

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Shanghai Xiyu Jizhi Technology Co., Ltd., Nanonoble Pte. Ltd. v. BaLa
Case No. DIO2026-0013

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Shanghai Xiyu Jizhi Technology Co., Ltd., China (the “First Complainant”) and Nanonoble Pte. Ltd., Singapore (the “Second Complainant”), both represented by Chofn Intellectual Property, China.

The Respondent is BaLa, Canada.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <minimaxi.io> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 23, 2026. On March 23, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 27, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on March 30, 2026 providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainants to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainants filed an amended Complaint on March 31, 2026.

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 April 7, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 27, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 30, 2026.

The Center appointed Tobias Malte Müller as the sole panelist in this matter on May 8, 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 First Complainant is a Chinese company established in 2021 active in the artificial intelligence technology sector. The Second Complainant was incorporated in 2024 and mainly provides MiniMax open platform services. The Complainants operate their official websites at “www.minimaxi.com” and “www.minimax.io”.

The Complaint is based amongst others on the following verbal trademarks for MINIMAX:

- (1) International trademark no. 842282A registered on February 5, 2004, in the name of the First Complainant, for services in class 38, designating China;
- (2) New Zealand trademark no. 1270412 registered on March 4, 2025, in the name of the Second Complainant, for goods in class 9; and
- (3) International trademark no. 1849388 registered on January 27, 2025, in the name of the Second Complainant, for services in classes 38, 41, 42, and 45, designating amongst others Canada.

It results from the evidence provided with the Complaint, which has not been contested by the Respondent, that the above marks are in force.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on January 14, 2026. The disputed domain name does not resolve to any active website and is merely passively held.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainants

The Complainants contend that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainants contend that:

- (1) the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainants' MINIMAX trademark in its entirety, with only the addition of the single letter “i” at the end, so that said trademark remains the dominant and clearly recognizable element within the disputed domain name;
- (2) the Respondent is not a distributor, partner, or licensee of the Complainants and has never been directly or indirectly authorized by the Complainants to use their trademarks or any domain names corresponding to said trademarks in any form. Its unauthorized registration and current passive holding of the disputed domain name clearly demonstrate that the Respondent lacks any genuine business intent but rather intended to exploit the Complainants' established reputation; and
- (3) At the time of registration, the Complainants' trademark was already a leading name in the AI industry with global media coverage. Given the Complainants' prominence in the tech community and the Complainants' operation through their domain names <minimax.io> and <minimaxi.com>, the Respondent's selection of the specific combination of the Complainants' brand variant and the same .IO Top-Level Domain (“TLD”) could not be a mere coincidence. It is highly improbable that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name blindly. The Respondent has further concealed its identity through a privacy service and there

is no plausible scenario where the Respondent could actively use the disputed domain name in a way that would not infringe upon the Complainants' rights.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainants' contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Procedural Issue: Consolidation of the Complainants

The Complaint was brought by two Complainants, namely Shanghai Xiyu Jizhi Technology Co., Ltd., and Nanonoble Pte. Ltd.

Although the Complainants do not expressly request consolidation, the Panel notes that the Complaint consistently refers to both entities collectively as "the Complainant" and seeks transfer of the disputed domain name to "the Complainant". Pursuant to its general powers under paragraphs 10(a), and its authority under paragraph 10(e) of the Rules to determine consolidation issues, the Panel considers the Complaint as including an implicit request for consolidation and addresses the matter accordingly.

As set forth in section 4.11.1 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)")¹: "In assessing whether a complaint filed by multiple unrelated complainants may be brought against a single respondent, panels look at whether (i) the complainants have a specific common grievance against the respondent, or the respondent has engaged in common conduct that has affected the complainants in a similar fashion, and (ii) it would be equitable and procedurally efficient to permit the consolidation."

