

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108836

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108836
Time of filing	2026-07-20 09:52:27
Domain names	taobao.bot

Case administrator

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

Complainant

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

Complainant representative

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

Respondent

Name	wentao gong
------	-------------

OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The Panel is unaware of any other pending or decided legal proceedings relating to the disputed domain name.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant holds multiple trademark registrations worldwide consisting of the term “TAOBAO”. Among the Complainant's trademark portfolio, the following registrations are listed as examples:

- PRC TM N. 38040117 – “TAOBAO”, registered on March 21, 2020;
- EUIPO TM N. 009080029 – “TAOBAO”, registered on October 21, 2011;
- UK TM N. UK00909080029 – “TAOBAO”, registered on October 21, 2011;
- Brazil TM N. 902605941 – “TAOBAO”, registered on March 5, 2013;
- US TM N. 5688961 – “TAOBAO”, registered on March 5, 2019;
- PRC TM N. 25197065 – “TAOBAO”, registered on July 7, 2018;
- PRC TM N. 25191815 – “TAOBAO”, registered on November 7, 2018;
- PRC TM N. 84002178 – “”, registered on December 21, 2025.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is Alibaba Innovation Private Limited, a company incorporated in Singapore and forming part of the global corporate structure of Alibaba Group Holding Limited, a multinational technology and e-commerce group founded in 1999 in Hangzhou, Zhejiang Province, China.

The internal organization of the Alibaba Group reflects a structure whereby intellectual property rights may be held by different entities while being coordinated at group level. In particular, Alibaba Innovation Private Limited is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Alibaba Group Holding Limited. Hanbao Investment Holding Limited is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Alibaba Group Holding Limited, and Hanbao Investment Holding Limited is the sole shareholder of Alibaba Innovation Private Limited. Taken together, Alibaba Innovation Private Limited is wholly-owned by Hanbao Investment Holding Limited, which is in turn wholly-owned by Alibaba Group Holding Limited. Accordingly, Alibaba Innovation Private Limited forms part of, and is ultimately wholly-owned within, the Alibaba Group corporate structure.

Within this structure, the Complainant is involved in the development, promotion, and protection of innovative technology products and services, and operates within a globally recognized technology group with extensive commercial activities, international presence, and a well-established reputation in the fields of e-commerce, cloud computing, and artificial intelligence.

The Alibaba Group comprises numerous affiliated entities operating across different jurisdictions and business sectors. In addition to the Complainant, these entities include, among others, Alibaba (China) Co., Ltd. (), Alibaba Cloud Computing Ltd., and Cloud Intelligence Assets Holding (Singapore) Private Limited, which support the Group's technology platforms, research and development activities, and commercial operations worldwide.

The Alibaba Group is a leading global technology, e-commerce, and digital services company operating across more than 190 countries and regions. Through its various platforms, it operates major online marketplaces across the B2B, C2C, and B2C sectors, including Alibaba.com, Taobao, and Tmall, serving a substantial user base worldwide. In addition to its core commerce activities, the Group provides a broad range of technology-driven services, including cloud computing, artificial intelligence, digital media and entertainment, logistics, and other advanced digital and data-driven services. The Group also develops and supports artificial intelligence technologies and related digital innovation initiatives through various entities within its global corporate structure.

In particular, "TAOBAO" is one of the Alibaba Group's flagship consumer-to-consumer (C2C) online marketplace platforms. Launched in 2003, "TAOBAO" enables individuals, merchants, and businesses to offer products and services through an online marketplace accessible to consumers throughout China. Over the years, "TAOBAO" has become one of China's best-known and most widely used e-commerce platforms, attracting a substantial user base and generating significant commercial success. Together with TMALL, "TAOBAO" forms part of the Alibaba Group's core China commerce business and has acquired considerable goodwill and reputation through extensive use, promotion, and consumer recognition.

Since 2003, the "TAOBAO" platform has been operated through the domain name <taobao.com>, which resolves to the official "TAOBAO" online marketplace.

The Complainant has secured an extensive portfolio of domain names consisting of or incorporating the term "TAOBAO", including registrations across numerous gTLDs, new gTLDs, and ccTLDs. These registrations reflect the Group's longstanding efforts to protect and promote the "TAOBAO" brand online.

The "TAOBAO" brand also maintains a significant online presence through its official mobile application and social media channels.

The disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent on January 31, 2026.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT

The disputed domain name resolves to a webpage created through GoDaddy's website-building platform. The webpage displays a "coming soon" notice, a contact form, and an invitation for Internet users to subscribe to an e-mail list in order to receive updates, promotions, and other communications, together with references to the disputed domain name itself. The Respondent is neither affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant to use the "TAOBAO" trademark, whether as a domain name or in any other manner.

In light of the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name, which is identical to the Complainant's "TAOBAO" trademark, the Complainant instructed its authorized representative to contact the Respondent and request the transfer of the disputed domain name.

