

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108838

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108838
-------------	-----------------

Time of filing	2026-07-20 12:05:57
----------------	---------------------

Domain names	alibaba.bot
--------------	-------------

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	ALIBABA Innovation Private Limited
--------------	------------------------------------

Complainant representative

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

Respondent

Organization	LI QING
--------------	---------

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 bases its Complaint, among others, on the following trademarks:

- International trademark registration “ALIBABA”, no. 1800560, registered on 1st March 2024, for goods and services in classes 09, 35, 38, 41, 42;
- European Union trade mark “ALIBABA”, no. 017971585, registered on 23 February 2019, for goods and services in classes 09, 16, 35;
- China national trademark “ALIBABA”, no. 40188557, registered on 21 June 2021, for goods in class 09;
- China national trademark “ALIBABA”, no. 41057403, registered on 7 October 2020, for services in class 35.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, a company incorporated in Singapore, is part of the ALIBABA Group, a multinational technology and e-commerce group founded in 1999, in Hangzhou, Zhejiang, China.

The ALIBABA Group operates globally across more than 190 countries and regions and provides a broad range of services spanning consumer-to-consumer (C2C), business-to-consumer (B2C), and business-to-business (B2B) online marketplaces, as well as cloud computing, digital media and entertainment, logistics, and advanced technology services. The Group’s principal platforms include

ALIBABA.com (B2B), Taobao (C2C), and Tmall (B2C).

The Complainant is involved in the development, promotion, and protection of innovative technology products and services, and has developed and promoted artificial intelligence agent platforms, developed within the AgentScope ecosystem by research and engineering teams affiliated with the Complainant.

Based on the arguments put forward by the Complainant, such has used the ALIBABA denomination on internet environments including on the website <https://www.alibabagroup.com/>, <https://www.alibaba.com/>, as well as on social media, such as Facebook, LinkedIn and Instagram.

The Complainant owns the ALIBABA trademarks cited above.

The disputed domain name <alibaba.bot> , registered on 8 February 2025, resolved to a website about humanoid robots, industrial manipulators, servo actuators and intelligent hardware, which mentioned that, the content was provided for educational and public science popularization purposes.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

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

The Complainant's contentions are the following:

(i) the disputed domain name < alibaba.bot > is identical to the Complainant's trademark ALIBABA, as it incorporates the Complainant's ALIBABA trademark in its entirety,

(ii) that the Respondent lack rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name for a number of reasons, among which that (a) the Complainant is not aware of any evidence indicating that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name or by the denomination "alibaba", (b) any use of the "alibaba" denomination by the Respondent appears to be derived solely from the registration and use of the disputed domain name and is accompanied by misleading references to the same technical ecosystem publicly associated with the Complainant's official ALIBABA trademark and platform, (c) the Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, nor has it been authorized, permitted, or otherwise granted consent to use the ALIBABA trademark, or any identical or confusingly similar denomination in the disputed domain name or in any other manner, (d) 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, and that

(iii) the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith for a number of reasons, among which that (a) the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full awareness of the Complainant's ALIBABA AI platforms, intelligent hardware and robots, (b) the Complainant has multiple registered ALIBABA trademarks worldwide, (c) the Respondent has incorporated the ALIBABA trademark in its entirety as the dominant element of the disputed domain name, (d) the disputed domain name resolved to a website about humanoid robots, industrial manipulators, servo actuators and intelligent hardware, which mentioned that the content was provided for educational and public science popularization purposes, which in the Complainant's view, increased the likelihood for the Internet users to perceive the website as connected with, endorsed by, or otherwise authorized by the Complainant, (e) the Respondent has no affiliation with, nor authorization from, the Complainant to use the ALIBABA trademark, (f) the Respondent failed to reply to the Complainant's formal communication, requesting the immediate cease of any use, and the transfer, of the disputed domain name to the Complainant, made through the online contact form made available by the Registrar, (g) after the Registrar verification provided, the Complainant verified the registrant information as provided and claims that, the registrant address appears to be fictitious.