In the light of the above, the Panel finds that the two Complainants have a specific common grievance against the Respondent because they both own registered trademarks for MINIMAX and the Second Complainant mainly provides MiniMax open platform services. Against this background, the Panel does not see reasons why a consolidated Complaint brought by the Complainants against a single Respondent would not be fair and equitable. Moreover, the Respondent failed to come forward with any allegations or evidence to object to the consolidation. For reasons of procedural efficiency, fairness, and equity the Panel therefore accepts the joint Complaint. Therefore, throughout the remainder of the current Decision, the Panel will refer to both the Complainants as "the Complainant".

6.2 Substantive issues

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to "decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable". Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires a complainant to prove each of the following three elements in order to obtain an order that the disputed domain name be transferred or cancelled:

- (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 in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith.

The Panel will therefore proceed to analyze whether the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are satisfied.

¹ Given the similarities between the Policy and the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "UDRP"), the Panel will refer to cases decided under both the Policy and the UDRP, and notably the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), if relevant to this proceeding.

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 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 mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name completed by an additional "i" added at the end of the Second-Level Domain. In the Panel's view, this addition does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the registered trademarks, which remain clearly recognizable 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](#), sections 1.7 and 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 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 disputed domain is inactive and can, therefore, not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services in the sense of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use in the sense of paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy. Furthermore, the Panel does not dispose of any elements or evidence in the records indicating any demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name or a name corresponding to the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

In addition, there are no elements in the available record that could lead the Panel to the conclusion that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name pursuant to paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy or that it has acquired trademark rights. In particular, the Complainant has not authorized or licensed the Respondent to use any of its trademarks in any way and the information on the Respondent as resulting from the Whois and the Registrar Verification Response is not similar to the disputed domain name.

Moreover, in the present case, the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark in its entirety, merely adding the letter "i" at the end of the Second-Level Domain. Therefore, Internet users may not notice such subtle difference and believe that the disputed domain name is connected to the Complainant, particularly noting the Complainant owns <minimax.io> and <minimaxi.com>.

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 Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy provides that the Complainant must establish that the Respondent registered or used the disputed domain name in bad faith. Unlike the UDRP, under the Policy (being the .IO Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy), it is sufficient for the complainant to prove that either registration or use of the domain name is in bad faith, whereas the UDRP requires the complainant to prove both.

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.

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).

In the present case, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name is inactive. The apparent lack of active use (*e.g.*, to resolve to an active website) of the domain name does not as such prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. The Panel must therefore examine all the circumstances of the case to determine whether the Respondent is acting in bad faith. Factors that have been considered relevant in applying the passive holding doctrine include:

- (i) the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant's mark;
- (ii) the failure of the respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use;
- (iii) the respondent's taking active steps to conceal its identity; or
- (iv) the use of false or inaccurate contact details (noted to be in breach of the respondent's registration agreement) (see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3).

In the case at hand, the Panel considers the following circumstances surrounding the registration as suggesting that the Respondent was aware that it has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and that the disputed domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith:

- (i) the Complainant's marks were registered prior to the registration of the disputed domain name. According to the undisputed and in part documented allegations in the Complaint, a certain degree of reputation of the Complainant's marks in the AI industry (where the use of the .IO TLD is quite wide spread) has been established through global media coverage;
- (ii) the composition of the disputed domain name, including the Complainant's trademark identically, is confusing similar to the Complainant's trademark and domain names, from which the Panel infers that it is more likely than not that by registering the disputed domain name the Respondent intended to take unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant;
- (iii) the clear absence of rights or legitimate interests;
- (iv) the Respondent's failure to bring forward any plausible arguments for its choice of the disputed domain name or for a plausible legitimate active use that the Respondent could make out of the disputed domain name; and
- (v) the disputed domain name was initially registered through a privacy shield service, combined with the apparent inaccuracy of certain Whois contact details - as evidenced by the Center's inability to transmit the Written Notice by fax to the fax number disclosed for the Respondent in the Registrar Verification Response.

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, <minimaxi.io>, be transferred to the Complainant.

/Tobias Malte Müller/

Tobias Malte Müller

Sole Panelist

Date: May 22, 2026