

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Google LLC v. merso / Yang Jun
Case No. DIO2026-0027

1. The Parties

Complainant is Google LLC, United States of America, represented by Morgan, Lewis & Bockius, LLP, United States of America.

Respondent is merso / Yang Jun,¹ China, self-represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <nano-banana.io> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 19, 2026. On June 19, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 19, 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 and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on June 22, 2026, inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on June 23, 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”).

¹ While the disputed domain name was registered under the name “merso”, the Response received from the Registrar-confirmed registrant email clarified the Respondent’s identity as “Yang Jun”, and the Respondent email communications included references “merso”. In these circumstances the Panel considers the Respondent to be “merso / Yang Jun”.

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 25, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the extended due date for Response was July 19, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on July 17, 2026. Respondent also sent email communications to the Center on July 13, 14, and 21, 2026. Complainant submitted a Further Statement on July 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Marina Perraki, Richard Hill, and Hong Xue as the Panel in this matter on August 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.

Procedural Issue: Supplemental Filing

Complainant has submitted an unsolicited supplemental filing. Paragraph 10 of the Rules vests the panel with the authority to determine the admissibility, relevance, materiality and weight of the evidence, and also to conduct the proceedings with due expedition.

In the present case, the Complainant's Supplemental Filing discusses certain elements of the Respondent's response. The Supplemental Filing is therefore relevant to the case. As it was filed before the constitution of the Panel and is of reasonable length, the Panel decides to accept it.

Furthermore, Respondent submitted a Supplemental Filing on July 21, 2026, which addresses an assertion in the Complainant's Supplemental Filing, which is thus also accepted. More specifically, Respondent opposes Complainant's assertion that Respondent is the same respondent as in *Siemens AG v. Yang Jun Yang, Yang Jun*, WIPO Case No. [D2018-1115](#).

The Panel notes that information in neither of the two Supplemental Filings is determinative of the outcome of this Decision.

4. Factual Background

Complainant is a Delaware limited liability company located in Mountain View, California. The Google name and company were created in 1998 by Stanford Ph.D. candidates Larry Page and Sergey Brin. Since that time, the Google search engine has become one of the most highly recognized Internet search services in the world. Google is routinely included in global lists of top brands. In 2020, Forbes ranked Google the second most-valuable brand globally, and in 2025, Brand Finance ranked Google as the third most-valuable brand in its Global 500 ranking. Complainant has recently been launching several new AI software products. Among these products is NANO BANANA, Complainant's AI-powered image editing software that allows users to edit images using text prompts. Complainant's NANO BANANA software was released on August 12, 2025 and immediately received wide public commentary and media coverage.

Complainant owns trademark registrations for NANO BANANA, including the Singapore trademark registration No. 40202529520Q, NANO BANANA (figurative), filed on November 14, 2025 and registered on January 22, 2026 for services in International Class 42, with priority from September 4, 2025 based on Complainant's earlier filed trademark application No. TO/M/2025/04930 in Tonga.

The disputed domain name ("Domain Name") was registered on August 14, 2025 and at the time of filing of the Complaint it led to a website offering competing AI services, namely identical AI image and video generation and editing software, under a name identical to Complainant's NANO BANANA mark, prominently displaying a "Nano Banana AI Image & Video Platform" banner and systematically mentioning the product name NANO BANANA (the Website). The Domain Name currently redirects to a website at "imagvio.ai" with identical content.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant asserts that it has established all three elements required under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Name.

B. Respondent

On July 17, 2026 Respondent submitted a Response, in which he asserted that the second and third elements are not met. Respondent did not dispute that the Domain Name is “textually similar to the wording NANO BANANA” under the first element. Respondent affirmed that the Domain Name was used in connection with “an operating AI image-generation and image-editing platform”, which he claimed he developed himself. Respondent noted additional functionalities of his own software to those of Complainant's. Respondent stated that he did not use “Complainant's corporate logo as the platform's own logo” and did not use language such as “official”, “authorized”, etc. As regards bad faith registration and use, Respondent raised the argument that Complainant did not have a trademark registration at the time of registration of the Domain Name. Respondent acknowledged that he knew of the NANO BANANA mark at the time of registration of the Domain Name and considered it “to be an emerging name used in connection with an AI image model”. Per the Response, “Respondent did not understand at that time that the wording had already become an established Google trademark or the official name of a mature Google-branded commercial service”. Following formal notice of the Complaint, Respondent migrated its platform to a new domain. Respondent claims that Complainant has not established bad faith registration and use with an intention deliberately to impersonate Complainant.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists the three elements which Complainant must satisfy with respect to the Domain Name:

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

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Panel finds that Complainant has established unregistered trademark or service mark rights for the purposes of the Policy (WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), section 1.3).²

According to the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.1.1, the term “trademark or service mark” as used in UDRP paragraph 4(a)(i) encompasses both registered and unregistered (sometimes referred to as common law) marks. Per the Complaint, Complainant's NANO BANANA mark is associated with Complainant's services such that, as the Panel finds on balance, Complainant has common law rights in NANO BANANA for the purposes of the Policy. Complainant has demonstrated that Complainant's Nano Banana AI-powered image editing model generated widespread public commentary from its launch on August 12, 2025. The length of time of use of such rights is not itself determinative, while the fact that a respondent is shown to have been targeting the complainant's mark based on the manner in which the

² The Panel, noting the similarities between the Policy and the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “UDRP”), follows prior decisions under the UDRP and refers to UDRP jurisprudence, including reference to the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

mark is used on the related website may also support the complainant's assertion and evidence that its mark has achieved significance as a source identifier ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.3). The Panel finds that unregistered rights have been established for the purposes of the Policy (see also *Google LLC v. Bill Johnson, cloudmap, Loong Two*, WIPO Case No. [DIO2025-0055](#), and *Google LLC v. cheng xinfang*, WIPO Case No. [DIO2025-0056](#)). Moreover, Complainant has provided evidence of registered trademark rights.

