

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Bitmain Technologies Limited v. Chris Morgan, Cloud Mining Case No. DIO2025-0003

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Bitmain Technologies Limited, Hong Kong, China, represented Han Kun (Shenzhen) Law Offices, China.

The Respondent is Chris Morgan, Cloud Mining, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <antminer.io> is registered with OwnRegistrar, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 5, 2025. On February 5, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 6, 2025, 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 (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 6, 2025, 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 February 8, 2025.


The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the .IO Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Policy"), the Rules for .IO Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Rules"), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for .IO 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 February 13, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 5, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 6, 2025.

The Center appointed Peter Burgstaller as the sole panelist in this matter on March 10, 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 Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant (and its affiliates) is a leading global technology company, offering products e.g., in the areas of blockchain and artificial intelligence (Annex 4 and 5 to the Complaint).

The Complainant owns trademark registrations for , inter alia in:

- United States of America, Reg. No.4,708,056 and 4,708,234, both registered March 24, 2015;
- European Union, Reg. No.013168042, registered December 24, 2014;
- Singapore, Reg. No. T1412371F and T1412795I, both registered February 26, 2015 (Annex 2 to the Complaint).

Moreover, the Complainant displays on its main website available under the domain name <bitmain.com>, registered July 17, 2007, its Miner-Models under the mark ANTMINER (Annex 14 to the Complaint).



The disputed domain name was registered on August 14, 2023 (Annex 11 to the Complaint).


At the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website where the Complainant's mark ANTMINER was prominently displayed, and the Miner-Models under the mark ANTMINER were offered with similar model names than those of the Complainant (Annex 16 to the Complaint).


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 has trademark rights in the mark  and the disputed domain name contains the ANTMINER trademark in its entirety, simply adding the country code Top-Level-Domain ".io" ("ccTLD"), and is therefore at least confusingly similar to the Complainant's  trademark.

The Complainant alleges, that it has never assigned, granted, licensed, sold, transferred, or in any way authorized the Respondent to register or use the  trademark in any manner, and the Respondent has no other legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Further, the Complainant submits that it is inconceivable that the Respondent would not have been aware of the Complainant and its trademarks when registering the disputed domain name, because the Complainant's  mark is distinctive and well-known globally especially in the field of the Complainant's business.

The Respondent moreover failed to exercise the basic duty of care when registering the disputed domain name; a simple online search for ANTMINER would have shown the Complainant's rights to the  mark.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the Respondent is engaged in the same business as the Complainant, specifically the sale of computer products, primarily selling products named "Antminer," which are identical to the Complainant's registered trademark . Besides, the product models offered by the Respondent (such as Antminer E9, Antminer L7, Antminer S19 Pro, Antminer S19 XP, Antminer S21 XP, etc.) are completely identical to the product models published and sold by the Complainant. The Complainant contends that the Respondent impersonates the Complainant's identity.

B. Respondent

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


6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that:

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

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 Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.¹

The Complainant submitted evidence that establishes rights in the figurative mark . [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name is identical to the figurative trademark of the Complainant since the Complainant's mark ANTMINER is included in the disputed domain name in its entirety. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. Panel assessment of identity or confusing similarity involves comparing the (alpha-numeric) domain name and the textual components of the relevant mark. To the extent that design (or figurative/stylized) elements would be incapable of representation in domain names, these elements are largely disregarded for purposes of assessing identity or confusing similarity under the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.10.

Finally, it has also long been held that ccTLDs are generally disregarded when evaluating the confusing similarity of a disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.


Based on the available record, 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.

While the overall burden of proof in the proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the often impossible 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. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

¹Given the similarities between the Policy and the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "UDRP"), the Panel will refer to cases decided under the UDRP, and the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), if relevant to this proceeding.

Having reviewed the 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 Complainant's trademark  is distinctive and it is inconceivable that the Respondent would not have been aware of it when registering the disputed domain name.

Further, the Complainant expressly denies there being any relationship between itself and the Respondent.

The Complainant also notes that the disputed domain name is not being used for a bona fide offering of goods or services – it resolves to an unauthorized website with purported products of the Complainant and displaying product models and model names similar to those on the Complainant's website.

The composition of the disputed domain name carries a high risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1. In addition, the conditions for a legitimate use of the Complainant's trademark in a domain name under the Oki Data test are not met in the present case, since the Respondent must inter alia accurately and prominently disclose the Respondent's relationship with the trademark holder to show a legitimate use of a trademark as a reseller, distributor, or service provider. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.8; *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#).


The evidence in the Complaint does not reveal any disclaimer that discloses the Respondent's relationship with the Complainant, and the Respondent has not introduced any evidence to the contrary. Rather, it appears the Respondent has purposely attempted to create a false association with the Complainant by prominently displaying the Complainant device mark and referring to the Complainant's information on the website. Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Respondent clearly does not comply with the Oki Data test.


The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions and hence has not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie showing.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered or 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 Complainant provided evidence which demonstrates that it has rights in the mark  and it has intensively used this mark in business for years, with a strong online presence and long before the disputed domain name was registered.

It is inconceivable for this Panel that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant's rights, which leads to the necessary inference of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2. This finding is supported by the fact that the Respondent's business is in the same field than that of the Complainant and a simple search and/or screen registrations against available online databases would have shown the Complainant and/or its  mark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.3. Such finding is reinforced by the fact that the disputed domain name resolved to a website prominently displaying the Complainant's device mark. Therefore, the Panel finds that the Respondent knew the Complainant's trademark and registered the disputed domain name targeting the Complainant.

The disputed domain name was also used in bad faith. In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent provided, without authorization by the Complainant, a website under the disputed domain name and offered purported products of the Complainant under the mark ANTMINER with at least similar model names to those of the Complainant.

By doing this, the Respondent disrupted the Complainant's business and intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark which constitutes bad faith use.

Based on the available record, 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 <antminer.io> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Peter Burgstaller/

Peter Burgstaller

Sole Panelist

Date: March 24, 2025