As the Respondent's identity and contact details were not publicly available and were shielded through a privacy service, the only available means of communication was the contact form provided by the Registrar. Accordingly, on June 15, 2026, the Complainant's authorized representative submitted the Registrar's contact form in an attempt to reach the Respondent and request the transfer of the disputed domain name.

In light of the Respondent's failure to respond to the Complainant's request and to voluntarily transfer the disputed domain name,

the Complainant instructed its authorized representative to file the present Complaint.

1. The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;

The Complainant has rights in the "TAOBAO" trademark for the purposes of the Policy, within the meaning of section 1.2.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.1, including the registered trademark rights evidenced by the trademark registrations identified above.

In the present case, the disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's "TAOBAO" trademark in its entirety. The only additional element is the ".bot" generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD"), which is generally disregarded for the purpose of assessing identity or confusing similarity under the first element of the Policy. Accordingly, the "TAOBAO" trademark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is identical or, at a minimum, confusingly similar to the Complainant's "TAOBAO" trademark, in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

2. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name;

The Complainant is not aware of any evidence indicating that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name or by the name "TAOBAO", whether as an individual, business, or other organization, within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy. The publicly available Whois records do not disclose any identifying information linking the Respondent to the "TAOBAO" designation. On the contrary, the registrant's identity has been concealed through the use of a privacy-protection service.

Any use of the "TAOBAO" name by the Respondent appears to derive solely from the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name itself. The website associated with the disputed domain name prominently displays the "TAOBAO" designation and invites Internet users to submit their contact details and subscribe to an e-mail list for future updates and promotions. Such circumstances do not support a finding that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name and therefore cannot give rise to any rights or legitimate interests therein.

Moreover, the Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, nor has it been authorized, permitted, or otherwise granted consent to use the "TAOBAO" designation, or any identical or confusingly similar sign, in the disputed domain name or in any other manner. The Complainant has never had any business, commercial, or contractual relationship with the Respondent that could give rise to any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name, which wholly incorporates the Complainant's well-known "TAOBAO" trademark, is likely to mislead Internet users into believing that the disputed domain name and the corresponding website are associated with, authorized by, or endorsed by the Complainant. Such circumstances do not give rise to any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

In these circumstances, and given the absence of any authorization from the Complainant, any evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the "TAOBAO" designation, or that it holds any independent rights in the term "TAOBAO", is lacking. Accordingly, the Respondent cannot plausibly claim to have acquired any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

Consequently, the Complainant respectfully submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

3. The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

As regards the Respondent's bad faith at the time of registration, the Complainant submits that the Respondent could not reasonably have ignored the existence of the "TAOBAO" trademark. The disputed domain name was registered on January 31, 2026, many years after the Complainant obtained trademark registrations for "TAOBAO" in multiple jurisdictions and after the mark had become distinctive and well known through extensive use and promotion worldwide.

In view of the distinctiveness and reputation of the "TAOBAO" trademark, the Complainant submits that it is unlikely that the Respondent selected the term "TAOBAO" independently of the Complainant's trademark rights. This conclusion is further reinforced by the fact that the Respondent appears to be located in China, where the "TAOBAO" platform has operated since 2003 and has become one of the country's best-known and most widely used e-commerce platforms.

The Respondent has incorporated the "TAOBAO" trademark in its entirety as the sole distinctive element of the disputed domain name, with the ".bot" generic Top-Level Domain functioning merely as a technical suffix. The choice of the ".bot" gTLD is particularly noteworthy, as Internet users may reasonably associate such extension with chatbot, automated, artificial intelligence, and other technology-related services. Given the Alibaba Group's extensive activities in the technology sector, including cloud computing, artificial intelligence, and other digital services, such use may increase the likelihood that Internet users will assume an association between the disputed domain name and the Complainant. As a result, the disputed domain name is likely to be perceived as being associated with, authorized by, endorsed by, or otherwise connected to the Complainant and its "TAOBAO" brand.

The disputed domain name resolves to a webpage created through GoDaddy's website-building platform. The webpage displays a "coming soon" notice, a contact form, and an invitation for Internet users to subscribe to an e-mail list in order to receive updates, promotions, and other communications.

By using a domain name consisting exclusively of the Complainant's well-known "TAOBAO" trademark in connection with a

webpage that invites Internet users to submit their contact details and subscribe to future promotional communications, the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to attract Internet users to an online location under its control. Such use is likely to create the impression that the disputed domain name and the corresponding website are associated with, authorized by, endorsed by, or otherwise connected with the Complainant.

Despite incorporating the Complainant's "TAOBAO" trademark in its entirety within the disputed domain name, the Respondent has no affiliation with, nor authorization from, the Complainant to use the "TAOBAO" designation in any manner.

The Respondent's adoption of the identical "TAOBAO" designation, combined with the use of the disputed domain name in connection with a website inviting Internet users to submit their contact details and subscribe to future updates, promotions, and other communications, further supports the conclusion that the Respondent intended to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement.

