Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108597

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108597
Time of filing	2026-04-22 08:59:03
Domain names	skylenage.ai, skylenage.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Alibaba Group Holding Limited

Complainant representative

Organization	Convey srl

Respondent

Name	li lin

OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The Panel is unaware of any other pending or decided legal proceedings relating to the domain names <skylenage.com> and <skylenage.ai> (the "Disputed Domain Names").

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant, Alibaba Group Holding Limited, owns registered trade marks in SKYLENAGE, including:

- Chinese trade mark registration no. 87684832 in Class 9, registered on 14 March 2026; and
- Chinese trade mark registration no. 87694959 in Class 42, registered on 14 March 2026.

(collectively, the "Complainant's trade marks").

The Complainant further relies upon its prior use and public disclosure of the term SKYLENAGE in connection with its artificial intelligence evaluation platform before the registration of the Disputed Domain Names.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

A. Complainant's Assertions

The Complainant is a multinational technology and e-commerce group founded in 1999 and operating globally across a wide range

of digital, cloud computing, artificial intelligence and related technology sectors.

As part of its artificial intelligence activities, the Complainant developed SKYLENAGE (), an artificial intelligence model evaluation platform intended to assess and benchmark the capabilities of large language models and related artificial intelligence systems.

Beginning in September 2025, the Complainant publicly disclosed the SKYLENAGE platform and associated benchmark datasets through a series of technical publications, developer repositories, research platforms and industry events. The Complainant also filed trade mark applications for SKYLENAGE in China on 18 September 2025.

B. Respondent's Position

The Respondent participated in the proceeding and submitted detailed procedural objections concerning, among other matters, consolidation, the language of the proceeding and certain alleged procedural deficiencies in the Complaint.

Following Procedural Order No. 1, the Respondent submitted observations concerning the language of the proceeding.

Following Procedural Order No. 2, the Respondent submitted further observations addressing the merits of the Complaint.

The Respondent's submissions are summarised below and addressed in the Panel's findings.

C. Disputed Domain Names

The Disputed Domain Name <skylenage.com> was registered on 26 September 2025.

At the time relevant to the Complaint, it resolved to a pay-per-click (PPC) landing page displaying sponsored advertising links and was simultaneously offered for sale through the registrar's marketplace at a stated price of USD 100,000. The Disputed Domain Name does not presently resolve to an active website.

The Disputed Domain Name <skylenage.ai> was also registered on 26 September 2025.

At the time relevant to the Complaint, it resolved to a landing page offering the domain name for sale at a stated price of USD 500,000. The Disputed Domain Name does not presently resolve to an active website.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

A. Complainant

A.1 Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant submits that the Disputed Domain Names are identical, or at least confusingly similar, to the SKYLENAGE trade mark.

The Complainant contends that each Disputed Domain Name reproduces the SKYLENAGE trade mark in its entirety and that neither the <.com> nor the <.ai> Top-Level Domain (the "TLD") is capable of distinguishing the Disputed Domain Names from the Complainant's trade mark.

A.2 Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has never been authorised to use the term "Skylenage", is not commonly known by that name, and has no rights or legitimate interests in either Disputed Domain Name.

The Complainant further contends that the Disputed Domain Names were used solely for monetisation and resale purposes, including PPC advertising and substantial offers for sale.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has failed to provide credible evidence of any independent business activity, branding initiative, or bona fide preparations for use of the term "Skylenage" prior to registration of the Disputed Domain Names.

A.3 Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Complainant submits that the SKYLENAGE trade mark is inherently distinctive and was publicly disclosed shortly before the registration of the Disputed Domain Names.

According to the Complainant, the registration of two domain names identical to the SKYLENAGE trade mark on the very day of the public launch of the platform cannot reasonably be explained as coincidence.

The Complainant further relies upon the Respondent's offers to sell the Disputed Domain Names, the use of privacy services, the absence of any response to cease-and-desist communications, and evidence of a broader pattern of registrations incorporating third-party trade marks.

The Complainant further submits that the relevant enquiry is whether the Respondent was aware of and targeted the Complainant's

SKYLENAGE activities at the time of registration, rather than whether the Complainant's trade mark registrations had formally matured at that date.

A.4 Relief Sought

The Complainant requests transfer of the Disputed Domain Names in accordance with paragraph 4(i) of the UDRP Policy.

