Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108501

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108501
Time of filing	2026-03-23 09:45:11
Domain names	hailuo2.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	Shanghai Xiyu Jizhi Technology Co., Ltd.
Organization	Nanonoble PTE. LTD.

Complainant representative

Organization	Chofn Intellectual Property

Respondent

Organization	NY

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

Complaint was filed by two complainants (in the following only „Complainant“ if not otherwise specified), one of them was established in 2021 and is a leading artificial intelligence technology company engaged in the development of general AI technologies and related applications. The other one, Complainant 2, was established in 2024 and is primarily responsible for the operation and international commercialization of the HAILUO AI and MINIMAX brands outside China and is the proprietor of the following trademarks.

The Complainant 2 owns several trademarks for "HAILUO" in several countries among them the European Union trademark HAILUO n° 019097061 in classes 9, 35, 38, 41, 42, 45 registered since March 22, 2025, and in effect.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The complainant has independently developed the product HAILUO AI and officially launched it in China in April 2024. The product is based on the Complainant’s proprietary model and offers multimodal artificial intelligence capabilities, including text analysis, content generation, AI music creation, and AI video generation.

Since early May 2024, HAILUO AI has been widely reported by Chinese media. In August 2024, the Complainant released its first AI high-definition video generation model, which became available for free use on the official HAILUO AI website. Prior to the registration of the disputed domain name, HAILUO AI test videos had also already been published on YouTube and attracted substantial online attention.

The Complainant further submits that HAILUO AI quickly achieved significant market recognition. Public reports indicate that the product's visits increased by 867.41% in September 2024, and that monthly visits reached 11.73 million in October 2024, representing year-on-year growth of 2772.92%. In June 2025, Complainant launched its video generation model named HAILUO 02.

The website under the disputed domain name resolves to a website that references a HAILUO 2 AI Video Generator.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 18, 2025.

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, inter alia, contends, that the disputed domain name <hailuo2.com> incorporates the Complainant's HAILUO mark in its entirety. The addition of the numeral "2" to the trademark does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant has never licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the HAILUO or HAILUO AI marks, or any domain name corresponding to those marks. The Respondent is not, and has never been, an authorized dealer, distributor, reseller, or partner of the Complainant.

Prior to this targeted registration, the Complainant's HAILUO AI and HAILUO marks had already achieved substantial global media coverage and established a massive user base. Given that the Respondent's exact incorporation of the "HAILUO" mark coupled with the specific version number demonstrates bad faith at the time of registration.

Furthermore, the Respondent's current use of the disputed domain name establishes bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy since the disputed domain name resolves to a website that meticulously clones the Complainant's official site, prominently featuring the Complainant's registered HAILUO logos, proprietary product videos, and official imagery.

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

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

In order to succeed in its claim, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements enumerated in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied:

(i) The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and

(ii) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name; and

(iii) The disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has established the fact that it has valid trademark rights for „HAILUO" for several countries.

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the distinctive HAILUO marks of the Complainant since the addition of a number „2" at the end does not prevent a finding of a sufficient confusing similarity.

The Panel therefore considers the domain name to be confusingly similar to the trademark „HAILUO", in which the Complainant has rights in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Respondent has no rights in the disputed domain name since the Respondent was not authorised by the Complainant to use its trademarks. Furthermore, the Respondent has no legitimate interest in the domain name since there is no indication that the Respondent is commonly known by the name "HAILUO2" nor that the Respondent is using the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of related goods or services.

The Panel therefore finds that the respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the domain name.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The success of the Complainant, its worldwide business activities and the almost identical name for the video AI product are sufficient indications for this Panel that the trademark HAILUO was known to the Respondent at the time of registration of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant has not authorised the Respondent to make use of a designation, such as the website under the disputed domain name referring to Hailuo 02 AI Video on the first page, which is highly similar to its marks. This Panel does not see any conceivable legitimate use of that kind that could be made by the Respondent of this particular disputed domain name without the Complainant's authorization.

The circumstances of this case indicate that the Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain name primarily with the intention of attempting to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its potential website or other online locations, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of such website or location, or of a product or service on such website or location. The Panel therefore considers the disputed domain name to have been registered and used in bad faith in accordance with 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. **hailuo2.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Dietrich Beier**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-04-27