Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108602

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108602
Time of filing	2026-04-27 09:14:29
Domain names	copaw.bot

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	Alibaba Innovation Private Limited

Complainant representative

Organization	Convey srl

Respondent

Organization	weidian

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

In these proceedings, the Complainant mainly relies on the following trademarks, registered on its name or of affiliated entities under the same group of companies:

- COPAW – Hong Kong TM No. 307196347 –Nice Classes 9, 42 – filed on 20 February 2026;

- COPAW – European Union TM Application No. 019324669 – Nice Classes 9, 42 – filed on 3 March 2026;

- COPAW – Singapore TM Application No. 40202605545V – Nice Classes 9, 42 – filed on 3 March 2026;

- COPAW – United States TM Application No. 99685536 – Nice Classes 9, 42 – filed on 5 March 2026;

- COPAW – China TM Application No. 90346964 – Nice Class 42 – filed on 2 March 2026;

- COPAW – China TM Application No. 90346963 – Nice Class 9 – filed on 2 March 2026.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a company incorporated in Singapore and forming part of the Alibaba Group, a multinational technology and e-commerce group founded back in 1999, in Hangzhou, Zhejiang, China, where the Respondent is apparently located. Ever since, the Complainant's group has become one of the world's largest online marketplaces and is very active in the technology sector, with presence in more than 190 countries around the world. According to evidence provided by the Complainant and not refuted by the Respondent, it seems that, as part of its artificial intelligence and agent-oriented development activities, the Complainant has developed and promoted an AI agent platform originally released under the name CoPaw, which now operates rebranded, under the name QwenPaw.

The Complainant owns a large-sized portfolio of trademarks including the wording "CoPaw", among which a Hong Kong registration, filed just about a week before the registration of the disputed domain name. It also owns and/or controls and/or operates a related domain name <qwenpaw.agentscope.io> since June 21, 2024.

The disputed domain name <copaw.bot> was registered on February 28, 2026 by the Respondent, as confirmed by the Registrar.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its CoPaw trademark, as it wholly incorporates that trademark. This last element is sufficient to support the finding that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. As to the gTLD ".bot", the Complainant suggests that it should be disregarded, as per the usual practice.

The Complainant maintains that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because the Respondent is not known by the disputed domain name, the Complainant is not affiliated with nor has it ever authorised the Respondent to register its trademark as a domain name and the Complainant has no business with the Respondent.

According to the Complainant, given the distinctiveness and quick-acquired reputation of the CoPaw trademark, the platform having been released only a few days earlier, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademark in an intentionally designed way with the aim to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks, and this is evidence of the fact that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

With respect to use in bad faith, the Complainant points out that the Respondent has used the domain name in the same field, having operated a similar and overlapping platform, which is to be considered as a clear indication of bad faith. It is, indeed, impossible to conceive any actual or contemplated use that would not be illegitimate. Further, the Respondent has allegedly shown a pattern of bad faith conduct with regard to domain name registrations.

For all these reasons, the Complainant concludes that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

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).

The disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's whole trademark (CoPaw), incorporated as such in the disputed domain name, without any changes.

As far as the gTLD ".bot" is concerned, it is generally recognized that top level domains do not have any bearing in the assessment of identity or confusing similarity, according to paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

Hence, the Panel is satisfied that the first requirement under the Policy is met.

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).

Since proving a negative fact is almost impossible, panelists in UDRP proceedings have generally agreed that it is sufficient for the complainant to establish a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name to

shift the burden of proof to the respondent.

In the case at issue, the Complainant argued that it had never authorised the Respondent to register the CoPaw trademark in a domain name, and that it had never licensed its trademark to the Respondent.

Furthermore, the Respondent has not demonstrated any use of the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services or a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Finally, there is no other evidence in the case file that could demonstrate that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

In view of the foregoing, the Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. In order to rebut the Complainant's arguments, the Respondent had the possibility to make his own defense. However, the Respondent has chosen not to file a Response.

Therefore, the Panel is satisfied that also the second requirement under the Policy is met.

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).

As far as registration in bad faith is concerned, given the acquired reputation of the Complainant's trademark, which had been widely publicized in the online market just a few days before according to the evidence provided by the Complainant and not refuted by the Respondent, and the fact that the disputed domain name fully incorporates this trademark, it is rather evident that, at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name, the Respondent was well aware of the Complainant's trademark. The registration as domain name of a third party's well-known trademark with full knowledge of the fact that the rights over this trademark belong to a third-party amounts to registration in bad faith.

With respect to use in bad faith, the disputed domain name resolves to a competing website, whereby the Respondent offers a similar and overlapping agent platform to the one offered by the Complainant. Such use of a domain name can show bad faith under some circumstances, such as when the complainant’s trademark has such a reputation that it is widely known, and when it is impossible to conceive any plausible actual or contemplated active use of the domain name by the respondent that would not be illegitimate. This fact is to be combined with the full incorporation of the Complainant’s reputable trademark in the disputed domain name. These are exactly the circumstances that apply in the case at issue. The trademark CoPaw enjoys wide and extensive reputation, even if acquired at a short amount of time. Therefore, it is impossible to conceive any plausible active use of the disputed domain name that would be legitimate.

Further, the Respondent has attempted to pass itself off for the Complainant, through the disputed domain name website, for commercial gain. Such fraudulent behaviour is also a clear indication of bad faith use.

Therefore, the Panel finds it clear that the disputed domain name was used in bad faith.

For all circumstances mentioned above, the Panel is satisfied that also the third requirement under the Policy is satisfied.

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 disputed domain name wholly incorporates the Complainant's trademark. The disputed domain name is therefore confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark.

The Respondent was not authorised to include the Complainant's trademark in the disputed domain name, and the Complainant never licensed its trademarks to the Respondent. The Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, or a legitimate non-commercial or fair use.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's well-known trademark. His use of the disputed domain name as a competing website and for passing off purposes, is in bad faith, as there is no conceivable use of the disputed domain name that could amount to a legitimate use.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **copaw.bot**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Sozos-Christos Theodoulou**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-06-01

Publish the Decision