

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Alibaba Group Holding Limited v. Ali Uraish Mirani  
Case No. DCO2026-0026

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Alibaba Group Holding Limited, Cayman Islands, United Kingdom, represented by Convey Srl, Italy.

The Respondent is Ali Uraish Mirani, United States of America.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <agentbay.co> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 17, 2026. On March 17, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 18, 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 (Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 18, 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 March 20, 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 March 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 12, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Knud Wallberg as the sole panelist in this matter on April 15, 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 Alibaba Group Holding Limited (“Alibaba”), a multinational and e-commerce conglomerate founded in 1999, in Hangzhou, Zhejiang, China. Alibaba operates globally across more than 190 countries and offers a broad range of services, including consumer-to-consumer (C2C), business-to-consumer (B2C), and business-to-business (B2B) online marketplaces, as well as services in cloud computing, digital media and entertainment and others technology-driven services. The Complainant forms part of a wider corporate group that includes entities such as Alibaba (China) Co., Ltd., Alibaba Innovation Private Limited, Alibaba Cloud Computing Ltd. (“Alibaba Cloud”) and Cloud Intelligence Assets Holding (Singapore) Private Limited.

Alibaba has developed AgentBay – also known as Wuying AgentBay (无影 AgentBay with 无影 being the Chinese for Wuying) – a cloud-based platform offered through Alibaba Cloud, which provides a secure and pre-configured environment for running AI Agents, supporting tasks across browser, desktop, code, and mobile environments within a controlled sandbox infrastructure. The AgentBay product was publicly launched on July 1, 2025. The Complainant provides an official Software Development Kit (SDK) for AgentBay, published on GitHub with the version “v0.2.0” dated July 8, 2025, and provides information about this product at “[www.aliyun.com/product/agentbay](http://www.aliyun.com/product/agentbay)”.<sup>1</sup>

The Complainant, through its affiliated company Cloud Intelligence Assets Holding (Singapore) Private Limited, has trademark rights in the following registrations comprising the word AGENTBAY in several jurisdictions worldwide, including:

- European Union registration no. 019213395 of the wordmark AGENTBAY, filed on July 4, 2025, and registered on November 15, 2025, for goods and services in classes 9 and 42;
- United Kingdom registration no. UK00004229333 of the wordmark AGENTBAY, filed on July 4, 2025, and registered on September 26, 2025, for goods and services in classes 9 and 42; and
- Australian registration no. 2592522 of the wordmark AGENTBAY, registered from October 6, 2025, for goods and services in classes 9 and 42.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 2, 2025, and resolves to an active website that purportedly offers AI-related services branded as “AgentBay”. The website claims to be an “AI Agents Management Platform”, promoting features for centralized monitoring, management, and optimization of AI agents. It offers users the opportunity to participate in a complimentary beta program, as well as access a paid professional version.

---

<sup>1</sup>Noting in particular the general powers of a panel articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the UDRP Rules, it has been accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record if it would consider such information useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision, in particular to affirm or corroborate a party’s contention. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), section 4.8.

## 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 the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's AGENTBAY mark and that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant also contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant thus contends that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name on August 2, 2025, i.e., after the Complainant's official public launch of the AGENTBAY platform and that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name for an AI-focused platform offering services that fall within the same commercial field as the Complainant's AGENTBAY platform constitutes bad faith use under the Policy.

### B. Respondent

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

## 6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules the Panel shall decide the Complaint in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that a complainant must prove each of the following:

- (i) that the domain name registered by the respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; and
- (ii) that the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and
- (iii) that the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy states that the burden of proving that all these elements are present lies with the Complainant. At the same time, in accordance with paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, if a party, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, does not comply with any provision of, or requirement under, the Rules, or any request from the Panel, the Panel shall draw such inferences therefrom as it considers 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 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](#), sections 1.2.1 and 1.4.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7

The Top-Level Domain ".co" is a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

The Panel finds that the conditions in paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy are therefore fulfilled in relation to the disputed domain name.

## **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.

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.

Based on the evidence filed, the Panel finds that the Complainant announced the launch of the AgentBay product on the Alibaba Cloud’s website on July 1, 2025, which contained the distinctive name AgentBay as part of the name of the Wuying AgentBay (无影 AgentBay) platform. The Complainant has thus used AGENTBAY to identify its cloud-based platform before the Respondent registered the disputed domain name. In addition, the Complainant also publishes and updates its official SDK for AgentBay on GitHub with the version “v0.2.0” dated July 8, 2025, prior to the Respondent’s registration of the disputed domain name. Further, noting the composition of the disputed domain name and the content of the website as described above, in the absence of any explanation from the Respondent regarding its choice of “agentbay” as the disputed domain name, the Panel finds it is more likely than not that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its AGENTBAY brand at the time of registration of the disputed domain name.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent has used and continues to use the disputed domain name for an AI-focused platform that purportedly offers services, which are similar to the services that are offered by the Complainant under its AGENTBAY trademark.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv).

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 <agentbay.co> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Knud Wallberg/*

**Knud Wallberg**

Sole Panelist

Date: April 29, 2026