

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108820

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108820
Time of filing	2026-07-10 11:39:33
Domain names	goofish.ai

Case administrator

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

Complainant

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

Complainant representative

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

Respondent

Name	yuhai quan
------	------------

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 the following registered trademarks owned by the Complainant itself (namely, the United States and South Korean trademarks listed below), jointly owned by the Complainant and another Alibaba Group company (namely, the Indonesian trademark), or owned by other companies within the Alibaba Group:

- Malaysian stylised trademark “Goofish GOOFISH”, no. TM2019023774, registered on 10 November 2021 for goods in class 9, owned by Alibaba Innovation Private Limited;
- New Zealand word trademark “GOOFISH”, no. 1124408, registered on 3 November 2020 for goods and services in classes 9, 35, 38, 41, 42 and 45, owned by Alibaba Innovation Private Limited;
- Chinese word trademark “GOOFISH”, no. 68556198, registered on 7 February 2024 for goods in class 25, owned by Alibaba (China) Co., Ltd.;
- European Union figurative trademark “Goofish”, no. 018090691, registered on 24 October 2019 for goods and services in classes 9, 35, 38, 41, 42 and 45, owned by Alibaba Innovation Private Limited;
- South Korean word trademark “GOOFISH”, no. 4016098440000, registered on 27 May 2020 for goods and services in classes 9, 35, 38, 41, 42 and 45, owned by the Complainant, Alibaba Group Holding Limited;
- Australian word trademark “GOOFISH”, no. 2020183, registered on 2 July 2019 for goods and services in classes 9, 35, 38, 41, 42 and 45, owned by Alibaba Innovation Private Limited;
- United Kingdom word trademark “GOOFISH”, no. UK00918090690, registered on 24 October 2019 for goods and services in classes 9, 35, 38, 41, 42 and 45, owned by Alibaba Innovation Private Limited;
- Singapore combined trademark “Goofish GOOFISH”, no. 40201914298Y, registered on 29 October 2020 for goods and services

- in classes 9, 35, 38, 41, 42 and 45, owned by Alibaba Innovation Private Limited;
- United States word trademark “GOOFISH”, registration no. 6473745, registered on 7 September 2021 for goods and services in classes 9, 35, 38, 41, 42 and 45, owned by the Complainant, Alibaba Group Holding Limited;
 - Indonesian combined trademark “Goofish”, application no. D002019036240, registered on 8 January 2021 for goods and services in classes 9, 35, 38, 41, 42 and 45, jointly owned by the Complainant and Alibaba Innovation Private Limited; and
 - Chinese word trademark “GOOFISH”, no. 57991640, registered on 28 January 2024 for services in class 35, owned by Alibaba (China) Co., Ltd.

These trademarks are hereinafter referred to collectively as the “GOOFISH Trademark” or the “Trademark”.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Facts asserted by the Complainant

The Complainant, Alibaba Group Holding Limited, is a multinational technology and e-commerce company founded in 1999 and operating in more than 190 countries and regions. Its activities include online marketplaces, cloud computing, digital media and entertainment, logistics and artificial intelligence services. The Complainant states that Alibaba Innovation Private Limited, the holder of certain relevant intellectual property rights, is an indirect wholly owned subsidiary of the Complainant.

The Complainant operates “Goofish”, a second-hand online marketplace known in China as “Xianyu”, through which users may buy and sell pre-owned goods. According to the Complainant, the platform includes artificial intelligence tools that generate product descriptions and suggest prices. The Complainant states that the Goofish brand has also been promoted internationally.

The Complainant relies on registrations for the GOOFISH mark in several jurisdictions, including Australia, China, the European Union, Indonesia, Malaysia, New Zealand, Singapore, South Korea, the United Kingdom and the United States. These registrations pre-date the registration of the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 1, 2024. According to the Complainant, it resolves to a pay-per-click parking page displaying links to third-party websites and was previously offered for sale for an amount exceeding the registrant’s reasonable out-of-pocket costs.

