

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108773

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108773
Time of filing	2026-06-30 09:15:59
Domain names	happyhorse.app, hppyhorse.com, happy-horse.net, happyhorsesai.com, happyhorseai.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	Alibaba Group Holding Limited
--------------	-------------------------------

Complainant representative

Organization	Thomsen Trampedach GmbH
--------------	-------------------------

Respondents

Name	Zuck Dont
Name	Kevin Stark
Name	Zhanjia Qiu
Name	Andy Leo

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 relies on unregistered (common law) trademark rights in the designation “HappyHorse”. On April 7, 2026, a new AI video generation software was published anonymously under the name “HappyHorse” on the AI benchmarking platform Artificial Analysis. It received positive reviews and widespread attention immediately. On April 10, 2026, the Complainant revealed that it was the publisher of “HappyHorse”. The Complainant owns the corresponding domain names <happyhorse.com> (created September 23, 1997), <happyhorse.cn> (created on May 5, 2016), and <happyhorse.ai> (created April 13, 2023).

Alibaba Innovation Private Limited, a wholly-owned indirect subsidiary of the Complainant, is, inter alia, the owner of the following trademark applications:

United States trademark serial number n. 99757039 “HAPPYHORSE” word, filed on April 10, 2026;

Singaporean trademark application serial number 40202609086Y, “HAPPYHORSE” device, filed on April 10, 2026;

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant in this administrative proceeding is Alibaba Group Holding Limited, a leading Chinese multinational technology company specializing in e-commerce, retail, Internet and technology. Founded on June 28, 1999, the company provides consumer-to-consumer, business-to-consumer and business-to-business sales services via Chinese and global marketplaces, as well as local consumer, digital media and entertainment, logistics and cloud computing services. The Complainant is one of the world's largest retailers and e-commerce companies and is active in over 190 countries.

As part of its AI strategy, the Complainant has developed "Happy Horse AI", which was launched anonymously on April 7, 2026. This groundbreaking AI video generation model was designed to transform textual and visual content into video formats. HappyHorse 1.0 topped Artificial Analysis's AI Video Arena chart, ranking first and surpassing well-known models like ByteDance's Seedance 2.0. On April 10, 2026, the Complainant revealed that it was the actual publisher of "HappyHorse".

The disputed domain names <happyhorse.app>, <happy-horse.net> and <happyhorseai.com> were registered on April 7, 2026, <happyhorsesai.com> was registered on April 8, 2026, and <hppyhorse.com> was registered on June 4, 2026.

At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain <happyhorse.app> redirects users to the domain name <horsehppy.com>, which resolves to a website offering an AI video generator service that imitates the Complainant's product. Meanwhile, the disputed domains <happy-horse.net> and <happyhorsesai.com> are inactive, whereas <happyhorseai.com> resolves to an active website at <fastmoroai.com>, which promotes FastMoro AI, specifically AI video and image creation tools. Lastly, the disputed domain <hppyhorse.com> resolves to the active website <horsehppy.com>, impersonating the Complainant and offering the latter's HappyHorse product for sale and use.

From the evidence submitted by the Complainant, it appears that the disputed domain <happyhorse.app> previously redirected users to the domain name <hppyhorse.com>, which resolved to a website offering an AI video generator service imitating the Complainant's product. In addition, the domains <happy-horse.net>, <happyhorsesai.com>, and <happyhorseai.com> all resolved to the same active website, impersonating the Complainant and offering its "HappyHorse" product for sale and use.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant claims that:

Although its trademark applications were filed two to three days after the registration of the disputed domain names <happyhorse.app>, <happy-horse.net>, <happyhorseai.com>, and <happyhorsesai.com>, the Complainant had already established rights in the sign at the time of their registration through its public product launch on the same day. Specifically, on April 1, 2026, the mark was already the subject of public discussion on social media, with users actively identifying it by name and speculating about its origin, following the initial appearance of HAPPYHORSE 1.0 during the weekend of March 28–29. Consequently, the name HAPPYHORSE was immediately and widely understood as distinctive.

The HAPPYHORSE sign had, therefore, acquired a clear and demonstrable secondary meaning, designating a single, identifiable commercial source, prior to and at the time of the disputed domain name registrations.

The fact that the domain names <happyhorse.app>, <happy-horse.net>, and <happyhorseai.com> were registered on the exact day of the launch, that the domain <happyhorsesai.com> was registered on the following day, and that the domain name <hppyhorse.com> was registered after the website associated with <happyhorse.app> had been disabled, clearly demonstrates that the Respondent targeted the Complainant's sign. Under these circumstances, the Respondent could not have independently selected the disputed domain names without prior knowledge of the Complainant's newly launched product.

The disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's sign.

The domain names <happyhorse.app> and <happy-horse.net> reproduce the Complainant's mark in its entirety, without any alteration or modification.

