



Asian Domain Name Dispute Resolution Centre

hong kong

(Hong Kong Office)

**ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

---

<b>Case No.</b>	HK-2101530
<b>Complainant:</b>	Shenzhen Relx Technology Co., Ltd
<b>Respondent:</b>	Charles Lee
<b>Disputed Domain Name(s):</b>	<relx.shop>

---

**1. The Parties and Contested Domain Name**

The Complainant is Shenzhen Relx Technology Co., Ltd, of Rm B-208, BLD A, 2F, Vanke Yunchang, Bodun Tech. Park, Chaguang Rd, Xili Subdistrict, Nanshan Dist., Shenzhen, Guangdong 518055, China.

The Respondent is Charles Lee, of Yu Hang Qu Liang Mu Lu 999Hao, Hang Zhou Shi, Zhe Jiang, 311100 the People's Republic of China.

The domain name at issue is relx.shop, registered by Respondent with GoDaddy.com, LLC, of 14455 North Hayden Rd, Suite 219, Scottsdale AZ 85260, United States.

**2. Procedural History**

On 27 August 2021, the Hong Kong Office of the Asian Domain Name Dispute Resolution Centre (the "Centre") received the Complaint filed by the Complainant in accordance with the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Policy") approved by the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) on 24 October 1999 and the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Rules").

On 31 August 2021, GoDaddy.com ("Registrar") confirmed with the Centre the registration details of the Disputed Domain Name.

On 31 August 2021, the Centre sent an email communication to the Complainant providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint by 5 September 2021. The Complainant submitted the amended Complaint to the Centre on 1 September 2021.

On 1 September 2021, the Centre sent the Notification of Commencement of Proceedings to the Respondent informing the Respondent that the proceedings official commenced and requested the Respondent to reply within 20 days (i.e. on or before 21 September 2021).

On 23 September 2021, the Centre confirmed receiving no response from the Respondent within the specified time period.

On 23 September 2021, the Centre appointed Mr Eugene Low as the sole panelist.

### **3. Factual background**

#### *For the Complainant*

The Complainant, Shenzhen Relx Technology Co., Ltd (Chinese name: 深圳雾芯科技有限公司), is a company registered under the laws of the People's Republic of China. The Complainant is the owner of trademark registrations for its RELX brand across various jurisdictions. Its primary operations include the research, development, manufacturing and distribution of its RELX 悦刻 brand of e-vapor products.

#### *For the Respondent*

The Respondent is Charles Lee with a contact email address [bjlixia@outlook.com](mailto:bjlixia@outlook.com).

### **4. Parties' Contentions**

#### **A. Complainant**

The Complainant's contentions may be summarized as follows:

Complainant is a leading e-vapor company based in Shenzhen, China. It is committed to building and strengthening its brand by promoting the prevention of underage use of its products through a number of key initiatives e.g. the technology-driven Sunflower System in collaboration with its network of distributors, retailers and partners. Complainant also actively supports a variety of social responsibility initiatives relating to anti-counterfeiting, environmental protection and charity. Complainant's RELX brand is well known among its users, distributors, retailers and industry peers for its association with social responsibility.

Complainant operates the website at its primary domain name <relxtech.com>.

Complainant is the owner of trademark registrations for its RELX brand across various jurisdictions, including at the China's Trademark Office of National Intellectual Property Administration ("CNIPA"), the United States Patent & Trademark Office ("USPTO"), European Union's Intellectual Property Office ("EUIPO") and Thailand's Department of Intellectual Property ("TH-DIP"). Complainant has spent a considerable amount of time and money protecting its intellectual property rights. These registrations are referred to hereafter as the "RELX trademark" or "Complainant's trademark." The trademark registrations relevant to this instant matter are:

TRADEMARK	JURISDICTION/ TM OFFICE	REGISTRATION NUMBER	REGISTRATION DATE	CLASS
RELX & Design	TH / TH-DIP	1954762	2020-11-10	34
RELX & Design	CN / CNIPA	28527765	2018-12-07	34
RELX & Design	US / USPTO	5818187	2019-07-30	34
RELX & Design	EM / EUIPO	017652439	2018-05-18	34

i) The disputed domain name(s) is/are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights:

Complainant is the owner of the RELX trademark. The Second Level Domain of the Disputed Domain Name solely consists of the textual element of Complainant's RELX trademark, resulting in a domain name that is confusingly similar to Complainant's RELX trademark. Here, Complainant holds trademark registrations for a design logo prominently featuring the word RELX, making the Disputed Domain Name confusingly similar to the prominent textual element of Complainant's trademark.

