

## Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108421

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108421
Time of filing	2026-02-20 08:09:39
Domain names	wherewindsmeetcheat.com

### Case administrator

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

### Complainant

Organization	NetEase, Inc.
--------------	---------------

### Complainant representative

Organization	Stobbs IP
--------------	-----------

### Respondent

Name	Mihai Claudiu
------	---------------

#### 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 claims that daughter companies own several trademarks for „Where winds meet“ in several countries, among them, for example, the European trademark registration 019014945 of NETEASE INTERACTIVE ENTERTAINMENT PTE. LTD.in classes 9 and 41 registered since July 31, 2024 and the Chinese registration 67279193-16 of Netease (hangzhou) Network Co., Ltd.registered on June 28, 2023 in class 16, being in effect.

#### FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a global internet and video games company listed on NASDAQ. In the 2nd quarter of 2025, NetEase reported RMB 27.9 billion (US\$3.9 billion) in net revenues, including RMB 22.8 billion (US\$3.2 billion) from games and related value-added services. The Complainant is claimed to be the parent company of subsidiaries including without limitation: Netease Information Technology (Beijing) Co Ltd; Guangzhou NetEase Information Technology Limited; and Netease Hangzhou Network Co Ltd which are the registered proprietors of various trade marks and other intellectual property rights, including the registered trade marks.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 28, 2025.

The disputed domain name resolves to a page offering information on so called cheats and hacks for the game Where Winds Meet.

---

#### PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant contends that the complaint has been filed on behalf of the Complainant itself and the Subsidiaries, in order to defend its rights in its registered trade marks and its valuable goodwill and reputation in its Where Winds Meet brand.

The Complainant is well-known internationally for their successful games, including: Where Winds Meet.

No administratively compliant Response has been filed.

---

#### RIGHTS

The Complainant has not shown that he has rights in the trademarks or has the authority to conduct these proceedings for the trademark owners. The panel must accordingly not further decide on the confusing similarity of the disputed domain names rights or legitimate interests or an application and use in bad faith.

---

#### NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

Since the Complainant has not shown that he has rights in the trademarks respectively has the authority to conduct these proceedings for the trademark owners. The panel must accordingly not further decide on the confusing similarity of the disputed domain names rights or legitimate interests or an application and use in bad faith.

---

#### BAD FAITH

Since the Complainant has not shown that he has rights in the trademarks respectively has the authority to conduct these proceedings for the trademark owners. The panel must accordingly not further decide on the confusing similarity of the disputed domain names rights or legitimate interests or an application and use in bad faith.

---

#### 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

In view of the fact that the Complainant is not the proprietor of the trademarks and no authorization of the trademark owners and no further clear and neutral evidence on the relations between the Complainant and the trademark proprietors were available in the file, the Panel asked for further information on the relation between them. In particular, one Annex initially submitted to prove such relation (parent company and its subsidiaries) did refer to subsidiaries of a company [NETEASE.COM](https://www.netease.com), INC and not to the Complainant with its current name.

The Complainant then submitted a Form 20-F submitted by legal advisors of the Complainant to the United States Securities and exchange commission (275 pages) to explain the relations between the companies. In this document, one exact name match of one daughter company being a trademark proprietor can be found, i.e. for Netease (hangzhou) Network Co., Ltd., but not for NETEASE INTERACTIVE ENTERTAINMENT PTE. LTD, where the element „PTE.“ was not present.

Furthermore, this document is prepared by the (legal advisors of the) Complainant itself and has therefore another character and weight as evidence to prove the standing of the Complainant to conduct the present proceedings, as it would be an authorisation of the trademark owners or another agreement allowing the Complainant to act on behalf of the trademark owners in this respect.

The panel accordingly finds that the Complainant has not demonstrated with the necessary clarity that he is authorized to conduct these proceedings on the basis of the identified trademarks owned by different companies.

For the foregoing reasons, the complaint is rejected.

This decision is not a decision on the merits of the disputed domain names being - or not - identical or confusingly similar to the claimed trademarks or whether the Respondent have rights or legitimate interests and whether he registered and used the disputed domain names in bad faith, but only about the non sufficient evidence of the standing of the Complainant for filing the complaint on the basis of trademarks of two other companies, presented here. The Complainant may file the complaint again at any time, with, for example, an authorization of the trademark owners to conduct these proceedings.

---

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

**Rejected**

---

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

1. **wherewindsmeetcheat.com**: Remaining with the Respondent

---

## **PANELLISTS**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Dietrich Beier</b>
-------------	-----------------------

---

DATE OF PANEL DECISION **2026-04-13**

**Publish the Decision**

---