The disputed domain name <happyhorsesai.com> reproduces the Complainant's mark in its entirety, with the sole modification consisting of the addition of the letter "S" at the end of the word "HORSE", making it plural. Such minor alteration constitutes a classic case of typosquatting. Further, the addition of the letters "AI", which also appears in the disputed domain name <happyhorseai.com>, does not dispel confusing similarity. On the contrary, the suffix "AI" does not diminish but rather emphasizes the overall impression that the disputed domain is connected to the Complainant's trademark, as it serves to highlight the Complainant's product.

Finally, the disputed domain name <hppyhorse.com> reproduces the Complainant's sign with the omission of the letter "a" in the word "HAPPY". This negligible omission represents another clear instance of typosquatting.

The Respondents do not have any rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain names.

The Complainant contends that the Respondents are not commonly known by the disputed domain names and that the Respondents are not affiliated with or authorized by the Complainant in any way. The Complainant contends that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. Instead, the disputed domain name <happyhorse.app> initially resolved to a website impersonating the Complainant and offering an AI video generator that imitates the Complainant's product. Afterward, the domain name redirected users to the other disputed domain name <hppyhorse.com>, which hosts the same or similar website and content. Moreover, the disputed domain names <happy-horse.net>, <happyhorsesai.com>, and <happyhorseai.com> previously resolved to an active website impersonating the Complainant and offering its product HappyHorse for sale and use. Such uses cannot establish rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

The disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain names <happyhorse.app>, <happy-horse.net>, and <happyhorseai.com> were registered on the exact date of the Complainant's public product launch, at a time when the Complainant had already gained immediate visibility, including reaching the top position on Artificial Analysis's AI Video Arena leaderboard. Moreover, the disputed domain name <happyhorsesai.com> was registered on the day following the launch of the Complainant's product. This shows that the Respondent deliberately targeted the Complainant's sign and new product. This precise timing cannot be coincidental.

UDRP panels have consistently held that registration of a domain name on or immediately following a Complainant's product launch or public announcement constitutes strong evidence of opportunistic bad faith, as it demonstrates that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's sign and deliberately acted to pre-empt or exploit the Complainant's rights (See WIPO Overview 3.1, at 3.8.2 and The New York Times Company v. Zhalgas Abishev, Forum Claim No. FA2405002096513).

The fact that the Respondent registered the domain names on the very same day as the product launch, and not days or weeks before, confirms that the Respondent acted in direct response to the launch. The same can be said for the registration of the disputed domain name <happyhorsesai.com>, which was registered the day after the launch. This is not a case of coincidental prior registration; it is a case of deliberate, targeted opportunism.

Absence of trademark registrations

The Complainant acknowledges that its trademark applications were filed a few days after the registration of the disputed domain names and that they are still pending. However, this does not preclude a finding of bad faith. It is well established under the UDRP that bad faith can be found even where a Complainant's trademark rights had not yet been formally registered at the time of the domain name registration, provided that the Complainant had already established unregistered or common law rights in the sign, and that the Respondent was aware of those rights (See WIPO Overview 3.1, at 3.8.2).

The Complainant further claims that its HAPPYHORSE sign had already acquired public recognition at the time of the domain name registrations, as evidenced by its prominent placement on Artificial Analysis's AI Video Arena leaderboard. This was also acknowledged in Case No. CAC-108620, a decision involving the present Complainant, where the panel found that: "the Complainant has established unregistered or common law trademark rights in the name "HappyHorse" for the purposes of the Policy, by demonstrating that "HappyHorse" has become a distinctive identifier among users of AI models and systems for the Complainant's AI video generation software".

Furthermore, in the above-mentioned decision, the UDRP panel has already held that the fact that the Registrant registered the disputed domain name before the Complainant accrued registered trademark rights in the HAPPYHORSE sign does not preclude a finding of bad faith registration.

Regarding the Respondents' identity, the Complainant has requested a consolidation of multiple disputed domain names and the Respondents.

In support of the above request, the Complainant claims, inter alia, that:

All five domain names incorporate and target the Complainant's "HAPPYHORSE" sign with minor or no modifications. Further, the five domain names have been used as part of the same scheme, namely by being associated with a website that impersonates the Complainant. The corresponding websites display substantially identical content, reproduce the Complainant's sign, reproduce the same horse logo, and purport to offer the Complainant's HappyHorse 1.0 product without authorization.

The registrations of the disputed domain names were made in a highly compressed timeframe. Three of the disputed domain names were registered on April 7, 2026, i.e., the date of the launch of the Complainant's product. The disputed domain name <happyhorsesai.com> was registered on the following day. Further, the domain name <hppyhorse.com> was registered shortly after the domain name <happyhorse.app> had been disabled following a takedown request submitted by the Complainant to the service provider. After the hosting of content on <happyhorse.app> was disabled, substantially similar content appeared on the newly registered domain <hppyhorse.com>.

