

## Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108678

Case number CAC-UDRP-108678

Time of filing 2026-05-27 09:37:47

Domain names cosyvoice.net

### Case administrator

Name Olga Dvořáková (Case admin)

### Complainant

Organization Alibaba Group Holding Limited

### Complainant representative

Organization Convey srl

### Respondent

Organization cheng du li sheng yun ke ji you xian gong si

#### 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, inter alia, the owner of the following trademarks and trademark applications containing the word element "COSYVOICE":

(i) COSYVOICE (word), United Kingdom trademark, registration no. UK00004339829, application date 12 February 2026, registration date 15 May 2026, registered for goods and services in the int. classes 9 and 42;

(ii) COSYVOICE (word), EU trademark, application no. 019316594, application date 12 February 2026, registration date 7 June 2026, registered for goods and services in the int. classes 9 and 42; and

(iii) COSYVOICE (word), Chinese trademark applications no. 90126597 and 90126598, application date 6 February 2026.

(Complainant's Trademarks)

The Complainant has also demonstrated extensive international use of the unregistered mark "COSYVOICE" since 7 July 2024 in connection with its open-source artificial intelligence voice synthesis model.

#### FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The **Complainant** in this administrative proceeding is Alibaba Group Holding Limited, a global technology conglomerate operating in e-commerce, cloud computing, and artificial intelligence. In July 2024, the Complainant globally introduced and released as open-source its advanced AI text-to-speech synthesis model under the name “CosyVoice”, which immediately gained significant publicity, visibility, and a broad user base within the international developer community.

The **disputed domain name** <cosyvoice.net> was registered on 6 August 2025 and is held by the Respondent.

The **disputed domain name website** currently operates a platform that explicitly describes itself as the “official platform” for the CosyVoice technology.

**Respondent’s trademark application:** The Respondent filed an application for a Chinese trademark for the identical textual element “COSYVOICE” on 24 November 2025.

The Complainant seeks the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

---

#### PARTIES CONTENTIONS

##### THE COMPLAINANT:

###### A) CONFUSING SIMILARITY

The Complainant states that

The disputed domain name <cosyvoice.net> is identical to Complainant’s Trademarks, which are incorporated in its entirety;

The addition of the generic top-level domain suffix “.net” is irrelevant for the purpose of assessing confusing similarity.

###### B) NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainant states that:

The Respondent has no authorization to use the COSYVOICE mark, is not affiliated with the Complainant, and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name;

Operating a website that free-rides on the Complainant’s open-source project and deceptively claims to be the “official platform” does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor a legitimate non-commercial or fair use.

The Respondent therefore has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name

###### C) BAD FAITH REGISTRATION AND USE:

The Complainant contends that:

The Respondent registered the domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant’s then already popular AI technology.

The bad faith is evident as the Respondent uses the website to impersonate the Complainant’s services under its own name. Furthermore, the Complainant has demonstrated a speculative pattern of conduct, as the Respondent also registered the domain name <qwen3tts.cn> targeting another prominent AI product of the Complainant (“QWEN”).

Accordingly, the Complainant concludes that the domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

##### THE RESPONDENT:

The Respondent, in its response, merely points out that it filed an application for a Chinese trademark for “COSYVOICE” on 24 November 2025, which predates the Complainant’s formal trademark applications (February 2026).

On this basis, the Respondent denies bad faith and proposes an amicable settlement to transfer the domain name to save procedural costs, provided that the interests of the current regular users of the website are protected.

---

#### 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

##### A) RIGHTS

The first UDRP element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's Trademark and the disputed domain name.

This test typically involves a side-by-side comparison of the disputed domain name and the textual components of the relevant trademark to assess whether the trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name.

In cases where a disputed domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark, or where at least a dominant feature of the relevant mark is recognizable in such domain name, the disputed domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that trademark for purposes of UDRP standing.

In such case, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element.

Applying the principles described above, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's Trademark.

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of the first element, the relevant question is simply whether the Complainant has rights in a trademark and whether the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to that trademark. The Complainant's trademark rights need not necessarily predate the registration of the disputed domain name (WIPO Overview 3.0, Section 1.1.3).

