Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108306

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108306
Time of filing	2026-01-12 09:20:25
Domain names	qoderide.net

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	Alibaba Group Holding Limited

Complainant representative

Organization	Convey srl

Respondent

Organization	zhangxin inc

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 has established rights in the trademark QODER for the purpose of standing to file a UDRP complaint.

The Complainant's affiliated company CLOUD INTELLIGENCE ASSETS HOLDING (SINGAPORE) PRIVATE LIMITED is the owner of the following trademark registration:

- Hong Kong trademark registration No. 306901920 for QODER (word mark) registered on May 16, 2025, in classes 9 and 42.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is part of the Alibaba Group, a leading Chinese multinational conglomerate founded on June 28, 1999, in Hangzhou, Zhejiang (hereinafter, "Alibaba"). Alibaba operates globally across a wide range of sectors including e-commerce, retail, internet, and technology, offering consumer-to-consumer (C2C), business-to-consumer (B2C), and business-to-business (B2B) sales services through both Chinese and international marketplaces. In addition, Alibaba provides services in digital media and entertainment, logistics, and cloud computing. Alibaba Innovation Private Limited is part of Alibaba's global ecosystem, which also includes entities such as Alibaba (China) Co. Ltd., Bright Zenith Private Limited and Cloud Intelligence Assets Holding (Singapore) Private Limited.

Ranked in 2020 as the fifth-largest artificial intelligence enterprise globally, the Complainant is active in over 190 countries and through its fintech subsidiary, Ant Group, also operates as the world's second-largest financial services provider after Visa, besides also being recognized as one of the most prominent venture capital and investment firms worldwide.

Alibaba has also significantly expanded into the media, entertainment and artificial intelligence sectors, with revenues in these areas growing at a triple-digit rate year over year.

In the field of generative media, Alibaba launched QODER, an agent coding platform designed for real software development, that exemplifies Alibaba's commitment to advancing multimodal AI and democratizing access to next-generation content creation tools.

Actively promoted as a next-generation AI-powered Integrated Development Environment (IDE), the QODER service is capable of autonomously planning, writing, testing, and delivering production-ready code, featuring distinct modes —"Agent Mode" for real-time conversational pair programming and "Quest Mode" for end-to-end asynchronous task execution — along with capabilities such as deep codebase understanding, persistent memory, model auto-selection, and integration with tools via Model Context Protocol (MCP).

The Alibaba's QODER platform is promoted through the website "www.qoder.com", based on the domain name <qoder.com>, registered on August 21, 2009 – and operated by Complainant's affiliated company Bright Zenith Private Limited.

The disputed domain name <qoderide.net> was registered by the Respondent on August 22, 2025, one day after the Complainant publicly announced the launch of QODER, on August 21, 2025, and on the same day of the filing of two trademark applications for QODER in China by Alibaba (China) Co. Ltd.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website featuring the QODER mark and promoting an AI-powered coding platform featuring a next-generation intelligent programming environment under the name QODER IDE.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark QODER, as it includes the trademark in its entirety with the mere addition of the added string "ide", followed by the generic Top Level Domain ("gTLD") ".net", which are not sufficient to escape the finding that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark.

The Complainant asserts that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name because: i) the Respondent has never been authorized, licensed or otherwise permitted by the Complainant to use the QODER mark in any manner; ii) the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and has no relevant trademark or trade name rights in QODER or in a name corresponding to the disputed domain name; and iii) the disputed domain name has not been used for a bona fide offering of goods or services or for a legitimate non-commercial use, since it has been redirected to a website displaying the Complainant's trademark and promoting the Complainant's QODER services without authorization and without accurately and prominently disclose its lack of affiliation with the Complainant.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith because: i) the Respondent registered the disputed domain name on August 22, 2025, after the Complainant's trademark filings for QODER in Hong Kong and mainland China and also the day after the public release of the QODER service in the media; ii) the disputed domain name resolves to a website where the Complainant's trademarks are unduly and prominently displayed, demonstrating the Respondent was clearly aware of the Complainant's trademark QODER; iii) the Respondent created a domain name that is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks, thereby reinforcing the association with the Complainant's brand and increasing the likelihood of confusion; iv) the term "qoder" has no inherent meaning in the English language, which further supports the conclusion that the Respondent chose the disputed domain name to deliberately and intentionally evoke the Complainant's mark; v) the Respondent is using the website associated with the disputed domain name to offer information about the Complainant's service and to actively promote and distribute AI software under the name "QODER IDE" without authorization; vi) the Respondent's website is available in multiple languages, including English and additional languages spoken in jurisdictions where numerous trademarks of the Complainant are registered, which clearly indicates an intent to target international audiences and further supports the conclusion that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's brand and business; and vii) the use of the Complainant's trademarks both in the disputed domain name and within the website is deceptive, as it tends to confuse users who may reasonably, but wrongly, believe that they are navigating the official website of the Complainant.