Respondent's use of the Disputed Domain Name also contributes to the confusion. Respondent is using the Disputed Domain Name to resolve to a website that uses Complainant's logo and purports to be "RELX SHOP" and sells RELX branded products, which suggests that Respondent intended the Disputed Domain Name to be confusingly similar to Complainant's trademark as a means of furthering consumer confusion.

ii) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name(s):

The granting of registrations by TH-DIP, CNIPA, USPTO and EUIPO to Complainant for the RELX trademark is prima facie evidence of the validity of the terms "relx" as a trademark. These registrations also prove Complainant's ownership of this trademark, and of Complainant's exclusive right to use the RELX trademark in commerce on or in connection with the goods and/or services registered.

Respondent is not sponsored by or affiliated with Complainant in any way. Furthermore, Complainant has not licensed, authorized, or permitted Respondent to use Complainant's trademark in any manner, including in domain names.

Respondent is not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name, which evinces a lack of rights or legitimate interests.

In the instant case, the pertinent Whois information identifies the Registrant as "Charles Lee / Lee Charles", which does not resemble the Disputed Domain Name in any manner. Thus, where no evidence, including the Whois record for the Disputed Domain Name, suggests that Respondent is commonly known by the Disputed

Domain Name, then Respondent cannot be regarded as having acquired rights to or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name within the meaning of ¶ 4(c)(ii).

Respondent is not making a bona fide offering of goods or services or legitimate, noncommercial fair use of the Disputed Domain Name. Respondent uses the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a commercial website claiming to be “RELX SHOP”, and attempting to offer unauthorized or potentially counterfeited products bearing Complainant’s brand. Past Panels have concluded that a respondent’s efforts to sell unauthorized or potentially counterfeit products under the guise of a complainant’s brand, trademarks, and/or logos amounts to neither a bona fide offering of goods or services under Policy ¶ 4(c)(i), nor a Policy ¶ 4(c)(iii) legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

Even assuming that Respondent is using the Disputed Domain Name to offer Complainant’s genuine products, Respondent’s use of the Disputed Domain Name still does not qualify as a bona fide offering of goods or services as contemplated by Policy ¶ 4(c)(i). The Oki Data Test has been generally followed to determine whether a respondent’s use of a disputed domain name in the resale of a complainant’s products constitutes a bona fide offering of goods or services in accord with Policy ¶ 4(c)(i). See *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, D2001-0903 (WIPO Nov. 6, 2001)

Here, Respondent is not an authorized reseller or distributor for Complainant and Respondent’s use of the Disputed Domain Name fails to meet the third criterion of the Oki Data Test, which requires that the website accurately discloses the Respondent’s relationship with the Complainant. The website found at the Disputed Domain Name has no visible disclaimer stating that the website is neither endorsed nor sponsored by the Complainant to explain the non-existing relationship with the trademark holder. Instead, Respondent named its website as “RELX SHOP”, (mis)representing itself as Complainant or its affiliate. This (mis)representation conveys the false impression that the Respondent was authorized to use Complainant’s trademark and offer Complainant’s products. Respondent’s website is clearly commercial in nature and it is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name.

Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name on February 4, 2021, which is after Complainant’s registration of its RELX trademark with TH-DIP, CNIPA, USPTO and EUIPO, and Complainant’s first use in commerce of its trademark in July 2018. The Disputed Domain Name’s registration date is also after the Complainant’s registration of its <relxtech.com> domain name on November 27, 2017.

For the reasons set out above, the Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name.

iii) The disputed domain name(s) has/have been registered and is/are being used in bad faith:

The Complainant and its RELX trademark are known internationally, with trademark registrations across numerous countries. The Complainant has marketed and sold its

goods and services using this trademark since 2018, which is before Respondent's registration of the Disputed Domain Name.

By registering a domain name that exactly matches the term RELX, Respondent has created a domain name that is confusingly similar to Complainant's trademark. As such, Respondent has demonstrated a knowledge of and familiarity with Complainant's brand and business. Further, Respondent's website offers sale of goods that are identical to Complainant's goods and bearing Complainant's brand, with Respondent alleging that it is Complainant or its affiliate. Thus, it is "not possible to conceive of a plausible situation in which the Respondent would have been unaware of" the Complainant's brand at the time the Disputed Domain Name was registered. Stated differently, RELX is so closely linked and associated with Complainant that Respondent's use of this mark, or any minor variation thereof strongly implies bad faith.

