Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-107869

Case number	CAC-UDRP-107869
Time of filing	2025-08-25 09:10:25
Domain names	mumuplayer.org, mumu-ai.com, mumucluod.com

Case administrator

Organization	Iveta Špiclová (Czech Arbitration Court) (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	NetEase, Inc.

Complainant representative

Organization	Stobbs IP

Respondents

Name	Abdul Jabbar
Name	chen san
Name	qadsadtersfgsdfg asfqqqqqqaaasss

OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The Panel is not aware of any other legal proceedings which are pending or decided and which relate to the disputed domain names.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant and its subsidiaries assert that they are the registered proprietors of various trademarks and other intellectual property rights, including, inter alia, the following registered trademark:

- China Registration No. 24948081 for MUMU , registered on 28 August 2019 in Class 42.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, NetEase, Inc., is a multinational internet and video game company listed on NASDAQ and HKEX. In Q2 2025, the Complainant reported revenues of RMB 27.9 billion, primarily derived from its gaming and related services, and was ranked in the Forbes Global 2000. Through its subsidiaries, the Complainant operates globally and publishes leading game titles such as Naraka Bladepoint, Identity V, Eggy Party, and Marvel Rivals, each of which has achieved substantial user engagement.

The Complainant further enjoys significant brand recognition through its “MUMU” platform and extensive social media presence, with millions of followers and users worldwide. Its “MuMu Player” emulator, widely covered in international press, enables access to more than 2.2 million Android games on PC and Mac, and benefits from partnerships with Intel, Lenovo, and Qualcomm.

The Respondent appears to be an individual based in Pakistan.

The disputed domain name <mumuplayer.org> was registered on 1 July 2025.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain name should be transferred to it.

No administratively compliant Response has been filed.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy).

The Complainant claims rights in the MUMU (MUMU Emulator) and MUMU trademark (hereinafter MUMU trademark) through its Chinese trademark registration.

Furthermore, the Complainant contends that that the MUMU trademark in relation to emulation services is fanciful and therefore highly distinctive in relation to the relevant goods and services. The term 'MUMU' has no dictionary meaning in English or Chinese in relation to emulator or software services and is therefore inherently distinctive in the relevant classes. Indeed, an internet search of “MUMU emulator” returns results exclusively from the Complainant or third parties discussing the Complainant’s MuMu Player services.

By virtue of its trademark registrations, the Complainant has proved that it has rights in the mark under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy. See Avast Software s. r. o. v Milen Radumilo, 102384, (CAC 2019-03-12).

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name <mumuplayer.org> is identical to its official website, <mumuplayer.com>, and is therefore confusingly similar to its established rights. In addition, the term “mumu player” is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s registered marks protecting “MUMU ” (MuMu Emulator), as “player” is interchangeable with “emulator” to denote software used to play or emulate Android games on non-Android systems. Alternatively, the Complainant notes that “player” is descriptive of the services offered through the disputed domain, namely an interactive media player application for emulating Android games.

Having conducted a side-by-side comparison and taking into account the look-alike content on the website resolved by the disputed domain name <mumuplayer.org>, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s MUMU trademark. The presence of additional terms does not diminish the distinctiveness of the mark. See paragraphs 1.7 and 1.15 of the WIPO Overview 3.0.

For the foregoing reasons, the Panel finds the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the Respondent to have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy). More specifically, the Complainant must first make a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and the burden of proof then shifts to the Respondent to show it does have rights or legitimate interests. See PepsiCo, Inc. v Smith power production, 102378, (CAC 2019-03-08) ("The Panel finds that the Complainant has made out a prima facie case that arises from the considerations above. All of these matters go to make out the prima facie case against the Respondent. As the Respondent has not filed a Response or attempted by any other means to rebut the prima facie case against it, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.").

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to operate infringing websites that impersonate the Complainant, including unauthorized use of the Complainant’s stylized “M” logo. The infringing websites purport to offer an Android emulator for Apple Mac systems; however, the purported Mac download is in “.exe” format, which is incompatible with Mac devices and misleading to users. By contrast, the Complainant’s official website legitimately provides both “.exe” and “.dmg” files for Windows and Mac respectively. The Complainant therefore contends that the Respondent’s conduct constitutes fraudulent misrepresentation, potentially involving malware or security risks, and demonstrates that the Respondent lacks any legitimate interest and is not engaged in a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Complainant also submits that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name does not constitute legitimate non-commercial or fair use under Paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy, as the disputed domain name is being used to impersonate and pass off as the Complainant.

