Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108185

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108185
Time of filing	2025-12-03 10:05:36
Domain names	ibambulab.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	BAMBULAB LIMITED, (shen zhen tuo zhu ke ji you xian gong si)

Complainant representative

Organization	Thomsen Trampedach GmbH

Respondent

Name	Michael Nava

OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The Panel is not aware of any other legal proceedings that are pending or decided and that relate to the Disputed Domain Name.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

Complainant states (and provides documentation in support thereof) that it is the owner of the following trademark registrations, among others: EU Reg. No. 018584524 for BAMBULAB (registered February 15, 2022); U.S. Reg. No. 7,044,602 for BAMBULAB (registered May 2, 2023); and UK Reg. No. 3712903 for BAMBULAB (registered January 14, 2022). These registrations are referred to herein as the "BAMBULAB Trademark."

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Complainant states that it was "established" in 2020 and is "a consumer tech company focusing on desktop 3D printers… [p]rimarily based in Shenzhen, China, with other sites in Shanghai, China, and Austin, Texas, U.S. The Shenzhen company is registered under name of Shen Zhen Tuo Zhu Ke Ji You Xian Gong Si (Shenzhen Tuozhu Technology Co., Ltd.,) and the US company name is Bambulab USA Inc." Complainant further states that "[o]n 11 November 2022, the most authoritative and informative TIME Magazine highlighted the most impactful new products and ideas and honored the Bambu Lab X1 Series of 3D printers in the year's Best Inventions"; that "[i]n 2023 and 2024, CNET, a well-respected and trustworthy tech review provider, rated the Bambulab 3D printer as the best in various categories among other models"; and that "[i]n 2025, Both the Bambu Lab H2D 3D printer and the CyberBrick system were included in the 'Best Inventions of 2025' list by TIME Magazine."

The Disputed Domain Name was created on October 22, 2025, and, according to the Complaint (and as supported by a screenshot

included with the Complaint) "is redirected to a sales page at a price of 3439.75 USD."

Complainant states that "[o]n 20 November 2025, the representative of the Complainant sent an abuse notice email via the registrar platform to the registrant, but the registrant did not respond."

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

Complainant contends, in relevant part, as follows:

Paragraph 4(a)(i): Complainant states that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the BAMBULAB Trademark because "[t]he primary and most distinctive part of the domain name is 'bambulab', which is exactly the same as the trademark 'bambulab'"; and "[t]he additional 'i' infront [sic] does not significantly alter the visual perception of the core part of the domain name."

Paragraph 4(a)(ii): Complainant states that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name because, inter alia, "[t]he domain's registrant is Mechael Nava"; "there is not any relationship between the Respondents and the Complainant"; "the Complainant has not granted the domain registrants any authorization to use the trademark, either online or offline"; and "Complainant was unable to find sufficient evidence or justification that the Respondent met the criteria outlined in paragraph 4(c) under UDRP."

Paragraph 4(a)(iii): Complainant states that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith because, inter alia, the Disputed Domain Name was registered "much later than the Complainant's business establishment and trademark registration"; "[c]onsidering the distinguished reputation of the Bambulab brand in the world since 2022, especially among people who are interested in technology, it is difficult to assume that the registrants did not know the Complainant's business name 'Bambulab' as well as the 3D printer brand and randomly selected the domain name to register"; "[e]specially in the US, where the Respondent lives and the Time Magazine pubulishes [sic]"; "[t]he disputed domain name was registered on October 22, 2025" and "[b]y November 20, it was found redirecting to a website listing the domain for sale at a significantly inflated price"; "[t]herefore, the Complainant concludes that the Respondent's purpose in registering the domain name was not for bona fide use, but rather for illicit commercial benefit."

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 UDRP).

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 UDRP).

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 UDRP).

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

The trademark citations and documentation provided by Complainant are sufficient to establish that Complainant has rights in the BAMBULAB Trademark.

As to whether the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to these trademarks, the relevant comparison to be

made is with the second-level portion of the Disputed Domain Name only (i.e., "ibambulab") because "[t]he applicable Top Level Domain ('TLD') in a domain name (e.g., '.com', '.club', '.nyc') is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test." WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("WIPO Overview 3.0"), section 1.11.1.

Here, the Disputed Domain Name contains the BAMBULAB Trademark in its entirety, plus the letter "i". As set forth in section 1.7 of WIPO Overview 3.0: "[I]n cases where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark, or where at least a dominant feature of the relevant mark is recognizable in the domain name, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark for purposes of UDRP standing."

As to the addition of the letters "i", section 1.9 of WIPO Overview 3.0 says: "A domain name which consists of a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of a trademark is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element. This stems from the fact that the domain name contains sufficiently recognizable aspects of the relevant mark…. Examples of such typos include… the addition or interspersion of other terms or numbers."

Accordingly, the Panel finds that Complainant has proven the first element of the Policy.

Rights or Legitimate Interests: Paragraph 4(a)(ii)

Complainant states that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name because, inter alia, "[t]he domain's registrant is Mechael Nava"; "there is not any relationship between the Respondents and the Complainant"; "the Complainant has not granted the domain registrants any authorization to use the trademark, either online or offline"; and "Complainant was unable to find sufficient evidence or justification that the Respondent met the criteria outlined in paragraph 4(c) under UDRP."

WIPO Overview 3.0, section 2.1, states: "While the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the often impossible task of 'proving a negative', requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element."

The Panel finds that Complainant has established its prima facie case and, without any evidence from Respondent to the contrary, the Panel is satisfied that Complainant has satisfied the second element of the UDRP.

Registered and Used in Bad Faith: Paragraph 4(a)(iii)

Whether a domain name is registered and used in bad faith for purposes of the UDRP may be determined by evaluating four (non-exhaustive) factors set forth in paragraph 4(b) of the UDRP: (i) circumstances indicating that the registrant has registered or the registrant has 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 the registrant's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or (ii) the registrant has 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 the registrant has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or (iii) the registrant has registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or (iv) by using the domain name, the registrant has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the registrant's website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the registrant's website or location or of a product or service on the registrant's website or location.

As set forth in section 3.1.1 of WIPO Overview 3.0: "Circumstances indicating that a domain name was registered for the bad-faith purpose of selling it to a trademark owner can be highly fact-specific; the nature of the domain name (e.g., whether a typo of a famous mark…) and the distinctiveness of trademark at issue, among other factors, are relevant to this inquiry."

Further, as set forth in section 3.2.1 of WIPO Overview 3.0, "panels have applied a range of considerations in assessing bad faith," including "the nature of the domain name (e.g., a typo of a widely-known mark, or a domain name incorporating the complainant's mark plus an additional term such as a descriptive or geographic term…)" and "a clear absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with no credible explanation for the respondent's choice of the domain name."

Here, the Disputed Domain Name incorporates the entirety of the BAMBULAB Trademark, which is well-protected, apparently well-known and distinctive. And, Respondent sought to sell the Disputed Domain Name shortly after registering it.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that Complainant has proven the third element of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **ibambulab.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Douglas Isenberg**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-01-14

Publish the Decision