

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108793

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108793
Time of filing	2026-07-02 10:50:55
Domain names	wan3pro.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Dvořáková (Case admin)
------	-----------------------------

Complainant

Organization	Alibaba Innovation Private Limited
--------------	------------------------------------

Complainant representative

Organization	Convey srl
--------------	------------

Respondent

Organization	Dynadot Privacy Service
--------------	-------------------------

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

According to the evidence submitted by Complainant, Complainant is the owner of the United Kingdom trademark WAN, number UK00004164944 and registration date 25 July 2025.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

According to the information provided the disputed domain name <wan3pro> was registered on 23 March 2026.

According to the information and evidence provided by Complainant the disputed domain name resolves to a website imitating the website of Complainant.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

Complainant

Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain name should be transferred to it.

According to the evidence submitted by Complainant, Complainant is a company belonging to the Alibaba Group, a leading Chinese multinational conglomerate. As part of its AI strategy, Alibaba has developed Wan, an open-source family of multimodal video-generation models designed to produce high-quality, multilingual video content from text and other inputs. Wan 3.0 is a major upgrade over previous Wan versions: the major improvements have been a much higher video quality, as well as also the chance to do longer videos.

Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's WAN trademark. The disputed domain name fully incorporates Complainant's WAN mark. Complainant submits that in creating the disputed domain name Respondent combined Complainant's trademark WAN with additional elements, namely the number "3", which directly correspond to the name of Alibaba's AI video generation model "Wan 3.0", and the word "pro", which stands for the "professional" version of the model. By incorporating this version identifier into the disputed domain name, Respondent reinforces the association with Complainant's marks and products, thereby making the disputed domain name confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark WAN.

According to Complainant, Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name. Respondent is neither a licensee nor an authorized distributor of Complainant and has not been granted any permission to use Complainant's trademarks – nor any variation, misspelling, or derivative thereof – in the disputed domain name or in any other manner. Complainant is not aware of any evidence indicating that Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, or by any name corresponding to it, whether as an individual, business, or other organization.

Respondent is not making a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor is it engaged in any legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. On the contrary, Respondent is using the disputed domain name to promote and offer Complainant's WAN video generation service, without any authorization. This conduct demonstrates a clear intent to exploit the reputation and goodwill associated with Complainant's trademark WAN. Moreover, Respondent's website displayed Complainant's trademarks, thereby imitating Complainant and misleading internet users into believing that the website was affiliated with or endorsed by Complainant. Such use is not legitimate and further confirms that Respondent is attempting to divert users by capitalizing on Complainant's brand identity.

According to Complainant the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. In light of Complainant's registrations and use worldwide, it is reasonable to consider that Respondent could not have been unaware of the existence of Complainant's trademarks WAN, when registering the disputed domain name. In particular, the disputed domain name resolves to a website where Complainant's trademarks and products are unduly displayed, further demonstrating that Respondent was clearly aware of Complainant's trademark WAN.

With respect to the bad faith use of the disputed domain name, Complainant asserts that the prominent and unauthorized use of Complainant's trademarks on the associated website suggests that Respondent aims to exploit the reputation of Complainant's trademarks. This is done by diverting Internet users searching for Wan 3.0 models to Respondent's website for commercial gain, through the deliberate creation of confusion regarding the origin, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website.

Respondent

No administratively compliant Response has been filed.

RIGHTS

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 Complainant has rights (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy).

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown 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

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

In the opinion of the Panel the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's WAN trademark. Many UDRP decisions have found that a disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a complainant's trademark where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Complainant has established that it is the owner of a trademark registration for WAN. The disputed domain name incorporates the entirety of the WAN trademark as its distinctive element. The addition of the number "3" and the descriptive term "pro" is insufficient to avoid a finding of confusing similarity. The Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" in the disputed domain name may be disregarded.

The Panel notes that Complainant's registration of its trademark predates the creation date of the disputed domain name.

In the opinion of the Panel Complainant has made a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Complainant has not licensed or otherwise permitted Respondent to use its trademark or to register the disputed domain name incorporating its mark. Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark of Complainant. Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name nor has it acquired trademark rights. Complainant has no relationship with Respondent. In addition, Complainant has demonstrated that the disputed domain name resolves to a website imitating the website of Complainant and promoting and offering Complainant's WAN video generation service, without any authorization.

Respondent did not submit any response. Under these circumstances, the Panel finds that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. Complainant has rights in the WAN trademark. Respondent knew or should have known that the disputed domain name includes Complainant's mark. The Panel notes that Respondent's use of the disputed domain name imitating the website of Complainant demonstrates that Respondent possibly registered the disputed domain name with the intention to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the trademarks of Complainant as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website or location or of a service on its website or location, which constitutes registration and use in bad faith in a similar manner to that provided under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

- 1. wan3pro.com: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Dinant T.L. Oosterbaan
------	------------------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-08-10

Publish the Decision