Through the screenshot of the website resolved by the disputed domain name <mumuplayer.org>, the Panel observes that the website is titled "Mumu Player" and clearly impersonates the Complainant's official website. The website also prominently features the Complainant's logo.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. See Harley-Davidson Motor Company, Inc. v. Lina, 106758 (CAC, 2024-09-04) ("Past panels have agreed that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (e.g., the sale of counterfeit goods or illegal pharmaceuticals, phishing, distributing malware, unauthorized account access/hacking, impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. See paragraph 2.13 of the WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.0.").

The burden of proof has now shifted to the Respondent to demonstrate any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. However, the Respondent has failed to submit a response within the required timeframe to rebut the Complainant's assertions.

For the foregoing reasons, the Panel finds the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

BAD FAITH

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy).

The Complainant submits that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith under Paragraphs 4(a)(iii), 4(b)(iii), 4(b)(iv), and 4(b)(v) of the Policy, by intentionally creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's MUMU brand to attract Internet users for commercial gain. The Respondent deliberately targeted the Complainant's trademark, diverting potential customers to infringing website offering competing services, and thereby disrupted the Complainant's business. Given the Complainant's established reputation and recognition in the Android emulation industry, the Respondent's actual knowledge of the Complainant's rights at the time of registration is evident, further demonstrating bad faith.

After reviewing the screenshot of the website resolved by the disputed domain name <mumuplayer.org>, along with the Respondent's failure to submit a response within the required timeframe, the Panel concludes that the Respondent was likely aware of the Complainant's MUMU trademark at the time of registration. Additionally, the Panel finds that the Respondent's deliberate act of impersonating the Complainant for commercial gain constitutes bad faith. See Xiaomi Inc. v. Nguyễn Đức Đạt, 107237 (CAC, 2025-02-12) ("Additionally, the Complainant argues that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with actual knowledge of the Complainant's rights, as evidenced by its misleading use of the Complainant's XIAOMI mark in its entirety. While constructive knowledge alone is insufficient to establish bad faith under Policy paragraph 4(a)(iii), actual knowledge of a complainant's trademark rights is sufficient and may be inferred from a respondent's use of the disputed domain name to impersonate the complainant."). See also Esselunga S.p.A. v. Xuxu, 105785 (CAC, 2023-11-13) ("The Panel is persuaded that the Domain Name, comprising the Complainant's fanciful trademark and the ordinary word 'shop,' inherently impersonates the Complainant. Given the nature of the Domain Name and the size and reputation of the Complainant's business under the ESSELUNGA mark, the Panel is also persuaded that this impersonation is deliberate on the part of the Respondent.").

For the foregoing reasons, the Panel finds the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

PROCEDURAL FACTORS

The Panel is satisfied that all procedural requirements under UDRP were met and there is no other reason why it would be inappropriate to provide a decision.

PRELIMINARY FINDINGS - TERMINATION

Pursuant to Paragraph 17 of the Rules, if, before the Panel's decision, the Parties agree on a settlement, the Panel shall terminate the administrative proceeding.

On 22 September 2025, the Complainant requests that the Panel terminates the current proceedings in relation to <mumu-ai.com> and <mumucluod.com> pursuant to Rule 17(b) of the Rules. The Complainant further requests that upon termination of the proceedings in relation to the above domain names that the Panel proceeds to decision in relation to <mumuplayer.org>.

In light of the Complainant's request to terminate the proceedings concerning <mumu-ai.com> and <mumucluod.com>, the Respondent was invited to submit comments on the request on or before 24 September 2025. The Respondent failed to submit a timely comment within the required period.

On this basis, the Panel accepts the termination request concerning <mumu-ai.com> and <mumucluod.com> without reviewing the

3 elements of the Policy. The present decision is rendered solely with respect to the disputed domain name <mumuplayer.org>.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

Having established all three elements required under the UDRP Policy, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name should be transferred to the Complainant.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

AND THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME(S) IS (ARE) TO BE

1. **mumuplayer.org**: Transferred
2. **mumu-ai.com**: Terminated (consolidation not granted)
3. **mumucluod.com**: Terminated (consolidation not granted)

PANELLISTS

Name	**Mr Paddy TAM**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-09-25

Publish the Decision