On June 15, 2026, the Complainant’s representative contacted the Respondent (or the previous registrant) through the Registrar’s contact facility, requesting that the Respondent cease using the GOOFISH designation and transfer the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant, the Respondent did not reply. A reverse WHOIS search conducted by the Complainant allegedly associated the Respondent with approximately 382 domain names, many of which concern technology, artificial intelligence, robotics, software, online platforms and digital commerce.

Facts asserted by the Respondent

The Respondent states that the disputed domain name was originally registered by a friend on August 1, 2024, and was transferred to the Respondent as a gift, without payment, on June 22, 2026. The Respondent relies on WeChat communications with the original registrant and an email confirming the transfer.

The Respondent acknowledges that the textual element of the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant’s GOOFISH mark, but states that the “.ai” extension is commonly associated with artificial intelligence projects and technology start-ups. According to the Respondent, the disputed domain name does not imitate the Complainant’s visual identity or branding.

The Respondent states that the disputed domain name is intended for an artificial intelligence website named “Gu Feiyu”, which the Respondent describes as the Chinese transliteration of “Goofish”. The Respondent further states that “Goofish” is a combination of the ordinary English words “goo” and “fish” and was selected for its meaning in the context of an artificial intelligence project, rather

than because of the Complainant or its marketplace.

The Respondent holds more than 300 other domain names relating to technology, artificial intelligence and emerging Internet concepts. According to the Respondent, these domain names display static “under construction” or “coming soon” pages and have not been used for phishing, traffic diversion or targeting third-party brands.

The Respondent denies having offered the disputed domain name for sale. The Respondent states that the evidence submitted by the Complainant relates to December 26, 2025, when the disputed domain name was still held by the Respondent’s friend. The Respondent also states that any advertisements displayed at the disputed domain name are generated through the default parking or redirection settings of the Registrar or hosting provider, that the Respondent did not configure them, and that the Respondent receives no revenue from them.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant’s contentions

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical to its registered GOOFISH Trademark; that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. These contentions are considered in greater detail below.

The Respondent’s contentions

The Respondent acknowledges that the disputed domain name corresponds to the Complainant’s GOOFISH Trademark but denies that Internet users would be confused, particularly because the “.ai” extension is associated with artificial intelligence projects. The Respondent contends that he has rights or legitimate interests because he received the disputed domain name as a gift from a friend and intends to use it for an artificial-intelligence project named “Gu Feiyu”. He further denies bad faith, arguing that the earlier offers to sell the disputed domain name predate his acquisition, that the parking page was generated automatically and produces no revenue for him, that holding a portfolio of technology-related domain names is not unlawful, and that “Goofish” is a combination of the ordinary English words “goo” and “fish”. These contentions are considered in greater detail below.

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.

Confusing similarity

The disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's Trademark GOOFISH with the addition of the Internet country code top-level domain (ccTLD) for Anguilla ".ai."

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name incorporates the entirety of the Complainant's Trademark. The ccTLD ".ai" is disregarded in the assessment of confusing similarity under the test of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

For these reasons, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name is identical to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

Rights or legitimate interests

As regards paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, while the overall burden of proof rests with the Complainant, it is commonly accepted that this should not result in an often-impossible task of proving a negative. Therefore, numerous previous panels have found that a complainant is required to make out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. Once such a prima facie case is made, the burden of production 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, the complainant is generally deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy. If the respondent does come forward with some allegations or evidence of relevant rights or legitimate interests, the panel then must weigh all the evidence, with the burden of proof always remaining on the complainant.

The Complainant argues that:

- The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name or by the name GOOFISH;
- The Respondent is not making a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. On the contrary, the Respondent uses the domain name for a webpage containing pay-per-click advertising links, thus generating commercial revenue from Internet users attracted by the Complainant's Trademark;
- The Respondent is not related to the Complainant. The Complainant has not granted a license or authorisation to the Respondent to use the Complainant's Trademark or apply for registration of the disputed domain name; and
- The disputed domain name was registered after the Complainant registered its Trademarks.

