



(Hong Kong Office)

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

| | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Case No. | HK-1500726 |
| Complainant: | Alibaba Group Holding Limited |
| Respondent: | Angelica Belova |
| Disputed Domain Name: | <aliexpress.biz> |

1. The Parties and Contested Domain Name

The Complainant is Alibaba Group Holding Limited, (“the Complainant”) of Fourth Floor, One Capital Place, George Town, Grand Cayman, Cayman Islands, British West Indies, represented by Mayer Brown JSM, lawyers of Hong Kong.

The Respondent is Angelica Belova (“the Respondent”) of Avenida del Valle 34, Madrid, 28003, Spain, unrepresented.

The disputed domain name is <aliexpress.biz>, registered with IAPI GmbH of Talstraße 27, 66424 Homburg, Germany (“the Registrar”).

2. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the Hong Kong office of the Asian Domain Name Dispute Resolution Center (the “Center”) on 18 March, 2015. On 19 March, 2015, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the domain name at issue. On 27 March, 2015, the Center sent a reminder email to the Registrar seeking that same information. On 31 March, 2015, the Registrar finally 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 satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy”), the Rules of Procedure under the Policy (the “Rules”), and the Center’s Supplemental Rules.

In accordance with the Rules, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on 31 March, 2015. In accordance with the Rules, the due date for Response was 20 April, 2015. No Response was submitted and on 21 April, 2015, the Center notified the Respondent that it was in default.

The Center appointed Debrett G. Lyons as panelist in this matter on 27 April, 2015. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted and has acted impartially in reaching its conclusion.

3. Factual background

A. For Complainant

1. The Complainant is part of a Chinese company group engaged primarily in the provision of ecommerce and B2C services.
2. The Complainant (either itself or with the license of the company group) has used the trademark ALIEXPRESS in relation to those services since 2010.
3. In the twelve month period ending 31 December 2013, the business under the ALIEXPRESS trademark generated US\$2.0 billion in gross sales.
4. The Complainant is the owner, *inter alia*, of Hong Kong registration number 301402983AB, registered on 10 August 2009, and CTM (European Community) registration number 008508566, registered on 8 March 2010, both for the word mark ALIEXPRESS.
5. The Complainant has not licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the trademark or to register or use any domain name incorporating the trademark.
6. The Complainant petitions the Panel to order transfer the disputed domain name from the Respondent to the Complainant.

B. For Respondent

7. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on 12 February 2015.
8. The disputed domain name redirects Internet users to various websites unconnected with the Complainant and frequently shows the domain name as being for sale.

4. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant asserts rights in the trademark ALIEXPRESS and states that the disputed domain name is identical to the trademark.

The Complainant alleges that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant alleges that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

B. Respondent

No Response was filed with the Center.

5. Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy states that each of three findings must be made in order for a Complainant to prevail:

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

A) Identical / Confusingly Similar

Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy requires a two-fold enquiry – a threshold investigation into whether a complainant has rights in a trademark, followed by an assessment of whether the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the trademark.

Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy does not distinguish between registered and unregistered trade mark rights. It is accepted that a trade mark registered with a national authority is evidence of trade mark rights for the purposes of the Policy. The Panel finds that the Complainant has trade mark rights in ALIEXPRESS acquired through registration.

For the purposes of comparing the trademark with the disputed domain name, it has long been held that generic top-level domains, such as “.biz” in this case, can be ignored. The terms are then identical.

Panel finds the disputed domain name to be legally identical to the trademark and so finds that the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

B) Rights and Legitimate Interests

The Complainant has the burden to establish that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Nevertheless, it is well-settled that the Complainant need only make out a *prima facie* case, after which the onus shifts to the Respondent to rebut such *prima facie* case by demonstrating rights or legitimate interests.

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy states that any of the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, if found by the Panel to be proved based on its evaluation of all evidence presented, shall demonstrate rights or legitimate interests to a domain name for purposes of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy:

- “(i) before any notice to you of the dispute, your 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) you (as an individual, business, or other organization) have been commonly known by the domain name, even if you have acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or
- (iii) you are 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 publicly available WhoIs database identifies the registrant as “**Angelica Belova**” and so does not support any conclusion that the Respondent might be commonly known by the disputed domain name. There is no evidence that the Respondent has trademark rights in the disputed domain name, registered or not.

There is no evidence that the disputed domain name has ever been used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Complainant provides evidence that the disputed domain name redirects internet users to miscellaneous websites with no relevance to the Complainant and often to sites offering the domain name for sale. Such diversionary use is not use of the domain name in respect of a bona fide offering of services, nor is it legitimate non-commercial or fair use.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established a *prima facie* case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and so the onus shifts to the Respondent to show a right or legitimate interest in the name.

In the absence of a Response that *prima facie* case has not been met.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and so the Complainant has satisfied the second element of the Policy.

C) Bad Faith

Policy ¶ 4(b) sets out the circumstances which shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith. They are:

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

Panel finds that the Respondent’s actions fall squarely under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. It can be concluded on the balance of probabilities that the Respondent registered a domain name already found to be legally identical to the Complainant’s trademark with the

intention of attracting Internet users to online locations for commercial gain either in the form of pay-per-click referral fees or through sale of the domain name.

The Panel finds that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith and so finds that the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

6. Decision

Having established all three of the elements required under the Policy, the Panel decides that relief shall be **GRANTED**.



Debrett G. Lyons

Panelist

Dated: 4 May 2015