIN COFFEE trademark in multiple jurisdictions worldwide, including:

- China trademark registration No. 33963071, registered on December 14, 2019, covering goods in class 30;

- International trademark registration No. 1886618, registered on March 14, 2025, covering goods and services in classes 7, 9, 11, 18, 21, 30, 32, 35 and 43; and

- United States trademark registration No. 7782558, registered on May 6, 2025, covering goods and services in classes 30 and 43.

In addition, the Complainant has owned a prior domain name <luckincoffee.com> since July 4, 2017, and has been using it as official website for business for a long time. The Complainant's official website is accessible to Internet users all over the world, which enables the Complainant to promote LUCKIN COFFEE trademark and products globally.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website that prominently displays the Complainant's LUCKIN COFFEE, trademarks, together with extensive content presenting the Complainant's Luckin Coffee brand and is using the Complainant's "LUCKIN COFFEE", trademarks in relation to the purported offering of franchise services for the Complainant's Luckin Coffee brand. The website footer contains the misleading copyright notice "©2026 Luckin Coffee Franchise Strategic Platform. All rights reserved". In addition, the "Contact Us" page displays the Complainant's address and an enquiry form soliciting sensitive information from Internet users, including their full name, email address, phone number, etc.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 17, 2026.

The Complainant's submitted trademarks all predate the registration date of the disputed domain name.

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 that it is the owner of the registered trademarks LUCKIN COFFEE among others, so it cannot be questioned that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark registrations. The disputed domain name reproduces the registered trademark in its entirety, which is followed by the descriptive term "franchising". The addition of this term is not sufficient to dispel the ensuing confusing similarity between the Complainant's trademarks and the domain name owned by the Complainant, namely <luckincoffee.com>. Moreover, the addition of such term adds to the confusing similarity.

For reasons set out above, and pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Complainant has strong rights in the trademark LUCKIN COFFEE and the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to it.

Thus, the Complainant further states that the Respondent clearly had the Complainant's trademark in mind when registering the disputed domain name in order to exploit and profit from its trademark rights.

Respondents who knowingly adopt a third party's well-known trademark as a domain name cannot claim the benefit of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy to establish rights to it based merely on use to offer putative goods or services prior to the notice of a dispute.

Further, the Respondent's website content is likely to confuse Internet users into believing that the disputed domain name and the Respondent's unauthorized use may lead consumers to believe it is operated by, approved, sponsored by, or affiliated with the Complainant. In addition, the Complainant states that a prospective franchisee has already been defrauded by the Respondent using an email connected to the disputed domain name in connection with the purported offering of franchises under the Complainant's brand.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("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 entirety of the trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

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

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. Furthermore, the Panel considers that the composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. WIPO Overview 3.1 section 2.5.1.

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 Complainant's trademarks were registered several years prior to the registration of the disputed domain name. Therefore, most probably the Respondent knew or should have known the Complainant's trademarks when registering the disputed domain name. The Panel finds that this fact cannot be a simple coincidence.

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 Panel finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks, as to the source, sponsorship, or endorsement of the disputed domain name, in bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name 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 name <luckincoffeefranchising.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Rodrigo Velasco Santelices/
Rodrigo Velasco Santelices
Sole Panelist
Date: October 30, 2026