The Respondent argues that:

- The Respondent acquired the disputed domain name through a lawful gift from a friend;
- The Respondent did not pay for the domain name and did not hold it for speculative purposes;
- The landing pages of the disputed domain name and of the 300 other domain names owned by the Respondent do not contain misleading pay-per-click advertisements or links targeting any brands; and
- The Respondent intends to use the disputed domain name to create an AI website name "Gu Feiyu", the Chinese transliteration of "Goofish" in English.

The Panel finds that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name from the following facts:

- The disputed domain name includes the entire Trademark of the Complainant, with the only addition of ccTLD ".ai", which does not create any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

- There is no evidence that the Respondent is or has been commonly known by the disputed domain name or by the term “GOOFISH”, or any similar designation. The WHOIS information does not provide any information that might indicate any rights of the Respondent to use these terms.
- The Complainant’s Trademarks were registered well before the registration date of the disputed domain name or its transfer to the Respondent.
- There is no evidence to show that the Respondent is making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, without intent for commercial gain or to misleadingly divert consumers.
- The Respondent has not been shown to have any consent or authorisation to use the Complainant’s Trademark or variations thereof and does not seem to be related in any way to the Complainant.
- The Respondent has not shown that it holds any trademark rights or other rights regarding the term “GOOFISH” or any similar designation.
- The Respondent claims that he intends to develop an artificial-intelligence website named “Gu Feiyu”. However, the Respondent has submitted no business plan, preparatory materials, website design or other evidence supporting the alleged project. Neither the WeChat conversation nor the Dynadot correspondence mentions “Gu Feiyu” or any proposed artificial-intelligence project. Moreover, following its acquisition by the Respondent, the disputed domain name merely resolved to a commercial parking page. The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent’s unsupported assertion of a possible future use is insufficient to establish rights or legitimate interests or to rebut the Complainant’s prima facie case.

In sum, on the balance of probabilities, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case, which has not been rebutted by the Respondent, and that the evidence supports a finding that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel concludes that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Bad faith

The Complainant argues that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith:

- The Complainant states that the Registrant was fully aware of the Complainant’s Trademarks, which have been registered in various countries around the globe, including in China where the Respondent is based, and prior to the registration date of the domain name.
- The Complainant states that, in the past, the disputed domain name has been offered for sale for an amount highly exceeding reasonable out-of-pocket cost.
- Also, according to the Complainant, the disputed domain name resolves to a pay-per-click website generating revenue from Internet traffic attracted to the GOOFISH Trademark through which the Respondent advertises third party websites, thus creating the misleading impression that its website is operated by or affiliated with or endorsed by the Complainant.
- The Complainant also emphasises that it tried to contact the Respondent (or the previous registrant) who failed to provide any response.
- Finally, the Complainant argues that the Respondent owns approximately 382 domain name registrations and engages in a pattern of registrations targeting commercial identifiers operating in similar sectors as the Complainant.

The Respondent rebuts any bad faith registration or use with the following arguments:

- The offer for sale of the disputed domain name dates from before the transfer of the domain to the Respondent on June 22, 2026;
- The Respondent did not list the domain name for sale;

- The pay-per-click website (the Respondent calls it a “spam advertising page”) is the default setting of the domain registrar or the hosting provider. The Respondent has not set up these advertisements and does not profit from them;
- Holding a portfolio of domain names (that do not target well-known brands) is not illegal and does not indicate bad faith for this particular domain name; and
- The term GOOFISH has a generic nature, consisting of the English terms “GOO” (meaning sticky substance and used to refer to either Google or the Go programming language) and “FISH”. The intuitive meaning of the domain name is an “AI-based fish-shaped/sticky concept project” without connection to the Complainant’s second-hand e-commerce platform.

The Panel weighs these arguments and facts as follows:

As a preliminary matter, the Panel notes that the screenshots showing the disputed domain name offered for sale date from before the Respondent acquired it on June 22, 2026. In the absence of evidence that the Respondent controlled the disputed domain name during that earlier period or acted in concert with the previous registrant, the Panel does not attribute those offers for sale to the Respondent and does not rely on them in finding bad faith on his part.

First, as mentioned already, the disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's Trademark GOOFISH entirely, with the mere addition of ccTLD “.ai”, which at least creates the impression of an association with the Complainant and its GOOFISH Trademarks.

