Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-109053

Case number	CAC-UDRP-109053
Time of filing	2026-10-09 09:37:09
Domain names	taobaoshangou.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Alibaba (China) Co. Ltd.

Complainant representative

Organization	Thomsen Trampedach GmbH

Respondent

Name	qiang liu

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 states that it has rights in the following, among others, national (Chinese) and EU trademark registrations:

- 006725964 “TAOBAO.COM”, registered on 28 April 2010, for goods and services in classes 9, 38, 35, and 42;
- 35426829 "taobao", registered on 21 October 2020, for services in class 45;
- 87022990 "taobaoshangou", registered on 14 May 2026, for products in class 21;
- 85055884 "“, registered on 21 December 2025, for services in class 35.

The Complainant proved ownership of the aforementioned registrations by the submitted trademark lists from national and international databases.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant Alibaba (China) Co. Ltd., together with its affiliates doing business as “Alibaba”, is one of the world's largest companies in e-commerce, retail, Internet, and technology. In 2020, it was also rated as the fifth-largest artificial intelligence company. The company hosts the largest B2B (Alibaba.com), C2C (Taobao), and B2C (Tmall) marketplaces in the world.

“Taobao” is a Chinese online shopping platform. It is headquartered in Hangzhou and is owned by Alibaba. According to Alexa rank,

it was the eighth most-visited website globally in 2021. <Taobao.com> was registered on 21 April 2003, by Alibaba Cloud Computing (Beijing) Co., Ltd.

Taobao Marketplace facilitates C2C retail by providing a platform for small businesses and individual entrepreneurs to open online stores that mainly cater to consumers in Chinese-speaking regions (Mainland China, Hong Kong, Macau and Taiwan) and abroad, which is made payable by online accounts. Its stores usually offer an express delivery service. As of at least 2024, it is the world's most popular shopping hub as measured by gross merchandise value.

“Taobao Shangou” (Chinese: ; lit. 'Taobao Flash Shopping') is Alibaba’s primary local life, quick-commerce (q-commerce), and food delivery service platform.

Founded in 2008 and known until 2025 as Ele.me (Chinese: ; lit. 'Are you hungry?'), it was the second largest online food delivery service platform in China as of 2023.

In April 2018, Alibaba Group and Ant Group acquired Ele.me in a landmark $9.5 billion all-cash deal. Alibaba integrated Ele.me with its local lifestyle unit “Koubei” Chinese: , lit. "Reputation”) to form a unified Local Life Service Group, leveraging Ele.me’s massive "Fengniao" (Chinese lit."Hummingbird") logistics fleet to power instant on-demand fulfillment for fresh groceries and retail.

In 2025, Ele.me was rebranded to “Taobao Shangou”. This move marked a pivot from being viewed primarily as a food delivery app to a comprehensive quick-commerce marketplace embedded directly into Alibaba’s core e-commerce powerhouse, Taobao.

As of 2026, “Taobao Shangou” is the second-largest local life and food delivery network in China, holding a massive market share right behind Tencent-backed Meituan. While available as a standalone app, its main traffic engine is directly integrated as a primary tab on the core Taobao mobile app. This allows Alibaba to cross-sell retail goods to instant-delivery consumers and vice versa. Beyond restaurant food, the platform relies heavily on 30-to-60-minute delivery for: Fresh produce, groceries, and convenience stores, Pharmacies and emergency healthcare supplies, and Digital products, daily hardware, stationary, and cosmetics.

Powered by the underlying Fengniao Instant Logistics network, the platform serves over 2,000 cities across mainland China. It continuously experiments with localized fulfillment solutions, including specialized indoor last-mile delivery teams in dense high-rise urban districts.

Accordingly, the Complainant, has been well-known by the name “Taobao” in China and worldwide, has held exclusive rights to the name “Taobao” for over 20 years and is the creator and sole rights holder of “TAOBAOSHANGOU”.

The disputed domain name <taobaoshangou.com> (hereinafter “disputed domain name”) was registered on 30 April 2025. According to the Registrar, the Respondent is ‘qiang liu’. The Respondent provided an address as being in China.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT:

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

RESPONDENT:

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 UDRP).

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 UDRP).

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 UDRP).