These similarities in the registration and use of the disputed domains, the content hosted by the domain names, and the overall targeting of the Complainant's trademark and product demonstrate that the disputed domain names are more likely than not

controlled by a single person or entity, or by multiple people acting in concert.

The disputed domain names are all directed at the Complainant and have been used in connection with the same impersonation scheme. Previous panels have decided that consolidation would be appropriate to avoid unnecessary duplication of time, effort, and expense, and to reduce the potential for conflicting or inconsistent results arising from multiple proceedings (See *Speedo Holdings B.V. v. Programmer, Miss Kathy Beckerson, John Smitt, Matthew Simmons*, Case No. D2010-0281).

Consolidation of proceedings would be fair and equitable to all parties.

NO ADMINISTRATIVELY COMPLIANT RESPONSE HAS BEEN FILED.

.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain names are 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 names (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 names have been registered and are being used in bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy).

PROCEDURAL FACTORS

Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel, having reviewed the evidence and the arguments provided by the Complainant, finds that the disputed domain names identified in the Complaint, on the balance of probability, were registered by the same domain name holder or are, at least, under common control.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

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

From the case file, it appears that four of the five disputed domain names were registered before the Complainant's filing of its Canadian Trademark HAPPYHORSE, application No. 2468184, i.e., on April 7 and 8, while the trademark was filed on April 9, 2026.

This Panel thus notes that according to paragraph 1.1.3 of the WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.1, the UDRP makes no specific reference to the date on which the holder of the trademark or service mark acquired its rights, such rights must however be in existence at the time the complaint is filed.

In addition, the fact that a domain name may have been registered before a complainant has acquired trademark rights does not by itself preclude a complainant's standing to file a UDRP case, nor a panel's finding of identity or confusing similarity under the first element.

However, where a domain name has been registered before a complainant has acquired trademark rights, only in exceptional cases would a complainant be able to prove a respondent's bad faith.

The Complainant, apart from its trademark applications, also relies on unregistered or common law trademark rights in the name "HappyHorse".

The Panel accepts that the Complainant has established unregistered or common law trademark rights in the name "HappyHorse" for the purposes of the Policy, by demonstrating that "HappyHorse" has become a distinctive identifier among users of AI models and systems, identifying the Complainant's AI video generation software.

The Panel accepts the Complainant's contention that the immediate positive reviews and widespread attention that the Complainant's "HappyHorse" product received in the days and weeks following its release are sufficient evidence of the claimed unregistered or common law trademark rights. The Panel also notes that the Respondent did not challenge this contention.

As already pointed out, the Policy does not require that the Complainant's unregistered or common law trademark rights already existed on the date on which the disputed domain name was registered, i.e., on April 7, 2026.

A) Confusing similarity

The Panel agrees with the Complainant's assertion that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark.

Pursuant to section 1.8 of the Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("WIPO Overview 3.1") which states: "Where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. The nature of such additional term(s) may however bear on assessment of the second and third elements."

B) Lack of legitimate rights or interests

The Panel finds that the Complainant successfully submitted prima facie evidence that the Respondent has neither made any use of, nor demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor is making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain names, nor is commonly known by the disputed domain names.

The burden of evidence therefore shifts to the Respondent to show, using tangible evidence, that it does have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Respondent has made no attempt to do so.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

C) Registered or Used in Bad Faith

The Panel finds that the Complainant successfully submitted sufficient evidence that the Respondent has registered and used these disputed domain names in bad faith, namely by intentionally attempting to attract, for commercial gain, internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website (Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy).

The Respondent may have registered some of the disputed domain names before the Complainant accrued unregistered trademark rights. However, given the timing of events, namely:

- the public launch of "HappyHorse 1.0" on April 7, 2026;
- the social media buzz that the launch immediately created;
- the Respondent's registration of three of the disputed domain names on exactly the same date and another just one day later; and
- the Respondent's use of the disputed domain names,

it is clear that the Respondent intended to unfairly capitalize on the Complainant’s nascent trademark rights (see Section 3.8.2 of the WIPO Overview 3.0/3.1).

UDRP panels have consistently held that registration of a domain name on or immediately following a Complainant's product launch or public announcement constitutes strong evidence of opportunistic bad faith, as it demonstrates that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's sign and deliberately acted to pre-empt or exploit the Complainant's rights (See WIPO Overview 3.1, at 3.8.2).

Finally, the Respondent has not responded to nor denied any of the assertions made by the Complainants in this proceeding.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

- 1. happyhorse.app: Transferred
- 2. hppyhorse.com: Transferred
- 3. happy-horse.net: Transferred
- 4. happyhorsesai.com: Transferred
- 5. happyhorseai.com: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Fabrizio Bedarida
------	-------------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-08-18

Publish the Decision