Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-107888

Case number	CAC-UDRP-107888
Time of filing	2025-08-20 09:28:56
Domain names	hailuo02ai.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	Shanghai Xiyu Jizhi Technology Co., Ltd.
Organization	Nanonoble PTE. LTD.

Complainant representative

Organization	Beijing Chofn Intellectual Property Co., Ltd.

Respondent

Name	Harry Potter

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 name.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant is convinced that it has established unregistered or common law trademark rights in the Hailuo Ai logo for the following reasons:

1) The Complainant states that the Hailuo AI product was made known to a large portion of the public by virtue of the Complainant's large customer base and extensive global media coverage, and that this extensive publicity resulted in a deep bond between Hailuo AI and the Complainant;

2) The Complainant states furthermore that Hailuo AI have acquired a secondary meaning in China, establishing common law trademark rights. At the same time, due to extensive global media coverage, Hailuo AI may have acquired secondary meanings and established common law trademark rights in other countries or regions outside China;

3) The Complainant argues that it's trademark Hailuo AI does not per se correspond to words commonly found in English, Latin, Chinese and other languages. Therefore, the Complainant believes that Hailuo AI itself has a high degree of distinctiveness.

In order to protect the Hailuo brand, the Complainant has also filed trademark applications in advance with the trademark offices of the countries and regions in which the Complainant has frequent business activities. To date, the Complainant holds rights to the Hailuo AI trademarks in the UK, the EU, and other regions.

In summary, the Complainant submits that it has prior rights in the Hailuo AI trademark.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Beijing Chofn Intellectual Property Co., Ltd. was entrusted by the Complainants Shanghai Xiyu Jizhi Technology Co., Ltd and the Nanonoble PTE. LTD (together "Complainant") to file a complaint against Respondent and the disputed domain name <hailuo02ai.com>.

The Complainant was established in 2021 and is a leading general artificial intelligence technology company committed to co-creating intelligence with users. Its registered capital is US$20 million and its paid-in capital is also US$20 million. Nanonoble PTE. LTD., was established in 2024 and is mainly responsible for the operations of Hailuo AI and MiniMax brands in countries outside of China.

Hailuo AI was developed by the Complainant in this case and officially launched in China in April 2024. The product is based on the Complainant's self-developed trillion-parameter MoE model abab-6.5, and has multimodal interaction capabilities, and can provide a variety of functions, including text analysis, text writing, AI music and video creation, etc. Since early May 2024, Chinese media have widely reported on Conch AI's features and usage scenarios.

The Complainant released its first AI high-definition video generation model at the end of August 2024, which users can experience for free on the Hailuo AI official website. Furthermore, prior to the registration of the disputed domain name, Hailuo AI test videos had already been posted on YouTube and received widespread attention. Thanks to its AI video creation function, its visits increased by 867.41% in September. Especially in October, when its monthly visits reached 11.73 million, a year-on-year increase of 2772.92%, this growth has made Hailuo AI rank among the top in the global growth rate list of AI products.

The Complainant is convinced that it has established unregistered or common law trademark rights in the Hailuo Ai logo and has filed trademark applications in advance with the trademark offices of the countries and regions in which the Complainant has frequent business activities. To date, the Complainant holds rights to the Hailuo AI trademarks in the UK, the EU, and other regions.

The Complainant states that the Hailuo AI is an innovative product developed by the Complainant in this case based on artificial intelligence technology, and it performs particularly well in the field of AI video generation. Hailuo AI relies on the Complainant's independently developed trillion-parameter MoE large language model abab6.5, and combines deep learning, generative adversarial networks (GANs) and multimodal AI technologies. Its core functions include:

1) AI video generation: users only need to provide simple text prompts to generate high-quality video content. Conch AI can seamlessly generate complex dynamic videos and support special effects generation and scene transitions.

2) Multimodal interaction: supports multiple interaction methods such as text, voice and image. Users can interact with AI through voice calls, text input or image recognition.

3) Intelligent writing and recognition: provides intelligent writing, image recognition and information search functions, allowing users to quickly obtain the required content.

4) AI agent: users can create and experience AI agents for more personalized interactions.

Since MiniMax launched its video generation model at the end of August 2024, the popularity of Hailuo AI has been rising, especially on social platforms, where users have been actively sharing their experience and believe that Hailuo AI is becoming one of the best AI video generation tools on the market. In actual use cases, AI creators, film and television directors, and screenwriters from more than 180 countries around the world have actively adopted Hailuo AI for video creation, fully verifying the universality and trustworthiness of its model capabilities. It can be seen that the Complainant has a huge number of user groups in many countries and regions around the world, and continues to receive widespread attention.

When the Complainant searches for Hailuo AI on social media platforms and search engines, it can be seen that all the results point to the Complainant, and this search result shows that the Complainant has a large number of followers on TIKTOK, X.com. This shows in the view of the Complainant that Hailuo AI has a unique corresponding relationship with the Complainant.

The Complainant argues that in comparing the domain name at issue in this case with the Complainant's mark, the comparison in question should only be between the second level portion of the domain names (i.e., the primary identifying portion referred to below) and the Complainant's trademark, and that the applicable top-level domains in the domain name are considered to be standard requirements for registration, and therefore are not to be considered under the first element of the confusing similarity test.

The disputed domain name, after the removal of the top-level domain, the remaining part is hailuo02ai respectively. The Complainant believes that the combination of hailuo, the Arabic numerals "02" and ai does not form a new secondary meaning here, and that the combination corresponds to the Hailuo 02 video generation model released by the Complainant on June 18, 2025. Coincidentally, the disputed domain name was also registered on the date the Hailuo 02 model was released. The Complainant believes that the disputed domain name directly points to its main business, further exacerbating confusion. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the trademark and the domain name to determine whether the domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark. The test involves a side-by-side

comparison of the domain name and the textual components of the relevant trademark to assess whether the mark is recognizable within the domain name. Obviously, the disputed domain name completely contains the Complainant's Hailuo AI and hailuo trademarks.

