Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108065

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108065
Time of filing	2025-10-22 10:10:59
Domain names	wan21ai.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Alibaba Innovation Private Limited

Complainant representative

Organization	Convey srl

Respondent

Name	huan chen

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 owns numerous trademark registrations for WAN, WANX and TONGI WANX including:

- Hong Kong trademark registration number 306741441 for WANX, registered on 29 November 2024 in classes 9 and 42;
- United Kingdom trademark registration number UK00004164944 for WAN, filed 25 February 2025 and registered on 25 July 2025 in classes 9 and 42;
- United Kingdom trademark registration number UK00004131080 for WANX, filed 29 November 2024 and registered on 28 February 2025 in classes 9 and 42;
- United Kingdom trademark registration number UK00004050861 for TONGI WANX, registered on 13 May 2024 in class 9;
- EU trademark registration number 019113519 for WANX, registered 2 August 2025 in classes 9 and 42;
- Singapore trademark registration number 40202428255V for WANX, filed on 2 December 2024 and registered on 15 May 2025 in classes 9,and 42; and
- China trademark registration number 75902724 for TONGI WANX, registered on 21 June 2024 in class 38.

The Complainant is the registrant of the domain names <wanxai.com> registered on 4 November 2023, and <wan.art> and <wan.video> registered on 24 February 2025.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is part of the Alibaba group, a leading Chinese multinational conglomerate founded in 1999. The group operates globally across a wide range of sectors including e-commerce, retail, Internet, and technology. It also provides services in digital media and entertainment, logistics, and cloud computing.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations worldwide for the terms WAN, WANX, TONGIWANX and TONGIWANXIANG. The Complainant uses the terms WAN, WANX 2.1 and TONGIWANX to refer to its open-source video generation framework. WAN 2.1 is anopen source AI model for generating videos.

The Complainant registered the domain name <wanxai.com> on 4 November 2023 and the domain names <wan.art> and <wan.video> on 24 February 2025. These resolve to the Complainant's official website at https://wan.video/.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on 25 February 2025 using a privacy service. The text on the website to which the disputed domain resolves refers to "Wanx Video Model 2.1" and "Wan 2.1: Leading AI Video Generation Model (Wanx 2.1)".

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's registered trademarks. It asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant states that its AI model, "Tongyi Wanxiang" served as the foundation for the brand's evolution from "Tongyi Wanxiang" to "Tongyi WANX", then to the abbreviated "WANX" and subsequently rebranded as "WAN" in February 2025.

The Complainant says it registered the domain name <wanxai.com> in 2023 and subsequently registered the domain names <wan.art> and <wan.video> on 24 February 2025. These resolve to its official website and platform https://wan.video/. The Complainant asserts that the name WAN has become commonly associated with its product and brand in the context of AI-based video generation.

The Complainant states that the website to which the disputed domain name resolves, promotes "WAN 2.1" and the "Leading AI Video Generation Model (Wanx 2.1)". The Complainant states that using the Complainant's trademarks, WAN and WANX, on the website and offering the Complainant's WAN and WANX products is likely to mislead consumers and cause confusion by falsely implying a connection with the Complainant.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent's clear intent appears to be to impersonate the Complainant by falsely presenting itself as the Complainant's partner or affiliate, thereby deceiving unsuspecting internet users searching for the Complainant's products and services online.

The Complainant notified the Respondent of the infringement of its trademark right via an online contact form on the website that uses the disputed domain name. It asked the Respondent to immediately cease the infringement and to transfer the disputed domain name, but received no reply.

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).

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

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove each of the following:

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

IDENTICAL OR CONFUSINGLY SIMILAR

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for the terms WAN and WANX that satisfy the threshold requirement of having trademark rights for the purposes of standing to file a UDRP case (see paragraph 1.2 of the WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.0).

The disputed domain name is made up of the term “wan”, the numbers “21”, the letters “ai” and the top-level domain “.com”. The Complainant’s WAN mark is clearly identifiable in the disputed domain name. The addition of the numbers “21” and the letters “ai” do not avoid a finding that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademarks. The top-level domain, “.com” is a registration requirement and can be ignored when assessing confusing similarity.

The letters “ai” is the commonly used acronym for artificial intelligence, which is a core part of the Complainant’s business. The Complainant’s product, WANX 2.1 and WAN 2.1, refer to versions of the Complainant’s AI video generation model. Both WANX 2.1 and WAN are referenced on the website linked to the disputed domain name. Combining the term “wan”, the letters “ai” and the numbers “21” to form the disputed domain name serves to strengthen the association with the Complaint and its mark.

