Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-107219

Case number	CAC-UDRP-107219
Time of filing	2025-10-21 17:26:32
Domain names	xiaomipartners.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Xiaomi, Inc.

Complainant representative

Organization	CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB

Respondent

Name	Vladislav Pavliuk

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 proved to be the owner of the following trademarks:

1. XIAOMI (US Reg. No. 4527605) registered on May 13, 2014.
2. XIAOMI (WIPO Reg. No. 1177611) registered on Nov. 28, 2012;
3. XIAOMI (WIPO Reg. No. 1313041) registered on Apr. 14, 2016;
4. MI (WIPO Reg. No. 1173649) registered on Nov. 28, 2012;
5. MI (WIPO Reg. No. 1516163) registered on Oct. 17, 2019;
6. MI (Chinese Reg. No. 8911270) registered on July 7, 2012;

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is active in the field of consumer electronics, smartphones and smart hardware.

The disputed domain name <xiaomipartners.com> was registered on April 15, 2025 by Vladislav Pavliuk. The disputed domain name redirected to a website which reproduced the Complainant's trademark.

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).

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

1. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

The Complainant has successfully proved to be the owner of the trademarks XIAOMI and MI.

The Panel finds that the trademark XIAOMI is clearly recognizable in <xiaomipartners.com> since the addition of the generic word "partners" does not exclude the similarity between the trademark and the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, the addition of a domain name extension is generally disregarded in view of its technical function.

As a consequence, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark, for the purposes of the First Element of the Policy.

2. The Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, a complainant is required to make out a prima facie case that a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Once such a prima facie case is made, the respondent carries the burden of demonstrating its rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. If the respondent fails to do so, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

In this case, the Panel finds that the Complainant’s submitted evidence and allegations are sufficient to establish a prima facie case of the Respondent’s lack of rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

According to the information provided by the Complainant and not contested by the Respondent, Vladislav Pavliuk is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor is he authorized to use the Complainant’s trademark “XIAOMI”.

The Panel agrees that the current use of the disputed domain name could mislead internet users leading to false impressions of endorsement, affiliation with the Complainant. The Panel finds particularly relevant the fact that the Respondent uses the Complainant's figurative trademark and a similar visual impression of the Complainant's official website.

3. The disputed domain name was registered and is used in bad faith.

In support of the Respondent's use and registration in bad faith the Panel considers relevant that:

(i) the disputed domain name was registered well after the Complainant acquired rights on the trademark XIAOMI;

(ii) the Complainant's trademark enjoys a certain degree of reputation and distinctiveness;

(iii) the Respondent used the Disputed Domain Name to resolve to a website which had similarities with the Complainant's official website and in which the Complainant's figurative trademarks XIAOMI are used; all these elements could create a risk of confusion/association between the Disputed Domain Name and the Complainant;

(iv) the Complainant sent a c&d letter to the Respondent to which the Respondent did not reply.

All above considered the Panel agrees that the disputed domain name was registered and used in bad faith for the purpose of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **xiaomipartners.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Andrea Mascetti**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-11-29

Publish the Decision