B. Respondent

B.1 Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Respondent contends that its intended branding consists of the expressions " SkyleNaGe.com" and " SkyleNaGe.Ai", which it says are conceptually distinct from the Complainant's SKYLENAGE trade mark.

The Respondent further submits that the Parties operate in different industries and that the Complainant's trade mark rights are confined to Classes 9 and 42, whereas the Respondent's activities relate to manufacturing and materials processing.

The Respondent also submits that SKYLENAGE is not a famous trade mark and that the Complainant does not possess monopoly rights extending across all industries, classes or domain name registrations.

B.2 Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Respondent submits that it operates a long-standing electronics manufacturing business through Shenzhen Jiafengda Electronics Co., Ltd.

The Respondent states that the Disputed Domain Names were registered as part of a planned rebranding initiative under the name " SkyleNaGe", developed in connection with a manufacturing-focused business project.

The Respondent relies upon a portfolio of domain name registrations, a Class 40 Chinese trade mark application, alleged product use, and claimed preparations for future business activities as evidence of rights and legitimate interests.

The critical question, however, is not whether the Respondent operates a legitimate manufacturing business, but whether it has demonstrated rights or legitimate interests in the specific term "Skylenage". On the present record, the Panel is not satisfied that the Respondent had independently adopted, used, or prepared to use that term prior to registration of the Disputed Domain Names.

The Respondent further contends that it registered the Disputed Domain Names for its own business purposes and not for the purpose of targeting the Complainant.

B.3 Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Respondent denies having targeted the Complainant.

The Respondent states that the selection of the term "Skylenage" resulted from an independently conceived branding concept derived from various linguistic and conceptual elements and was unrelated to the Complainant's artificial intelligence activities.

The Respondent further submits that the Disputed Domain Names were registered before the Complainant's trade mark registrations matured and that the registration of a broader portfolio of related domain names is consistent with a genuine branding strategy.

The Respondent also contends that the prices displayed for the Disputed Domain Names were arbitrary values intended to discourage spam or unsolicited approaches and did not represent genuine offers to sell the domain names.

The Respondent denies having sought to sell the Disputed Domain Names to the Complainant and contends that it acted in good faith throughout.

B.4 Reverse Domain Name Hijacking

The Respondent requests a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking (the "RDNH").

The Respondent contends that the Complaint constitutes an abuse of the UDRP process and that the Complainant improperly sought to obtain domain names to which it is not entitled.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown that the Disputed Domain Names are identical or confusingly similar to a trade mark in which the Complainant has rights (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the UDRP 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 Names (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy).

BAD FAITH

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown that the Disputed Domain Names have been registered and are being used in bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the UDRP Policy).

PROCEDURAL FACTORS

1. Consolidation

By Procedural Order No. 1, the Panel ordered the consolidation of CAC Case Nos. 108596 and 108597 pursuant to Rules 10(b), 10(c) and 10(e) of the UDRP Rules.

The Panel found that the Disputed Domain Names were registered by the same Respondent and that the disputes concerned closely related factual circumstances and overlapping issues under the UDRP Policy. The consolidated proceeding has continued under CAC Case No. 108597.

2. Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the Disputed Domain Name <skylenage.com> is Chinese. The language of the Registration Agreement for the Disputed Domain Name <skylenage.ai> is English.

By Procedural Order No. 1, the Panel invited submissions concerning the language of the proceeding.

Following receipt of those submissions, the Panel issued Procedural Order No. 2. For the reasons set out therein, the Panel determined that English would be the language of the proceeding. The Panel further permitted the Respondent to submit observations on the merits in either English or Chinese.

3. Procedural Order No. 2

By Procedural Order No. 2, the Panel determined that English would be the language of the proceeding and afforded the Respondent an opportunity to submit observations concerning the merits of the Complaint in Chinese if the Respondent so wished. The Complainant was afforded an opportunity to reply.

The Parties each submitted further observations, which the Panel has considered in full.

4. Respondent's Procedural Objections

The Respondent raised a number of procedural objections concerning, among other matters, consolidation, language, and certain alleged deficiencies in the Complaint. The Panel has considered those submissions in full.

4.1 Consolidation Objections

The Respondent repeatedly requested that CAC Case No. 108596 and No. 108597 be consolidated and expressed concern that separate treatment of the disputes might result in inconsistent procedural treatment and outcomes.

Those objections were substantially addressed by Procedural Order No. 1, by which the Panel ordered consolidation of the proceedings pursuant to Rules 10(b), 10(c) and 10(e) of the UDRP Rules.