The Panel concludes that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademarks and that the Complainant has satisfied the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainant asserts that the mere registration of a domain name does not confer rights or legitimate interests upon the registrant (WIPO Case No. D2000-0134, Pharmacia & Upjohn Company v. Moreonline).

The Complainant states that the Respondent is not an authorised distributor of the Complainant, nor permitted to use the Complainant’s trademarks in the disputed domain name, or otherwise. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, or by any name corresponding to it and has submitted evidence of Whois records that indicate that the Respondent is not commonly known as the disputed domain name.

The Complainant states that although it has made its WAN 2.1 AI video generation model available as a free and open-source tool, it has not licensed or authorised the Respondent to register the disputed domain name incorporating its trademark. It says that the Respondent is not making a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor is it engaged in any legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant has made out a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name. The burden of proof now shifts to the Respondent to show that he has relevant rights.

The Respondent may demonstrate relevant rights if:

(i) before any notice of the dispute, the Respondent has used, or made demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name or a name corresponding to it in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or

(ii) it has been commonly known by the disputed domain name; or

(iii) is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

The Respondent has not filed a Response, nor challenged any of the Complainant’s assertions. There is no evidence to indicate that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not authorised to use the Complainant’s trademark or carry out any business for the Complainant. The Respondent is using the disputed domain name for a website that offers the Complainant’s WAN 2.1 AI video generation product. This is not a bona fide offering of goods or services by the

Respondent, nor a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The Panel concludes that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name and that the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy have been met.

REGISTERED AND USED IN BAD FAITH

Bad faith under the UDRP occurs when the Respondent takes unfair advantage of the Complainant's mark. Generally, where a respondent registers a domain name before a complainant's trademark rights accrue, panels will not find a respondent to have registered the disputed domain name in bad faith (WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.0 at paragraph 3.8.1). An exception to this general proposition is where the respondent registered the disputed domain name to unfairly capitalise on the complainant's nascent trademark rights (WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.0 at paragraph 3.8.2).

In the present case, the Complainant's rights in the WANX mark predate the registration of the disputed domain name. Regarding the WAN mark, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name the day the Complainant filed its WAN trademark application but before its subsequent registration, and a day after the Complainant registered its "wan" domain names, <wan.art> and <wan.video>.

In determining whether the disputed domain name was both registered and used in bad faith, the Panel has considered the following factors:

- the Respondent used a privacy service to create the disputed domain name;
- the disputed domain name combines the term "WAN", the numbers "21" and the term "AI", which combination directly references the Complainant's WAN 2.1 video generation AI model, and increases the likelihood of association and confusion with the Complainant's brand;
- the disputed domain name resolves to a website that displays the Complainant's WAN and WANX trademarks and refers to and offers information about the Complainant's products "WAN 2.1" and "WANX 2.1";
- the Respondent registered the disputed domain name the same day that the Complainant filed its trademark application for the WAN mark, and one day after the Complainant registered the domain names <wan.art> and <wan.video> on 24 February 2025;
- the website linked to the disputed domain name is available in languages spoken in jurisdictions where the Complainant's trademarks are registered;
- there is no disclaimer on the linked website indicating that the Respondent is unaffiliated with the Complainant and as a result, internet users are likely to be misled into believing that the website is somehow affiliated with or endorsed by the Complainant; and
- the Respondent failed to respond to the Complainant's communication notifying the Respondent of the infringement of the Complainant's trademark rights.

The factors outlined above lead the Panel to conclude that the Respondent knew of the Complainant's use or intended use of the WAN name when he registered the disputed domain name. Given that the Respondent's website refers to the Complainant's product, WANX 2.1, the Respondent also knew of the Complainant's mark WANX.

The Respondent has not filed a Response or provided any evidence of any good faith use of the disputed domain name, nor any explanation for offering the Complainant's "WAN 2.1" product, or for referencing the Complainant's "Leading AI Video Generation Model (Wanx 2.1)" on the website to which the disputed domain name resolves.

The Panel can envisage no possible good faith reason for the Respondent to have selected the disputed domain name. The Panel finds that on the balance of probabilities, the Respondent knew of the Complainant's mark and business when he registered the disputed domain name and intended, in bad faith, to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark to attract Internet users to the Respondent's website for commercial gain.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith and that the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy have been met.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **wan21ai.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Veronica Bailey**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-11-26