Respondent creates a likelihood of confusion with Complainant and its trademark by naming its website as "RELX SHOP", with Respondent then attempting to profit from such confusion by offering unauthorized or potentially counterfeit products bearing Complainant's brand. As such, Respondent is attempting to cause consumer confusion in a nefarious attempt to profit from such confusion. The impression given by the Disputed Domain Name and its website would cause consumers to believe the Respondent is somehow associated with Complainant when, in fact, it is not. Respondent's actions create a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Disputed Domain Name, and the Respondent is thus using the fame of the Complainant's trademarks to improperly increase traffic to the website listed at the Disputed Domain Name for Respondent's own commercial gain. It is well-established that such conduct constitutes bad faith.

Moreover, Respondent's use of the Disputed Domain Name constitutes a disruption of Complainant's business and qualifies as bad faith registration and use under Policy ¶4(b)(iii) because Respondent's domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's trademark and the website at the Disputed Domain Name is being used to offer Complainant's goods without Complainant's authorization or approval. Past Panels have confirmed that using a confusingly similar domain to mislead consumers and then offering a complainant's goods or services is evidence of bad faith registration and use.

In addition to the Disputed Domain Name, the Respondent currently holds registrations for several other domain names that misappropriate the trademarks of well-known brands and businesses. This fact demonstrates that the Respondent is engaging in a pattern of cybersquatting/typosquatting, which is evidence of bad faith registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name. The below represent further examples of cybersquatting/typosquatting by Respondent, thus establishing a pattern of such conduct and bad faith registration and use:

- <bridgestone.site> (Bridgestone Corporation – BRIDGESTONE)
- <burgerking.store> (Burger King Corporation – BURGER KING)
- <cocacola.life> (The Coca-Cola Company – COCA-COLA)
- <crocs.online> (Crocs, Inc. – CROCS)
- <fujitsu.xyz> (Fujitsu Limited – FUJITSU)

Finally, on balance of the facts set forth above, it is more likely than not that the Respondent knew of and targeted Complainant's trademark, and Respondent should be found to have registered and used the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith.

**B. Respondent**

The Respondent has not submitted any Response.

**5. Findings**

The ICANN Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy provides, at Paragraph 4(a), that each of three findings must be made in order for a Complainant to prevail:

- i. Respondent's domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights; and
- ii. Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and
- iii. Respondent's domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

**A) Identical / Confusingly Similar**

Based on the Complainant's trademark registrations for its RELX & Design trademarks, and in addition to the Complainant's actual use of the "RELX" mark, the Panelist is satisfied that the Complainant has rights to the mark "RELX" for the purpose of Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

The Disputed Domain Name consists of "RELX" and ".SHOP". "RELX" is identical to the Complainant's mark. ".SHOP" is a top level domain suffix and generally cannot help to differentiate a disputed domain name. The distinctive part of the Disputed Domain Name is therefore "RELX" which is identical to the Complainant's mark. Here, the Panelist considers that the suffix ".SHOP" may even add to the confusion by suggesting that the Disputed Domain Name or its associated website is being used as a shop or online shop.

The Panelist considers that Element (1) is satisfied.

**B) Rights and Legitimate Interests**

It is well established that under this Element, the burden of proof shall be effectively shifted to the Respondent once the Complainant has made out a prima facie case.

The Panelist is satisfied that the Complainant has made out a prima facie case that it has ownership of the RELX trademarks and exclusive right to use the RELX trademarks on goods and services these registrations cover. The Complainant further confirmed that the Respondent is not sponsored by or affiliated with Complainant in any way nor licensed, authorized, or permitted to use the Complainant's trademarks in any manner, including in domain names.

In the absence of any Response from the Respondent, there is no evidence before the Panelist to conclude that the Respondent has any rights on legitimate interest in the Disputed Domain Name.

The Panelist considers that Element (2) is satisfied.

### **C) Bad Faith**

The Complainant has adduced evidence that the Respondent's website on the Disputed Domain Name offers for sale goods that are identical to Complainant's goods and bearing Complainant's brand, with the Respondent alleging that it is Complainant or its affiliate. However, the Respondent is not an authorized reseller or distributor for the Complainant.

The Complainant has further adduced evidence of prior Panel decisions in which domain names have been transferred away from the Respondent to complaining parties, and that the Respondent has engaged in a bad faith pattern of cybersquatting, holding registrations for other domain names that misappropriate the trademarks of well-known brands and businesses.

Looking at the evidence as a whole, the Panelist has reason to believe that the Respondent knew of and targeted the Complainant's trademark, and have registered and used the Disputed Domain Name to mislead consumers and disrupt the Complainant's business. Therefore, the Panel finds that Respondent has registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith.

## **6. Decision**

The Complainant has proved all three elements. In accordance with the Complainant's request, the Panelist orders the Disputed Domain Name to be transferred to the Complainant.



Eugene Low  
Panelist

Dated: 4 October 2021