As an additional circumstance evidencing the Respondent's bad faith, the Complainant submits that Respondent failed to reply to the Complainant's contact request for trademark infringement sent via the Registrar's online form.

RESPONDENT

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 Complainant states that it has rights on the trademark QODER and relies on one trademark registration for QODER in Hong Kong (No. 306901920), registered in the name of Cloud Intelligence Assets Holding (Singapore) Private Limited, and two trademark applications for QODER in China (Nos. 87209278 and 87209279) filed in the name of Alibaba (China) Co. Limited.

As to the trademark applications, the Panel notes that, as stated in section 1.1.4 of the WIPO Overview 3.1, "A pending trademark application would not by itself establish trademark rights within the meaning of UDRP paragraph 4(a)(i)".

With reference to the Hong Kong trademark registration cited by the Complainant, the Complainant claimed that the trademark holder Cloud Intelligence Assets Holding (Singapore) Private Limited is one of the Complainant's "affiliated companies within the Complainant's global ecosystem".

As stated in section 1.4.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.1, "A trademark owner's affiliate such as a subsidiary of a parent or of a holding company, or an exclusive trademark licensee, is considered to have rights in a trademark under the UDRP for purposes of standing to file a complaint. The same holds true for a parent company filing a UDRP case on the basis of rights held in the name of one of the companies or brands under its corporate umbrella. While panels have been prepared to infer the existence of authorization to file a UDRP case based on the facts and circumstances described in the complaint (which may be supported by information that is publicly available online such as company websites or financial statements), they may expect parties to provide an explanation of the relationship between the entities and/or relevant evidence of authorization to file a UDRP complaint, especially if the companies are not named in the complaint as co-complainants".

In the case at hand, the Complainant has not submitted evidence of authorization to file the Complaint from the trademark owner nor evidence of its actual relationship with Cloud Intelligence Assets Holding (Singapore) Private Limited. However, considering i) the Complainant is the holding company of Alibaba; ii) Cloud Intelligence Assets Holding (Singapore) Private Limited appears to belong to Alibaba, according to the information publicly available online, and iii) the Complainant has submitted copy of the trademark registration certificate issued by the Hong Kong Intellectual Property Office for the trademark No. 306901920 as opposed to a mere printout of the trademark registration details as shown on the online trademark database, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established rights over the trademark QODER, based on such trademark registration, for the purpose of standing in this proceeding.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark QODER as it reproduces the trademark in its entirety with the addition of the term "ide", which may be interpreted as an acronym of "Integrated Development Environment", followed by the gTLD ".net". As stated in prior decisions rendered under the UDRP, where relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms and of the gTLD is not sufficient to prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has demonstrated that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has established rights according to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

2. With reference to the Respondent's rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that the Complainant has made a prima facie case and that the Respondent, by not submitting a Response, has failed to provide any element from which a Respondent's right or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name could be inferred.

The Panel notes that, based on the records, the Respondent has not been authorized or licensed by the Complainant or its affiliated companies to use its trademark QODER. Moreover, there is no evidence that the Respondent might be commonly known by the disputed domain name or a name corresponding to the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website displaying the Complainant's trademark and promoting a purported AI-powered coding platform featuring a next-generation intelligent programming environment under the name QODER IDE, which is offered for download both in a free and in paid "pro" and "pro+" versions. The Panel also notes that no disclaimer of non-affiliation with the Complainant is available on the website. The Panel finds that the disputed domain name has not been used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or legitimate non-commercial or fair use without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the Complainant's trademark. Indeed, the Panel notes that content of the Respondent's website was apparently designed to reinforce the impression that it was an authorized website for downloading Alibaba's QODER encoding software.

Moreover, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is inherently misleading, as it combines the Complainant's trademark, which has no meaning in the English language, with the acronym of "Integrated Development Environment", i.e. IDE, which is descriptive of the Complainant's service. Therefore, the disputed domain name carries a high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has demonstrated that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name according to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

3. As to bad faith at the time of the registration, the Panel finds that, in light of i) the distinctiveness of the QODER mark, ii) the composition of the disputed domain name, and iii) the timing of the registration, which occurred only one day after the public release of the Alibaba QODER service in the media (on August 21, 2025) and few months after the registration of the trademark QODER in Hong Kong by the Complainant's affiliated company referenced above, the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant's QODER mark when it registered the disputed domain name on August 22, 2025.

In view of the above-described use of the disputed domain name in connection with a website reproducing the QODER mark and promoting and distributing AI software under the name QODER IDE in multiple languages, without disclaiming the lack of relationship with the Complainant, the Panel finds that the Respondent was actually aware of the QODER trademark at the time of registration and it used the disputed domain name to intentionally attempt to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of its website, according to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has also demonstrated that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith according to paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **qoderide.net**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Luca Barbero**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-02-20

Publish the Decision