PROCEDURAL FACTORS

The Panel is satisfied that all procedural requirements under the UDRP were met and there is no other reason why it would be inappropriate to provide a decision.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

In the present case, the Respondent has not submitted any Response and consequently has not contested any of the contentions made by the Complainant. Therefore, the Panel proceeds to decide only on the basis of the Complainant's factual statements and the documentary evidence provided in support of them [Paragraph 5(f) of The Rules].

1. CONFUSING SIMILARITY

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark.

The WIPO Overview 3.1 in Paragraph 1.2.1 states: "Where the complainant holds a nationally or regionally registered trademark or service mark, this prima facie satisfies the threshold requirement of having trademark rights for purposes of standing to file a UDRP case."

The WIPO Overview 3.1 in Paragraph 1.7 states: "[…] in cases where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark […] the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark for purposes of UDRP standing."

The WIPO Overview 3.1 in Paragraph 1.11.1 states: "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."

In the present case, the Complainant has established that it has rights in multiple national EU trademark registrations for the "TAOBAO", "TAOBAO.COM", "", "TAOBAOSHANGOU", "" terms.

Following the Complainant's contention, "taobao" is the only pinyin writing way of "" and "shangou" is precisely the pinyin representation of "". The element "taobao" in the disputed domain name directly incorporates the pinyin form of this trademark. "taobaoshangou" as a whole constitutes the complete pinyin form of "". "SHANGOU" itself refers to "", ""or "" in Chinese, and it may be regarded as a generic term.

The Panel finds that in the disputed domain name, the "TAOBAO" and "TAOBAOSHANGOU" trademarks are presented and clearly recognizable in its entirety.

The <.com> gTLD in the disputed domain name is not sufficient to prevent the finding of confusing similarity since it is regarded as a necessary technical requirement of registration.

As a result, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the UDRP.

2. THE RESPONDENT´S LACK OF RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTEREST IN THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME

The Panel finds that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name.

According to Paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the UDRP, the Complainant shall make a case that the Respondent lacks rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. If the Complainant fulfills this demand the burden of proof shifts to the Respondent and so the Respondent shall demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. If the Respondent fails to prove its rights or legitimate interests, it is assumed that the Complainant satisfied the element of Paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the UDRP (see CAC Case No. 102430, Lesaffre et Compagnie v. Tims Dozman). Moreover, past panels were of the view that it is difficult or sometimes impossible to prove negative facts, i.e., absence of rights or legitimate interest on the part of the Respondent. In this respect, past panels referred to the WIPO Case No. D2000-1769, Neusiedler Aktiengesellschaft v. Vinayak Kulkarni. Within the meaning of Paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, once the complainant has made something credible (prima facie evidence), the burden of proof shifts to the Respondent to show that he has rights or legitimate interests in the domain name at issue by providing concrete evidence.

The WIPO Overview 3.1 in Paragraph 2.5.1 states: "Generally speaking, UDRP panels have found that domain names identical to a complainant's trademark carry a high risk of implied affiliation."

The Complainant contends that there is no evidence to suggest that Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. The WHOIS information for the disputed domain name does not indicate that Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Complainant adds that, as revealed by trademark searches conducted through the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, the European Union Intellectual Property Office, and WIPO Global Brand databases, the Respondent is neither associated with nor commonly known by the term "TAOBAO", "SHANGOU" or "TAOBAOSHANGOU".

Complainant has not licensed, otherwise permitted, or authorized Respondent to use the “TAOBAO” or “TAOBAOSHANGOU” trademarks or brand.

The Complainant claims that the Respondent’s actions in connection with the disputed domain name cannot be considered a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

Firstly, the Respondent applied a privacy or proxy service to hide its identity in the WHOIS information. Privacy services do not demonstrate that the registrant owns a trademark corresponding to the domain name or has been using the domain name in good faith to provide goods or services.

Secondly, the disputed domain name was redirected to a webpage listing the domain name for sale. The screenshot was caught on 1 May 2025, the day after the disputed domain name was registered, and again caught on 21 September 2026 (evidenced by the submitted screenshots).

The Complainant contends that offering to sell a domain name identical to a famous trademark or trade name immediately after registration does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor does it demonstrate that the Respondent has rights or legitimate interests in the domain name under the Policy.