For the sake of completeness, the Panel notes that the top-level suffix in the disputed domain name (i.e. ".net") must be disregarded under the identity and confusing similarity tests, as it is a necessary technical requirement of registration.

Consequently, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

##### B) NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

According to established UDRP precedent, once the Complainant makes a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks such rights or legitimate interests, the burden shifts to the Respondent to show otherwise.

In this case, the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and has received no authorization or license from the Complainant.

The mere filing of a trademark application by a respondent does not automatically establish rights or legitimate interests (WIPO Overview 3.0, Section 2.12), especially when the application was submitted long after the Complainant had globally popularized the name.

Using the disputed domain name to host a website that misleads internet users by claiming to be the "official platform" of the technology cannot be considered a bona fide offering of services, as it intentionally creates a false impression of affiliation with the Complainant.

While the Complainant's CosyVoice technology is distributed as open-source, the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name does not satisfy the criteria established in *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.* (WIPO Case No. D2001-0903) and as summarized in

WIPO Overview 3.0, Section 2.8. In particular, the Respondent's website falsely presents itself as the 'official platform,' failing to accurately disclose its relationship (or lack thereof) with the Complainant. This deceptive presentation precludes any finding of bona fide use.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

### C) BAD FAITH

Given the highly distinctive nature of the term "COSYVOICE" and the documented international reputation of the Complainant's AI model since July 2024 (supported by publications on arXiv, GitHub, and Hugging Face), it is not credible that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant and its prior rights.

Facts of this case establish that the Respondent's intent in registering the disputed domain name was to unfairly capitalize on the Complainant's nascent (yet unregistered) trademark rights. Under WIPO Overview 3.0, Section 3.8.2, such scenarios include registration of a domain name further to significant media attention (e.g., in connection with a product launch or prominent event), which applies to this case.

The Panel acknowledges that the Complainant's formal trademark applications were filed in February 2026, several months after the disputed domain name was registered on August 6, 2025. However, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established unregistered (or common law, where applicable) trademark rights in the COSYVOICE mark sufficient to satisfy paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

The evidence demonstrates that prior to the disputed domain name registration, the COSYVOICE designation had acquired secondary meaning and was distinctively associated with the Complainant's speech synthesis technology. In particular, the Complainant's CosyVoice project was publicly launched on the GitHub platform in July 2024, more than one year before the disputed domain name was registered. By August 2025, the project had accumulated over 8,000 stars on GitHub, had been the subject of extensive media coverage in major technology publications, and had been presented at prominent international conferences.

This level of public recognition and association between the COSYVOICE mark and the Complainant's products is sufficient to establish acquired distinctiveness and secondary meaning within the relevant sector.

The Panel further notes that the Respondent's own conduct – including the use of the Complainant's branding, logos, and product descriptions on the website associated with the disputed domain name – itself constitutes compelling evidence that the COSYVOICE mark had, by the time of the domain name registration, achieved sufficient recognition to be identified exclusively with the Complainant (see WIPO Overview 3.0, Section 1.3).

Under WIPO Overview 3.0, Section 3.8.2, bad faith may be found where a respondent targets a complainant's mark that has achieved significant attention, even if formal trademark registration has not yet occurred.

The Respondent therefore intentionally targeted the Complainant to free-ride on its reputation for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, or affiliation of the website, which constitutes evidence of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

This conclusion is also reinforced by the Respondent's established pattern of conduct, specifically its registration of the domain name <qwen3tts.cn> targeting another well-known AI brand of the Complainant ("QWEN"), which constitutes clear evidence of bad faith registration and use under paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy. UDRP panels have found that even two domain name registrations targeting the same complainant can constitute a 'pattern of conduct' within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(ii) (WIPO Overview 3.0, Section 3.1.2).

This constitutes evidence of bad faith registration and use within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(ii) and (iv) of the Policy.

The Respondent's conditional offer to transfer the disputed domain name does not preclude a finding of bad faith, nor does it obviate the need for a decision on the merits (WIPO Overview 3.0, Section 4.10)

Thus, the Panel has taken a view that 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).

---

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

**Accepted**

---

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

1. **cosyvoice.net**: Transferred

---

## PANELLISTS

Name **Jiří Čermák**

---

DATE OF PANEL DECISION **2026-06-24**

---

Publish the Decision

---