4.2 Language Objections

The Respondent objected to the use of English as the language of the proceeding and contended that Chinese should be adopted, relying in particular upon the language of the Registration Agreement applicable to the Disputed Domain Name <skylenage.com>, the location of the Parties, and considerations of procedural fairness.

The Respondent further argued that substantive matters should be addressed only after the language issue had been determined.

Those objections were addressed by Procedural Order No. 2.

4.3 Objections concerning the Complaint and Jurisdiction

The Respondent also challenged the adequacy of the Complaint and asserted that certain information relating to the Complainant, its representatives and mutual jurisdiction was incomplete.

The Panel has reviewed those submissions and does not consider that they disclose any deficiency capable of preventing

determination of the dispute under the UDRP Policy and the UDRP Rules.

4.4 Alleged Procedural Unfairness

The Respondent further alleged that aspects of the proceeding were unfair and that the Complaint had been brought in a procedurally abusive manner.

The Panel has considered those submissions but does not find that they establish any procedural unfairness affecting the Panel's ability to determine the dispute in accordance with the UDRP Policy and the UDRP Rules.

5. Sufficiency of the Record

Following Procedural Order No. 2, both Parties were afforded an opportunity to address the merits of the dispute. The Respondent submitted observations on the merits and the Complainant submitted a reply.

The Panel is satisfied that the Parties have been afforded a full and fair opportunity to present their respective positions and that the record is complete and sufficient to permit determination of the dispute.

6. Procedural compliance

The Panel is satisfied that all procedural requirements under the UDRP Policy, the UDRP Rules, and the CAC Supplemental Rules have been complied with and that the dispute is properly before the Panel for determination.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

A. Applicable Legal Framework

Pursuant to Rule 15 of the UDRP Rules, the Panel decides on the basis of the statements and evidence submitted, in accordance with the UDRP Policy, the UDRP Rules, and any applicable principles of law.

Under paragraph 4(a) of the UDRP Policy, the Complainant must establish, on the balance of probabilities, that:

(i) the Disputed Domain Names are identical or confusingly similar to a trade mark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;

(ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Names; and

(iii) the Disputed Domain Names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

B. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has established rights in the SKYLENAGE trade mark.

The Disputed Domain Names <skylenage.com> and <skylenage.ai> each reproduce the SKYLENAGE trade mark in its entirety.

The applicable TLDs (<.com> and <.ai>) do not prevent the Complainant's trade mark from remaining clearly recognisable and are to be disregarded for the purpose of the comparison required under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the UDRP Policy.

The Respondent contends that its intended branding consists of the expressions " SkyleNaGe.com" and " SkyleNaGe.Ai", which it says are conceptually distinct from the Complainant's SKYLENAGE trade mark and are associated with different business activities.

The Panel does not accept that submission. The comparison required under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the UDRP Policy is between the Complainant's trade mark and the Disputed Domain Names themselves. Each Disputed Domain Name consists solely of the term "Skylenage" together with the applicable TLD. The Respondent's asserted branding concept, the industry in which it claims to operate, and the classes in which the Parties may hold or seek trade mark protection are not relevant to this element of the UDRP Policy.

The Panel therefore finds that the Disputed Domain Names are identical to a trade mark in which the Complainant has rights.

C. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant has made out a prima facie case.

The Respondent is not authorised to use the Complainant’s SKYLENAGE trade mark and there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the name "Skylenage".

The Respondent submits that it operates an electronics manufacturing business and that the Disputed Domain Names were registered as part of a planned rebranding initiative under the name " SkyleNaGe". The Respondent further relies upon a Class 40 trade mark application, domain name registrations, and alleged preparations for future business use.

The evidence does not satisfactorily explain the adoption of the distinctive term "Skylenage" at precisely the time when the Complainant was publicly launching and promoting the same term in connection with its artificial intelligence evaluation platform.

The Respondent's evidence of alleged preparations for use of the name "Skylenage" is limited. While the Respondent relies upon a manufacturing business that pre-dates the present dispute, the evidence does not establish that the term "Skylenage" itself had been adopted or used independently of the Complainant's activities before registration of the Disputed Domain Names.

The evidence also fails to establish demonstrable preparations to use the Disputed Domain Names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services prior to notice of the present dispute. The Respondent's Class 40 trade mark application was filed several months after registration of the Disputed Domain Names and after the Complainant had publicly disclosed and begun using the trade mark SKYLENAGE.

