Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-109050

Case number	**CAC-UDRP-109050**
Time of filing	**2026-10-06 11:02:12**
Domain names	**wan30ai.com**

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	**Alibaba Innovation Private Limited**

Complainant representative

Organization	**Convey srl**

Respondent

Name	**Qinjie Xu**

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 is the owner of many trademark registration for, *inter alia*, WAN and WANX wordwide, including:

- Hong Kong trademark WANX with registration number 306741441, registered on November 29, 2024 for goods and services in classes 9 and 42;
- European Union trademark WANX, with registration number 019113519, registered on August 2, 2025 for goods and services in classes 9 and 42; and
- United Kingdom trademark WAN, registration number UK00004164944, registered on July 25, 2025 for goods and services in classes 9 and 42.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is part of the Alibaba Group and is active in, inter alia, Internet and technology services, cloud computing and artificial intelligence {"AI"). It has developed a family of AI video-generation models under the WAN brand, including WAN 2.5, WAN 2.6, WAN 2.7 and WAN 3.0. Originally the Complainant launched its AI video-generation models under the name "Tongyi Wanxiang", the model subsequently evolved into "Tongyi WANX", then "WANX", and was ultimately rebranded as "WAN" in February 2025.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 8, 2026, and resolves to a commercial website promoting AI video-generation

services by reference to the Complainant's WAN models. The website presents services under the designation "Wave AI" and a link "Generate with Wan 3.0" under the description of WAN.3.0 directs Internet users to a website under the domain name <wwqr.com>, where paid AI video-generation services are offered.

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.

No administratively compliant Response has been filed.

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

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions. The Respondent's default does not automatically result in a decision in favour of the Complainant, which must establish each element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy. Pursuant to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, the Panel may draw such inferences from the Respondent's default as it considers appropriate.

1. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's WAN trademark. The WAN trademark is reproduced in its entirety and is clearly recognizable in the disputed domain name. The additions "30" and "ai" do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. According to section 1.11 of WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), the "applicable Top Level Domain ("TLD") in a domain name (e.g., ".com", ".club", ".nyc") is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test".
2. The Complainant must make a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, after which the burden of production shifts to the Respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests. If the Respondent fails to provide such evidence, the Complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1.

   The Complainant has undisputedly stated that it has not licensed, authorized or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its trademarks or to register a domain name incorporating any of those trademarks. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or by the term "Wan". The disputed domain name resolves to a commercial website that extensively refers to the Complainant's WAN-branded AI video-generation models, including WAN 2.5, WAN 2.6, WAN 2.7 and WAN 3.0. The disputed domain name combines the Complainant's WAN trademark with elements that refer directly to the Complainant's WAN 3.0 AI technology. The use of the disputed domain name in connection with a commercial website that promotes services by repeated reference to the Complainant's models creates a misleading impression of sponsorship, affiliation or

endorsement. A use that falsely suggests affiliation with the trademark owner cannot constitute fair use. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.3. The redirection of Internet users who use the link ""Generate with Wan 3.0" to a separate commercial website likewise does not establish rights or legitimate interests.

As a side note the Panel observes that the second element may have been assessed differently if the Respondent had created a value-added service based on the Complainant's WAN-branded AI video generators, but the Panel cannot infer from the website to which the disputed domain name resolves that this is the case. It would have been incumbent upon the Respondent to provide clarity on this matter, but it failed to do so.

The Panel is therefore satisfied that the Complainant has made a prima facie case which has not been rebutted and therefore finds that the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

3. The Complainant's relevant trademark registrations predate the registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant alleges that the disputed domain name combines the Complainant's WAN trademark with "30", corresponding to the designation WAN 3.0, and "ai", referring to the technological field in which the Complainant uses its WAN marks, which has not been refuted by the Respondent. Moreover, the website to which the disputed domain name resolves repeatedly and specifically refers to the Complainant's WAN 3.0, WAN 2.7, WAN 2.6 and WAN 2.5 AI video-generation models. The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its trademarks when registering the disputed domain name and deliberately selected the disputed domain name to target the Complainant's WAN-branded technology.

   The disputed domain name is used to attract Internet users to a commercial website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's WAN trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the website and the services promoted on it. Although the website uses the designation "Wave AI", it repeatedly relies on the Complainant's WAN mark and model designations and directs users, who wants to make use of the WAN 3.0 model to commercial services offered through the website under the domain name <wwqr.com>. Such redirection to a different respondent-associated website may support a finding of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.4 sub (iv). The Respondent has not provided any explanation for its choice and use of the disputed domain name. In the circumstances of this case, the Panel finds that it is likely that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks.

   The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith and that the Complainant has satisfied 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. **wan30ai.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Alfred Meijboom**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-11-06

Publish the Decision