The Panel further finds that the Domain Name that incorporates Complainant's NANO BANANA mark in its entirety plus a hyphen, is confusingly similar to the NANO BANANA trademark of Complainant. The addition of the hyphen does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The country code Top-Level Domain ("ccTLD") ".io" is disregarded, as ccTLDs typically do not form part of the comparison on the grounds that they are required for technical reasons only. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Complainant has established Policy, paragraph 4(a)(i).

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Pursuant to paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, Respondent may establish its rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name, among other circumstances, by showing any of the following elements:

- (i) before any notice to Respondent of the dispute, Respondent's use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or
- (ii) Respondent (as an individual, business, or other organization) has been commonly known by the Domain Name, even if it has acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or
- (iii) Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

The Panel concludes that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name.

Respondent has not persuasively shown any such rights or legitimate interests with respect to the Domain Name. As per Complainant, Respondent was not authorized to register the Domain Name.

Prior to the notice of the dispute, Respondent did not demonstrate any use of the Domain Name or a trademark corresponding to the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

On the contrary the resolving Website was used to promote Respondent's competing commercial AI-powered image and video generation and editing services, under a name identical to Complainant's NANO BANANA mark. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.3 which states: "Similarly, a respondent's use of a complainant's mark to redirect users (e.g., to a competing site) would not support a claim to rights or legitimate interests."

The Panel finds that these circumstances do not confer upon Respondent any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name.

Complainant has established Policy, paragraph 4(a)(ii).

C. Registered or Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides that the following circumstances, “in particular but without limitation”, are evidence of the registration and use of the Domain Name in “bad faith”:

- (i) circumstances indicating that Respondent has registered or has acquired the Domain Name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the Domain Name registration to Complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of its documented out of pocket costs directly related to the Domain Name; or
- (ii) Respondent has registered the Domain Name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding Domain Name, provided that Respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) Respondent has registered the Domain Name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) by using the Domain Name, Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to Respondent’s website or other on line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of Respondent’s website or location or of a product or service on Respondent’s website or location.

The Panel concludes that Respondent has registered and used the Domain Name in bad faith. Considering the nature of Complainant’s mark which is coined and arbitrary and the fact that the Domain Name was registered only two days following the public release of Complainant’s product under that mark, the Panel finds it more likely than not that Respondent had Complainant’s mark in mind when registering the Domain Name (*Google LLC v. Bill Johnson, cloudmap, Loong Two*, WIPO Case No. [DIO2025-0055](#), *Google LLC v. cheng xinfang*, WIPO Case No. [DIO2025-0056](#)). The Panel also notes that the Domain Name incorporates the entirety of the Complainant’s mark with the sole addition of a hyphen and that the Website promoted software identical to that of Complainant under the exact same name as further indications of bad faith registration.

As regards bad faith use of the Domain Name, Complainant has demonstrated that the Domain Name was used to create the Website, which prominently displayed Complainant’s NANO BANANA mark in relation to software identical to Complainant’s product prominently promoted on the Website. The Domain Name operated therefore by intentionally creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant’s mark and business as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the website it resolved to. This can be used in support of bad faith registration and use (*Booking.com BV v. Chen Guo Long*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-0311](#); *Ebel International Limited v. Alan Brashear*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-0001](#); *Walgreen Co. v. Muhammad Azeem / Wang Zheng, Nicenic International Group Co., Limited*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-1607](#); *Oculus VR, LLC v. Sean Lin*, WIPO Case No. [DCO2016-0034](#); and [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4). Confusion was further enhanced by the fact that on the Website a banner showing another Complainant’s software product (Gemini Omni) and mentioning Complainant, was prominently displayed.

The Response confirms the above findings. Respondent contends that “Awareness of an emerging AI model name does not necessarily establish awareness that the name had already acquired enforceable and exclusive source-identifying trademark significance associated with Complainant during that two-day period”. Since Respondent concedes that he was aware of the name of the AI model of Complainant (NANO BANANA) before registering the Domain Name, it is unpersuasive that he was not aware during that two-day period that the AI model must be offered from a specific “source” as the name exactly functions to identify that source. In addition, Respondent states that he redirected the Website to another website under a different domain name with the intent to “reduce any continuing possibility of confusion”, which shows that he understood that the use of the Domain Name was likely to cause confusion with the Complainant’s mark. Respondent further affirmed that “Respondent recognizes that using a model name

in a domain name may give rise to a possible risk of confusion”. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4, which states: “Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos or incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term) to a well-known trademark, and particularly in the case of coined or fanciful marks, can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. ... Panels have moreover found the following types of evidence to support a finding that a respondent has registered a domain name to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark: ... (iii) the lack of a respondent’s own rights to or legitimate interests in a domain name, (iv) redirecting the domain name to a different respondent-owned website, even where such website contains a disclaimer, ...”.

Moreover, Registrants are responsible for providing correct Whois information pursuant to ICANN’s Registration Data Reminder Policy (formerly Whois Data Reminder Policy).

The Panel finds that the Respondent has provided apparently false Whois information under a different name from the name provided in the Response, and with a physical address being a short string of letters that does not specify a valid address in China. In the circumstances of this case such details are indicative of bad faith.

Under these circumstances and on this record, the Panel finds that Respondent has registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith.

Complainant has established Policy paragraph 4(a)(iii).

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 <nano-banana.io> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Marina Perraki/

Marina Perraki

Presiding Panelist

/Richard Hill/

Richard Hill

Panelist

/Hong Xue/

Hong Xue

Panelist

Date: August 21, 2026