

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Xiaomi Inc. v. Ltd iCity
Case No. DGE2025-0005

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Xiaomi Inc., China, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Ltd iCity, Georgia.

2. The Domain Names and Registry

The disputed domain names <myxiaomi.ge> and <xiaomi.com.ge> are registered with Caucasus Online LLC (the .GE Registry).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 2, 2025. On July 3, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the .GE Registry a request for registry verification in connection with the disputed domain name <xiaomi.com.ge>. On July 4, 2025, the .GE Registry transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name <xiaomi.com.ge> which differed from the named Respondent (Registrant Information Redacted) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 7, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the .GE Registry, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on July 11, 2025, adding the additional disputed domain name <myxiaomi.ge> to the Complaint. On July 17, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the .GE Registry a request for registry verification in connection with the disputed domain name <myxiaomi.ge>. On July 18, 2025, the .GE Registry transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

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

In accordance with the .GE Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 22, 2025. In accordance with the .GE Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 11, 2025. The Respondent did not submit a formal Response, however sent an email communication to the Center on July 7, 2025.

The Center appointed Fabrizio Bedarida as the sole panelist in this matter on August 21, 2025. 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 .GE Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant, Xiaomi Inc., was founded in April 2010 and was listed on the Main Board of the Hong Kong Stock Exchange on July 9, 2018 (1810.HK). The Complainant is a consumer electronics and smart manufacturing company, with smartphones and smart hardware connected by an Internet of Things (IoT) platform at its core. Since its initial launch, the Complainant has grown to become one of the leading providers of innovative technology worldwide.

The Complainant and its XIAOMI trademark are internationally known, with trademark registrations in numerous countries.

The Complainant has proven to be the owner of the XIAOMI and MI trademarks.

The Complainant is, inter alia, the owner of:

European Union Trade Mark XIAOMI (device) No. 017972921 registered on April 18, 2019.

International trademark XIAOMI (device) No. 1177611 registered on November 28, 2012.

International trademark XIAOMI (word) No. 1524028 registered on December 5, 2019.

Chinese trademark MI (device) No. 8911270, registered on July 7, 2012.

In addition, the Complainant is also the owner of the domain names <xiaomi.com> and <mi.com>.

The Complainant is also active on major social media platforms, including Facebook, X (formerly Twitter), and Instagram.

The disputed domain names <xiaomi.com.ge> and <myxiaomi.ge> were registered on September 8, 2020, and November 25, 2020, respectively.

The disputed domain name <xiaomi.com.ge> resolves to a website where the Complainant's MI trademark is displayed, and Complainant's products along with competing goods are offered for sale. The disputed domain name <myxiaomi.ge> merely redirects users to the website accessible via <xiaomi.com.ge>.

On June 6, 2025, the Complainant sent a cease and desist letter to the Respondent, which has remained unanswered.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant claims that the disputed domain names are respectively identical and confusingly similar to

the Complainant's registered trademark; that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests whatsoever with respect to the disputed domain names; and that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain names in bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not formally reply to the Complainant's contentions. In fact, the Respondent merely sent an email to the Center on July 7, 2025, stating that the matter would be forwarded to the Respondent's lawyer, who would contact the Center. However, no further communication was received.

6. Discussion and Findings

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the .GE Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the three following elements is satisfied:

- (i) the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and
- (iii) the disputed domain names have been registered or are being used in bad faith.

Having in mind the similarities between the .GE Policy and .GE Rules on the one side, and the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy ("UDRP") and associated rules on the other side, the Panel considers some UDRP precedents as well as the applicable sections of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), relevant to the present proceeding and will refer to them where appropriate.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has established rights in the XIAOMI trademark.

The disputed domain name <xiaomi.com.ge> is identical to the Complainant's XIAOMI trademark, with the only difference being the addition of the ".com.ge" Top-Level Domain ("TLD"), which is a technical requirement. The disputed domain name <myxiaomi.ge> incorporates the Complainant's XIAOMI trademark in its entirety and merely adds the generic term "my" at the beginning of the disputed domain name.

It is well established that the addition of other terms would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity pursuant to Policy, paragraph 4(a)(i). See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) at 1.8 ("Where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element.").

The Panel finds that the disputed domain names are, respectively, identical and confusingly similar to the XIAOMI trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

This Panel finds that the Complainant has made a prima facie case that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Respondent does not appear to be commonly known by the name "Xiaomi", the disputed domain names or by any similar name. The Respondent has no connection or affiliation with the Complainant and the Complainant has not licensed or

otherwise authorized the Respondent to use or register any domain name incorporating the Complainant's trademarks. The Respondent does not appear to make any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names, nor any use in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. In fact, it appears from the documents available that the disputed domain names resolve to a webpage which contains the Complainant's trademark and logo, and purportedly offer for sale Complainant's products along with products competing with the Complainant's goods. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.8.

Finally, the Respondent has not formally replied to the Complainant's contentions, claiming any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

UDRP panels have moreover found that domain names identical to a complainant's trademark carry a high risk of implied affiliation – which is the case here for the disputed domain name <xiaomi.com.ge>.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered or Used in Bad Faith

The Panel, on the basis of the evidence presented, accepts and agrees with the Complainant's contentions that the disputed domain names were registered and have been used in bad faith.

The XIAOMI trademark has been registered and used by the Complainant since 2010, and enjoys a widespread reputation and high degree of recognition as a result of its fame and renown and thus the XIAOMI mark is not one that the Respondent would have registered other than for the purpose of creating the impression of an association with the Complainant. This is particularly evident in the present case, where the disputed domain names incorporate the Complainant's XIAOMI trademark, and the Respondent's website displays the Complainant's registered MI trademark and logo alongside products that compete with the Complainant's goods. Consequently, the Panel finds that the Respondent knew of the Complainant's marks and intentionally intended to create an association with the Complainant and its business at the time of registration of the disputed domain names.

The Respondent's failure to reply formally to the Complainant's cease and desist letter, or to deny the allegations of bad faith in this proceeding, further support a finding of bad faith registration and use. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that, had the Respondent possessed any legitimate interest in the disputed domain name, it would have responded.

In addition, the Panel finds that the Respondent's use of the Complainant's trademark, in the disputed domain names and on the corresponding website, to attract users to purportedly offer the Complainant's products without a disclaimer and to promote competing products amounts to bad faith use.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has acted in bad faith by registering and using the disputed domain names, seeking to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's XIAOMI mark.

Therefore, the Panel finds that this use constitutes a disruption of the Complainant's business and qualifies as bad faith registration and use under the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel finds, on the basis of the evidence presented, that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain names in bad faith.

Therefore, the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the .GE Policy and 15 of the .GE Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain names, <myxiaomi.ge> and <xiaomi.com.ge> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Fabrizio Bedarida/

Fabrizio Bedarida

Sole Panelist

Date: September 2, 2025