Second, the Complainant’s trademark registrations pre-date both the original registration of the disputed domain name and its acquisition by the Respondent.

Third, the Complainant’s Trademarks extend to China, where the Respondent is located.

Fourth, the evidence submitted by the Complainant indicates that the Respondent is associated with a substantial portfolio of domain names. A number of those domain names incorporate recognisable third-party commercial identifiers, including BMW ALPINA, FARADAY FUTURE, MOUTAI, INSPUR and XIAOPENG, sometimes together with terms relating to artificial intelligence or technology. Although the evidence does not establish as such that the domain names in the Respondent’s portfolio constitute an abusive registration, the presence of several domain names incorporating recognisable third-party brands lends some support to the Complainant’s allegation of a pattern of targeting third-party commercial identifiers.

Fifth, the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name for a bona fide offering of goods or services or for a legitimate non-commercial or fair use.

Sixth, the Respondent states that he acquired the disputed domain name from a friend on June 22, 2026. A transfer of a domain name to a new holder constitutes in principle a new registration for the purposes of the Policy. The relevant date for assessing registration in bad faith is therefore June 22, 2026, rather than the date on which the disputed domain name was originally registered. The evidence submitted by the Respondent confirms that, before accepting the transfer, he was informed that an unnamed “.ai” domain name was being offered to him. The Dynadot request subsequently received by the Respondent identified the domain name as <goofish.ai>. The Respondent therefore had the opportunity and responsibility to ascertain which domain name he was acquiring and whether it corresponded to the rights of a third party. This is particularly relevant given that the Respondent holds a substantial portfolio of domain names, including several incorporating recognisable third-party commercial identifiers. Nevertheless, the Respondent provides no evidence that he undertook any enquiry before accepting the transfer. On the contrary, the evidence indicates that he accepted the transfer within minutes of receiving the Dynadot request. In these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent either knew of the Complainant’s GOOFISH Trademark or deliberately avoided making enquiries that would have disclosed it.

Seventh, the Respondent’s explanation that he intended to develop an artificial-intelligence website named “Gu Feiyu” is unsupported by any evidence. Neither the WeChat conversation nor the Dynadot correspondence mentions that name or any proposed artificial-intelligence project, and the Respondent has submitted no business plan, preparatory materials, website design or other evidence of demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name for that purpose. This explanation was first advanced in the Response and is unsupported by any evidence. It does not provide a credible reason for the Respondent’s selection of a domain name identical to the Complainant’s Trademark.

The Panel also notes that the transfer occurred on June 22, 2026, only seven days after the Complainant sent its notification through the Registrar’s contact facility. This timing may raise questions concerning the previous holder’s reasons for transferring the disputed domain name. However, the evidence does not establish that the Respondent knew of the notification before accepting the transfer or participated in an attempt to evade the Complainant’s claim. The Panel therefore accords the timing of the transfer only limited weight in assessing the Respondent’s bad faith.

Eighth, following the transfer, the disputed domain name resolved to a pay-per-click parking page displaying advertising links. The Respondent cannot avoid responsibility for that use merely by asserting that the page was generated automatically by the Registrar or that he did not personally receive the resulting revenue. A domain name registrant is generally responsible for the content appearing at its domain name, including automatically generated parking pages.

Taking these circumstances together—namely, the identity of the disputed domain name to the Complainant’s pre-existing Trademark, the Respondent’s substantial domain name portfolio, his failure to undertake an appropriate enquiry before accepting the disputed domain name, the absence of any contemporaneous evidence supporting his alleged artificial-intelligence project and the subsequent commercial parking-page use—the Panel finds, on the balance of probabilities, that the Respondent knew of, or was wilfully blind to, the Complainant’s trademark rights when he acquired the disputed domain name. The Panel accordingly finds that the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

By using the disputed domain name and the associated website in this manner, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s Trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website. This constitutes evidence of bad-faith registration and use within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

For all the reasons set out above, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was 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. **goofish.ai**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Bart Van Besien
------	-----------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-08-25

Publish the Decision