Where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not in the view of the Complainant prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element.

The Complainant also found that the content of the website pointed to by the disputed domain name is highly relevant to the Complainant's business, which indicates that the respondent deliberately used the disputed domain name to find the complainant's customers. Obviously, in the case that the Hailuo AI trademark has established a unique correspondence with the Complainant, and based on the above overall facts, the Complainant believes that the disputed domain name is likely to cause confusion among consumers.

As previously stated, the Complainant already owns the prior trademark rights to Hailuo AI and hailuo. The factual situation is that the Respondent is not in the identity of the Complainant’s distributor or partner. The Complainant has never directly or indirectly authorized the Respondent to use the trademarks "Hailuo AI and hailuo" trademarks or their corresponding domain names in any form.

The disputed domain name effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the owner of the trademark and does not constitute fair use. It is clear that Respondent created a similar website immediately after Complainant's release of the Hailuo AI product with the intent to disrupt Complainant's business and to intentionally mislead consumers for commercial gain.

The Complainant searched various national and regional trademark databases in the name of the Respondent and did not find that the Respondent had trademark rights in the name of Hailuo AI or hailuo. The name of the Respondent is Harry Potter. Obviously, it is impossible for him to enjoy the name rights for Hailuo AI and hailuo.

In summary, the Respondent does not have in the view of the Complainant any rights or legitimate interest in the domain name.

As mentioned above, the Complainant believes that it has prior trademark rights in Hailuo AI and hailuo. In addition, Hailuo AI and hailuo have been widely reported in the global media before the disputed domain name was registered, and based on the Complainant's large user base, Hailuo AI and hailuo have attracted the attention of many users. Considering the very high communication power of the Internet, the Complainant believes that the position of the Respondent does not affect the Panel's conclusion that the Respondent knew of the existence of the Complainant's Hailuo AI and hailuo trademarks before registering the domain name.

The Complainant believes that the Hailuo AI and hailuo trademarks itself has a high degree of distinctiveness due to its extensive use. The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the words to which the Complainant has rights, which excludes the possibility that the respondent accidentally selected a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to the words to which it has rights. As mentioned above, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name during a period when the Complainant hailuo AI and hailuo were rapidly gaining popularity outside of China, and created a website with content similar to the Complainant’s official website. If the Respondent did not know of the existence of the Hailuo AI and hailuo brands, it could not have operated a website with the same content as the Complainant's official website, and therefore, the Complainant believed that the Respondent did not avoid the Complainant’s trademark when he knew or should have known the Complainant’s trademark, and the act of choosing to apply for a domain name was malicious.

The Complainant draws the Panel's attention to the fact that the content of the website created by the disputed domain name uses the Complainant's Hailuo AI and hailuo logos, product videos, product images, and the webpage pointed to by the disputed domain name contains many advertising pages. The Complainant submits that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to deliberately imitate the Complainant's Hailuo AI and hailuo brands for profit is consistent with Policy 4B(iv): by using the domain name, you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your web site 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 web site or location or of a product or service on your web site or location. And in conjunction with the bad faith use described above, the Complainant finds it is possible to in turn that the Respondent acted in bad faith at the time of registration of the domain name.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

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).

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).

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).

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.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established rights in the Hailuo AI mark through both registered trademark rights and substantial common law rights acquired through extensive use, publicity, and consumer recognition. Consistent with WIPO Overview 3.0 section 1.3, common law or unregistered trademark rights are sufficient for standing under the first element where the Complainant demonstrates that the mark has become a distinctive identifier associated with its goods and services.

The Complainant has also filed trademark applications in advance with the trademark offices of the countries and regions in which the Complainant has frequent business activities. To date, the Complainant holds rights to the Hailuo AI trademarks in the UK, the EU, and other regions.

The disputed domain name contains the Complainant's mark "hailuo" in its entirety. The additional characters "02ai" do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. As stated in WIPO Overvie 3.0. section 1.8, where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms—whether descriptive, geographical, or otherwise—does not avoid a finding of confusing similarity under the first element.

The Panel also notes that the timing of registration coincides precisely with the release date of the Complainant's "Hailuo 02" model, which further supports the conclusion that the disputed domain name was chosen with reference to the Complainant's trademark and products.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant has made a prima facie showing that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant has never authorized the Respondent to use the Hailuo AI trademark or to register any domain name incorporating that mark.

There is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the name "hailuo" or "hailuo02ai". There is no evidence of a bona fide offering of goods or services prior to notice of the dispute. Instead, the evidence shows that the disputed domain name resolves to a website copying the Complainant's branding, product images, and videos, suggesting an intent to mislead Internet users.

The Panel finds that impersonation of a complainant's website is not considered legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Rather, such conduct supports a finding of lack of rights or legitimate interests.

Given the unrebutted evidence on record, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel finds that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith within the meaning of Policy 4(b).

First, the Panel considers it unlikely that the Respondent registered the domain name by coincidence. The record shows that the Complainant's Hailuo AI brand had been widely publicized prior to registration of the disputed domain name, and that its products had achieved significant market recognition. The timing of the registration—on the very day the Complainant released the "Hailuo

02” model—strongly indicates that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its rights when registering the disputed domain name.

Second, the website associated with the disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant’s logos, videos, and product descriptions, and contains advertising links, thereby attempting to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement. Such conduct falls squarely within Policy 4 (b) (iv), which provides that evidence of bad faith includes using a domain name intentionally to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to a website by creating such confusion.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **hailuo02ai.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Jan Schnedler**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-09-27

Publish the Decision