In any event, a subsequent trade mark application does not, without more, establish rights or legitimate interests existing at the time relevant to the present dispute.

The record further shows that the Disputed Domain Names were offered for sale at substantial prices and that the Disputed Domain Name <skylenage.com> was used in connection with a PPC landing page displaying sponsored advertising links. Use of a domain name identical to a third-party identifier for PPC monetisation and resale does not, in the circumstances of this case, constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Names.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Names.

D. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel is satisfied that SKYLENAGE is a distinctive and inherently unusual term adopted by the Complainant in connection with its artificial intelligence evaluation platform. It is not a dictionary word, descriptive term, acronym, or commonly used expression, but rather appears to be a coined term that became publicly associated with the Complainant shortly before registration of the Disputed Domain Names.

The evidence shows that, prior to registration of the Disputed Domain Names, the Complainant had publicly disclosed the SKYLENAGE platform and associated benchmark datasets through technical publications, developer repositories and industry-facing events. The Complainant had also filed Chinese trade mark applications for SKYLENAGE on 18 September 2025.

The relevant enquiry is not confined to the date on which the Complainant's trade mark registrations matured. Rather, the question is whether the Respondent was aware of, and sought to target, the Complainant's rights or activities at the time of registration.

The Disputed Domain Names were registered on 26 September 2025, within days of those public disclosures and on the same day as the public presentation of the SKYLENAGE platform at the APSARA (Yunqi) Conference.

The Respondent contends that its selection of "Skylenage" was coincidental and formed part of an independently conceived branding strategy derived from various linguistic and conceptual elements. The Panel does not find that explanation persuasive.

The fact that the Parties operate in different sectors, or may hold or seek trade mark protection in different classes, does not preclude a finding of targeting where a respondent registers a domain name identical to a distinctive identifier that has recently become associated with a complainant.

The record contains no persuasive evidence that the term "Skylenage" possessed an established meaning independent of the Complainant's use. Nor has the Respondent provided convincing contemporaneous evidence demonstrating that the term had been selected and adopted for its own business purposes before the Complainant’s public disclosures in September 2025.

The Panel considers it highly improbable that the Respondent independently selected and registered the identical, inherently distinctive term "Skylenage" within days of the Complainant's public disclosures and on the very day of the public presentation of the SKYLENAGE platform at the APSARA (Yunqi) Conference.

The timing of the registrations strongly supports an inference that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its SKYLENAGE activities at the time of registration.

The Respondent further submits that the prices displayed for the Disputed Domain Names were arbitrary values intended to discourage spam or unsolicited approaches and did not represent genuine offers to sell the domain names. The Panel does not find that explanation persuasive in the circumstances of this case. The Disputed Domain Names were actively listed for sale, and the Disputed Domain Name <skylenage.com> was simultaneously used in connection with a monetised PPC landing page. In those circumstances, the Panel does not accept the Respondent’s explanation that the listed prices were intended merely to discourage spam or unsolicited approaches.

The Respondent’s use of privacy services, its failure to respond substantively to the Complainant's cease-and-desist communications, and the evidence submitted concerning a broader pattern of registrations incorporating third-party trade marks reinforce that conclusion.

Considering the record as a whole, the Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

E. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking

The Respondent requests a finding of RDNH. The Panel declines to do so.

The fact that the Respondent elected to contest the Complaint vigorously, or advanced arguments that ultimately proved unsuccessful, does not render the Complaint abusive. The Complaint raised serious issues properly falling within the scope of the UDRP and was supported by evidence capable of establishing each of the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the UDRP Policy.

The Complainant owns registered trade mark rights in SKYLENAGE. The Disputed Domain Names are identical to those rights. The timing of the registrations, the offers for sale, and the other circumstances relied upon by the Complainant provided a proper basis for bringing the present proceeding.

The Panel therefore finds no basis for concluding that the Complaint was brought in bad faith or constituted an abuse of the UDRP process.

F. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraph 4(i) of the UDRP Policy and Rule 15 of the UDRP Rules, the Panel orders that the Disputed Domain Names <skylenage.com> and <skylenage.ai> be transferred to the Complainant, Alibaba Group Holding Limited.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **skylenage.ai**: Transferred
2. **skylenage.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Yana Zhou**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-06-17

Publish the Decision