Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108456

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108456
Time of filing	2026-03-04 09:48:45
Domain names	z-image.ai

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Alibaba Innovation Private Limited

Complainant representative

Organization	Convey srl

Respondent

Name	andy wang

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 is the owner of several trademark applications for “Z-IMAGE” filed in multiple jurisdictions, including:

European Union, serial No. 019293045 – Z-IMAGE – NCL. 9, 42, application filed on December 17, 2025;

United Kingdom, serial No. UK00004311892 – Z-IMAGE – NCL. 9, 42, application filed on December 17, 2025;

United States of America, serial No. 99556586 – Z-IMAGE – NCL. 9, 42, application filed on December 18, 2025;

Singapore, serial No. 40202532613Y – Z-IMAGE – NCL. 9, 42, application filed on December 18, 2025 .

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a leading Chinese multinational conglomerate founded on June 28, 1999, in Hangzhou, Zhejiang. The Alibaba Group operates globally across a wide range of sectors including e-commerce, retail, Internet, and technology. It offers consumer-to-consumer (C2C), business-to-consumer (B2C), and business-to-business (B2B) sales services through both Chinese and

international marketplaces. In addition, the Group provides services in digital media and entertainment, logistics, and cloud computing. In 2020, the company was ranked as the fifth-largest artificial intelligence enterprise globally.

As part of its AI strategy, the Complainant developed Z-Image, an open-source image generation framework designed to deliver high-quality, photorealistic visuals with efficient inference performance. Conceived within Alibaba's Tongyi-MAI research environment, Z-Image prioritizes lightweight architecture, multilingual text rendering, and robust prompt adherence. The evolution of the Z-Image ecosystem includes several specialized variants, including Z-Image-Turbo, a distilled version of the original 6-billion-parameter model optimized for sub-second image generation while maintaining strong photorealism and bilingual text rendering, as well as Z-Image-Omni-Base and Z-Image-Edit.

The disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent on November 27, 2025 – one day after the Complainant's public launch of the Z-Image project on GitHub. The domain name currently resolves to the website https://z-image.ai/, which prominently features and promotes the Complainant's Z-IMAGE-branded AI image-generation models and offers tiered pricing plans for access to services based on the Complainant's technology, without any authorization from the Complainant.

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

As the Respondent did not file an administratively compliant Response, pursuant to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Rules"), the Panel may draw such conclusions therefrom as it considers appropriate. The Panel accepts the contentions of the Complainant as admitted by the Respondent.

Taking the statements and documents submitted by the Complainant under careful consideration, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has established all the elements entitling it to claim the transfer of the disputed domain name.

I. Identical or Confusingly Similar disputed domain name

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name to be confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy”).

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown that it has rights in “Z-IMAGE” by virtue of its trademark applications filed in multiple jurisdictions, covering Nice Classes 9 and 42, as well as through extensive and documented prior use of the designation in connection with its AI image-generation technology.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's Z-IMAGE mark in its entirety, including the hyphen, which forms part of the mark itself. The second-level portion of the disputed domain name, “z-image”, is identical to the Complainant’s trademark.

Where a domain name incorporates a trademark in its entirety, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark (WIPO Case No. D2020-2410 – Bentley Motors Limited v. Domain Admin / Kyle Rocheleau, Privacy Hero Inc. among others). The “.ai” top-level domain is a generic top-level domain commonly associated with artificial intelligence. Panels have consistently held that TLDs are typically disregarded when assessing identity or confusing similarity under the first element of the Policy (see WIPO Case No. D2005-0540, RX America, LLC v. Matthew Smith; WIPO Case No. D2006-0582, Sanofi-Aventis v. US Online Pharmacies). In this case, the “.ai” TLD even reinforces the confusing similarity, as the Complainant’s Z-IMAGE models operate precisely in the field of artificial intelligence.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's Z-IMAGE trademark within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

II. The Respondent’s Rights or Legitimate Interests in the disputed domain name

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

While the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings lies with the Complainant, the burden of proof shifts to the Respondent where the Complainant establishes a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. If the Respondent fails to provide evidence for its rights or legitimate interests, the Complainant is deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy (WIPO Case No. D2004-0110 – Belupo d.d. v. WACHEM d.o.o.; WIPO case no. D2003-0455 – Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd.).

The Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, since the Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant nor has the Complainant granted any permission or consent to use its trademarks in a domain name. Further, the disputed domain name does not correspond to the name of the Respondent, nor is the Respondent commonly known as “Z-IMAGE”. The publicly available Whois records do not disclose any identifying information suggesting otherwise.

The disputed domain name is also not being used for a “bona fide” offering of goods or services. Although the Complainant has made its Z-IMAGE image generation models available as free and open-source tools, it has not licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to register domain names incorporating the Complainant’s trademarks or to offer commercial access to the Complainant’s technology through tiered pricing plans. The Respondent’s website prominently displays the Complainant’s trademarks to mislead internet users into believing that the website is operated, endorsed, or authorized by the Complainant. While the website contains a form of disclaimer, such wording is insufficient to mitigate the confusion created by the Respondent’s adoption of the Complainant’s Z-IMAGE designation (see WIPO Overview 3.0, section 3.7).

Summarised, the Complainant has established the necessary prima facie proof that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests. In particular, the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to promote and offer unauthorized commercial access to the Complainant’s Z-IMAGE AI models. Therefore, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

II. The disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in Bad Faith

The Respondent has also registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith within the meaning of para. 4(a)(iii) of the Policy by intentionally attempting to attract internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark for commercial gain.

The Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in bad faith within the meaning of para. 4 (a)(iii).

The Complainant publicly launched the Z-Image project on its official GitHub repository on November 26, 2025. The disputed domain name was registered the very next day, on November 27, 2025. Given this timing, it is implausible that the Respondent would have registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant and its Z-IMAGE designation. Furthermore, the disputed domain name resolves to a website that prominently features and promotes the Complainant’s Z-IMAGE AI models, confirming that the Respondent was unquestionably aware of the Complainant’s rights.

Therefore, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in bad faith within the meaning of para. 4 (a)(iii) of the Policy.

The Respondent is using the disputed domain name in bad faith within the meaning of para. 4 (a)(iii).

The disputed domain name resolves to a website at https://z-image.ai/ which presents itself as an official platform for the Complainant’s Z-IMAGE AI models. The website offers tiered pricing plans for access to the Complainant’s technology without any authorization. The website is available in English and several additional languages, demonstrating an intent to target a broad international audience. Thus, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website. Moreover, the Respondent’s registrant disclosure revealed internally inconsistent and objectively unreliable contact details, combining a purported U.S. location with a postal code traceable to Hangzhou, China, further supporting the finding of bad faith.

The Respondent failed to reply to the Complainant’s attempts to reach it regarding the infringement, which further demonstrates a lack of willingness to engage or address the trademark concerns raised by the Complainant. This constitutes an additional indication of bad faith.

The Panel concludes that the holding and use of the domain name constitute a case of bad faith under para. 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. **z-image.ai**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Dominik Eickemeier**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-04-20

Publish the Decision