The Respondent has filed an administratively compliant Response, contending that among others: (i) the denomination "Alibaba" derives from the Arabic folk tale "Ali Baba and the Forty Thieves" from the collection "One Thousand and One Nights", being used in the world prior to the Complainant's company founding and trademark application, (ii) the disputed domain name has not been used for commercial purposes, (iii) the disputed domain name does not overlap with the Complainant's business and thus does not cause confusion, (iv) the Respondent agreed to resolve the dispute amicably, but received no further response from the Complainant, (v) the Complainant's company is lacking good faith, (vi) the Complainant's company violates human rights.

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

I. Identity/Confusing Similarity

The Panel agrees that the disputed domain name <alibaba.bot> is identical to the Complainant's trademark ALIBABA, as the Complainant's ALIBABA trademark is included in its entirety in the disputed domain name.

The extension ".bot" is not to be taken into consideration when examining the similarity between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name (WIPO Case No. D2005-0016, Accor v. Noldc Inc.). The mere adjunction of a generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") such as ".bot" is irrelevant as it is well established that the generic Top Level Domain is insufficient to avoid a finding of confusing similarity (WIPO Case No. 2013-0820, L'Oréal v Tina Smith, WIPO Case No. D2008-0820 Titoni AG v Runxin Wang and WIPO Case No. D2009-0877, Alstom v. Itete Peru S.A.).

Therefore, the Panel is satisfied that the first condition under the Policy is met.

II. Lack of Respondent's rights or legitimate interests

The Complainant is required to make out a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. Once such prima facie case is made, the burden of proof shifts to the respondent to come forward with appropriate allegations or evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. If the respondent fails to come forward with such appropriate allegations or evidence, a complainant is generally deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the UDRP.

Based on the available evidence, the Respondent does not appear to be known by the disputed domain name, as such is not identified in the WHOIS database as the disputed domain name or by the terms "alibaba". The Complainant has never authorised, permitted, or otherwise granted consent to the Respondent to make use of its ALIBABA trademark, nor of a confusingly similar trademark in the disputed domain name.

Moreover, based on the evidence submitted by the Complainant and not refuted by the Respondent, the Complainant has never had any business, commercial, or contractual relationship with the Respondent.

Furthermore, the disputed domain name which incorporate entirely the Complainant's trademark ALIBABA, resolved, as per the evidence filed by the Complainant, to a website about humanoid robots, industrial manipulators, servo actuators and intelligent hardware, which although it mentioned that the content was provided for educational and public science popularization purposes, did not disclose in a clear and prominent manner the lack of relationship with the Complainant and its business, creating thus the impression of being affiliated with, authorised by, or endorsed by the Complainant in relation to its ALIBABA trademark.

The above does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services, or to a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The aspects claimed in the response filed by the Respondent in the file do support a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Therefore, the Panel is satisfied that also the second requirement under the Policy is met.

III. Bad Faith

Based on the available evidence, the Complainant's ALIBABA mark predates the registration date of the disputed domain

name. Thus, the Respondent has chosen to register the disputed domain name incorporating entirely the Complainant’s trademark ALIBABA in order to create a confusion with such trademark. Therefore, the Panel concludes that at the time of registration of the disputed domain name, the Respondent was well aware of the Complainant’s ALIBABA trademark and has intentionally registered the disputed domain name in order to create confusion with such trademark.

In the present case, the following factors should be considered:

- (i) the Complainant's ALIBABA mark predates the registration date of the disputed domain name;
- (ii) the Respondent failed to submit any evidence of actual or contemplated good faith use of the disputed domain name through the filed response;
- (iii) the Respondent registered the disputed domain name incorporating entirely the Complainant’s ALIBABA trademark;
- (iv) the Respondent was not authorised to use a domain name identical / similar to the Complainant's ALIBABA trademark;
- (v) the disputed domain name resolved to a website about humanoid robots, industrial manipulators, servo actuators and intelligent hardware, one of the Complainant’s and its group of companies business, without disclosing in a clear and prominent manner the lack of relationship with the Complainant.

In light of the foregoing, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has registered and has been using the disputed domain name in bad faith. Thus, also the third and last condition under the Policy is satisfied.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

- 1. alibaba.bot: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Delia-Mihaela Belciu
------	----------------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-08-17

Publish the Decision