On 30 September 2026, the Complainant's representative sent a dispute notice via the registrar Dynadot’s dispute report form, and again on 5 October 2026, the Complainant sent a C&D email to the email address shown on the historical screenshot on 1 May 2025. On 8 October 2026, the Respondent replied to the C&D letter sent by the Complainant's representative. In email correspondence, the Respondent denied having registered or used the domain in bad faith and rejected the rights holder's request to transfer the domain at the original cost. Instead, the Respondent demanded to sell the disputed domain name to the rights holder at a price 30 times higher than the original cost. Furthermore, the Respondent failed to provide any evidence of good faith.

The Respondent did not file any Response to the Complaint. Thus, the Respondent failed to demonstrate rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name.

To the satisfaction of the Panel, the Complainant made a prima facie case that there is no connection between the Complainant and the Respondent and that the Respondent does not have authorization in the disputed domain name or in the “TAOBAO”, “SHANGOU” or “TAOBAOSHANGOU” trademarks and the respective terms from the Complainant.

Above, the Panel found that the Complainant has rights in multiple national (Chinese) and EU trademark registrations for the “TAOBAO”, “”, “TAOBAOSHANGOU” and “” terms.

Following the information about the Complainant and the extent of its business activities, the Panel is of the opinion that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant, its trademark and business activities at the moment of registering the disputed domain name.

The Respondent cannot be recognized under the disputed domain name, since its identity is hidden in the submitted WHOIS information for the disputed domain name.

Moreover, the Complainant submitted evidence, from which is clear that the Respondent is offering the disputed domain name for sale from the day after the registration of the disputed domain name. Therefore, the Respondent has no demonstrable plan to use the disputed domain name and does not carry out any noncommercial nor fair use activity.

In conclusion, the Panel is of the view that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied the requirement under Paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the UDRP.

3. THE REGISTRATION AND USE OF THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME IN BAD FAITH

The Panel finds that the Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The WIPO Overview 3.1 in Paragraph 3.1.4 states: “Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos or incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term) to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith […].“

In the WIPO Case No. D2020-2116, VFS Global Services Private Limited v. WhoisGuard, Inc., Quijano & Associates / Narendra Singhmanushi, the Panel stated: “The Panel also determines that the Respondent’s use of the privacy protection service, WhoisGuard in the circumstances of the present case constitutes additional evidence of bad faith. Absent any explanation from the Respondent, the Panel cannot conceive of any plausible good faith use of the disputed Domain Name that could be made by the Respondent. The Respondent’s conduct in registering the disputed Domain Name therefore constitutes opportunistic bad faith.”

Above, the Panel found that the Complainant has rights in multiple national (Chinese) and EU trademark registrations for the “TAOBAO”, “”, “TAOBAOSHANGOU”, “” verbal elements.

This Panel is of the opinion that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant, its trademark and business activities at the moment of registering the disputed domain names on 30 April 2025.

The Panel cannot find any indicators of the Respondent’s good faith in registering or using the disputed domain name.

Firstly, the Panel found the disputed domain name to be confusingly similar (cf. part 1. above).

Secondly, from WHOIS information, it is clear that the identification of the Respondent is hidden (privacy protected).

Thirdly, the Complainant submitted evidence (screenshots of the respective website) from which it is clear that the disputed domain name is for sale. Moreover, the disputed domain name has been for sale from (at least) 1 May 2025, i.e. for nearly the whole time of its existence.

The Complainant pointed out that on 30 April 2025, the TAOBAOSHANGOU service was launched publicly. There were several media reports about this launch in the media. On the same day, the Complainant also filed an application for the trademark “” with the China National Intellectual Property Administration.

In the given circumstances, the registration of the disputed domain name seems to be an example of an opportunistic bad faith registration. Since there is no demonstrable plan from the Respondent and the Respondent is not known under the disputed domain name, the Panel is of the view that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in order to benefit from its following resale.

Therefore, the Panel states that the Respondent did not register and is not using the disputed domain name in good faith.

Following the above-mentioned, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied the conditions pursuant to Paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the UDRP.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **taobaoshangou.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Radim Charvát**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-11-12

Publish the Decision