Panels have consistently held that the unauthorized registration and use of a domain name incorporating a complainant's distinctive trademark may constitute bad faith where the respondent seeks to take advantage of the complainant's reputation and goodwill or creates a likelihood of confusion among Internet users as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement.

In light of the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name, which is identical to the Complainant's well-known "TAOBAO" trademark, the Complainant instructed its authorized representative to notify the Respondent of the Complainant's trademark rights and request the transfer of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent failed to reply to the communication submitted by the Complainant's authorized representative through the Registrar's online contact form, which represented the only available means of communication with the Respondent, and through which the transfer of the disputed domain name was requested. Such failure to respond, despite notice of the Complainant's rights in the "TAOBAO" trademark, further supports a finding of bad faith.

The Complainant respectfully submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, thereby satisfying the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

RESPONDENT

No administratively compliant Response was filed.

RIGHTS

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

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

To the satisfaction of the Panel, the Complainant has 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

To the satisfaction of the Panel, the Complainant has 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 the UDRP have been met, and there is no other reason why it would be unsuitable to provide the Decision.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

1. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has established rights in the “TAOBAO” trademark through several trademark registrations in different jurisdictions, with the earliest registration dating to 2011, well before the registration of the disputed domain name on January 31, 2026.

The disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's “TAOBAO” trademark in its entirety and the addition of the “.bot” gTLD does not prevent a finding of identity or confusing similarity, as the gTLD is generally disregarded for this assessment.

On the balance of probabilities, and based on the evidence on record, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's “TAOBAO” trademark.

Accordingly, the first element under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy is satisfied.

2. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. In particular, the Complainant states that the Respondent is not affiliated with, licensed, or otherwise authorized by the Complainant to use the “TAOBAO” trademark, and that there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Panel notes that, under section 2.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.1, the overall burden of proof remains with the complainant. However, where a complainant establishes a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production shifts to the respondent to provide evidence of such rights or legitimate interests. The Panel considers this approach persuasive and applicable in the present case.

Based on the evidence on record, the Complainant has established such a prima facie case. There is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name or by the term “TAOBAO”. There is also no evidence that the Respondent has any trademark rights or other independent rights in that term. Further, the Complainant has expressly stated that it has never authorized the Respondent to use its trademark.

The disputed domain name resolves to a “coming soon” webpage created through GoDaddy. The webpage contains a contact form and invites Internet users to subscribe to an e-mail list to receive future updates, promotions, and other communications. On the balance of probabilities, and based on the evidence on record, the Panel does not consider this use to constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name consists entirely of the Complainant's “TAOBAO” trademark, and no explanation has been provided for the Respondent's choice of this particular term.

The Respondent has not filed a Response and has therefore not provided any evidence or explanation capable of rebutting the Complainant's prima facie case. The Panel may draw appropriate inferences from the absence of a Response, while nevertheless considering the evidence available on the record, as reflected in section 2.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.1.

In these circumstances, on the balance of probabilities and based on the evidence on record, the Panel finds that the Respondent has not demonstrated, and there is no evidence establishing, any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, the second element under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy is satisfied.

3. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The disputed domain name was registered on January 31, 2026, many years after the Complainant obtained its “TAOBAO” trademark registrations, including the EU and UK registrations dating from October 21, 2011. The disputed domain name reproduces the “TAOBAO” trademark in its entirety.

The Respondent's choice of the term “TAOBAO”, without any additional term, is therefore significant. On the balance of probabilities, and based on the evidence on record, the Panel considers it unlikely that the Respondent independently selected this particular term without knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark. This is particularly so given the substantial period between the Complainant's earlier trademark registrations and the registration of the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name resolves to a “coming soon” webpage containing a contact form and an invitation to subscribe to an e-mail list for future updates, promotions, and other communications. The Panel considers that this use does not provide a credible explanation for the Respondent's choice of the “TAOBAO” name. Rather, on the balance of probabilities, the use of the Complainant's trademark as the sole distinctive element of the disputed domain name is likely to create an impression of an association with the Complainant.

The Panel also notes that the Respondent has not filed a Response and has therefore provided no explanation for the registration or intended use of the disputed domain name. The WIPO Overview 3.1 recognizes that panels may draw appropriate inferences from the relevant circumstances, including the absence of a response or evidence of good-faith use. It also confirms that a “coming soon” page does not, by itself, prevent a finding of bad faith.

Finally, the Respondent failed to respond to the Complainant's request for transfer submitted through the Registrar's contact form. While the failure to respond, by itself, does not establish bad faith, the Panel considers it as part of the overall circumstances of the case.

On the balance of probabilities, and based on the evidence on record considered as a whole, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant's "TAOBAO" trademark and has used it in a manner that supports a finding of bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

Accordingly, the third element under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy is satisfied.

4. Decision

For the reasons mentioned above and according to the provisions in Paragraph 4(i) of the Policy and Paragraph 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

- 1. taobao.bot: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Rodolfo Rivas Rea
------	-------------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-08-12

Publish the Decision