

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Zhejiang Geely Holding Group Co., Ltd v. BMS AUTO PTY LTD
Case No. DAU2026-0021

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Zhejiang Geely Holding Group Co., Ltd, China, represented by Wan Hui Da Law Firm, China.

The Respondent is BMS AUTO PTY LTD, Australia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <zeekrlife.com.au> is registered with Web Address Registration Pty Ltd (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 31, 2026. On August 3, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 4, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing additional contact details. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 4, 2026, providing the additional contact details provided by the Registrar, requesting clarification of a formal requirement in the Complaint, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on August 7, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the .au Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Policy" or ".auDRP"), the Rules for .au Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Rules"), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for .au Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Supplemental Rules").

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2(a) and 4(a), the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 12, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5(a), the due date for Response was September 1, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 2, 2026.

The Center appointed Alistair Payne as the sole panelist in this matter on September 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 is a large automobile manufacturer headquartered in China which was founded in 1986 and entered the automobile industry in 1997. It owns various automotive brands, including Geely Auto, ZEEKR, Lynk & Co, Geometry, Volvo Cars, Polestar, Proton Cars, Lotus and London Electric Vehicle Company. Overall, it stated to be the seventh largest vehicle manufacturer in China and has expanded internationally into numerous countries.

ZEEKR is the global luxury electric mobility technology brand owned by the Complainant and its first product under this brand was launched on April 15, 2021. It distributes this brand in more than 40 countries and brought its ZEEKR brand into Australia in 2024. The Complainant owns various trade mark registrations for ZEEKR including an International trade mark registration number 1650088 registered December 30, 2021, for the word mark ZEEKR designating, among others, Australia which was entered onto the Australian trade mark register under number 2256503 on August 8, 2022. The Complainant, or its official licensees also own the domain names <zeekrlife.com>, <zeekrlife.com.cn>, <zeekrlife.hk>, <zeekrlife.jp>, <zeekrlife.uk> and <zeekrlife.us>.

The disputed domain name was first registered on August 31, 2023 and was last modified on August 16, 2026. It is owned by the Australian based Respondent and currently does not resolve to an active website, redirecting to an error page at “http://global_errors.all.com/”.

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 its coined and distinctive registered trade mark ZEEKR is wholly incorporated into the disputed domain name and that the addition of the common English word “life” before the second level domain name root element does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant submits that it has never authorised or licensed the Respondent to use the ZEEKR mark or to register any domain name identical with or similar to the ZEEKR. It says that its trade mark search has not revealed that the Respondent ever applied for a trade mark registration for or incorporating the “zeekr”. It also submits that there is no evidence that the disputed domain name has gained a reputation.

As far as bad faith is concerned, the Complainant says that “zeekr” is a coined and inherently distinctive term which has no ordinary meaning or descriptive significance. It says that a simple Google search using the keywords “zeekr” or “zeekrlife” would have revealed search results which were exclusively related to the Complainant’s websites and business activities. The Complainant also says that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its ZEEKR registered trade mark and is likely to create confusion, free-ride on reputation of the Complainant’s registered trade mark ZEEKR and induce users to visit any website to which the disputed domain name resolves. This, says the Complainant, is likely to adversely affect the normal operation of the Complainant’s business and to a certain extent impede the Complainant’s use of the trade mark ZEEKR as a domain name.

Finally, the Complainant notes that the Respondent failed to reply to its cease and desist letter sent on June 12, 2026.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

The Panel has referred to the auDA Overview of Panel Views on Selected auDRP Questions, Second Edition ("auDRP Overview 2.0"), where appropriate.

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 trade mark and the disputed domain name. auDRP Overview 2.0, section 1.7.1.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. auDRP Overview 2.0, section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. auDRP Overview 2.0, section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here, the term "life", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that 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 as the trade mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. auDRP Overview 2.0, 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 .AU 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. auDRP Overview 2.0, section 2.1.1.

The Complainant has submitted that the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's ZEEKR mark, a coined and highly distinctive term, and that it has never authorised or licensed the Respondent to use the ZEEKR mark or to register any domain name identical with or confusingly similar to the ZEEKR mark. It has also submitted that its trade mark search has not revealed that the Respondent ever applied for a trade mark registration for or incorporating "zeekr". The Complainant has also asserted that there is no evidence that the disputed domain name has gained a reputation and that it does not currently resolve to a website.

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 Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered or Subsequently 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.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. In looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith for purposes of the Policy. auDRP Overview 2.0, section 3.3.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes that the Complainant's ZEEKR mark is a coined term that is highly distinctive. Based on the materials submitted in evidence by the Complainant, its ZEEKR vehicles have been well publicised since initial launch internationally in 2021 and in Australia since the national product launch in 2024. Although the disputed domain name was registered in 2023, prior to the Australian launch, it appears most likely that the Respondent did not register the disputed domain name containing the Complainant's coined trade mark by chance, but rather was aware of the Complainant's ZEEKR vehicles being distributed widely overseas and very possibly also of the Complainant's "zeekrlife" family of domain names. The disputed domain name appears to be an unauthorised extension of this family of domain names registered by the Respondent based in Australia for its own purposes. Notably, the Respondent has failed to respond to the Complainant's agent's pre action letter or to otherwise explain its registration of the disputed domain name.

In all of these circumstances the Panel finds it most likely that the Respondent was aware of and targeted the Complainant's ZEEKR mark when registering the disputed domain name and that the subsequent passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

7. Decision

For all 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 <zeekrlife.com.au> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Alistair Payne/

Alistair Payne

Sole Panelist

Date: September 21, 2026