1. The Parties and Contested Domain Name

The Complainant is Waterly Pharmaceuticals Pty Ltd ("Complainant") whose registered office is situated at Level 25, 88 Phillip Street, SYDNEY NSW 2000; and its authorized representative in this matter is Vivien Chan & Co. whose address is situated at 32/F, Harbour Centre, 25 Harbour Road, Wanchai, Hong Kong.

The Respondent is Aither Medical Holding Limited ("Respondent") whose address is situated at 香港油塘四山街2號油塘工業大廈第三座7樓D2室.

The domain name at issue is <CEMOY.COM.HK> ("Disputed Domain Name" or "disputed domain name") registered with Hong Kong Domain Name Registration Company Limited ("Registrar").

2. Procedural History

On 4 November 2020, Hong Kong International Arbitration Centre ("HKIAC") received a complaint (which was subsequently revised on 12 November 2020) (the "Complaint") filed by the Complainant pursuant to the Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy for .hk and. 香港 domain names (the “Policy”), adopted by the Hong Kong Domain Name Internet Registration Corporation Limited ("HKIRC") on 22 February 2011, the HKIRC Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy Rules of
Procedure (the “Rules”), approved by HKIRC effective from 15 July 2020, and the HKIAC Supplemental Rules for HKIRC Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”), effective from 15 July 2020.

On 5 November 2020, HKIAC transmitted by email to the Registrar, a request for registrar verification in connection with the WHOIS of the registrant of the Disputed Domain Name.

By email of 6 November 2020, the Registrar confirmed that the Respondent is the registrant or holder of the Disputed Domain Name; and that the Policy is applicable to the current dispute; and provided HKIAC with the WHOIS information regarding the Disputed Domain Name, including the administrative and technical contacts of the Respondent.

On 12 November 2020, HKIAC served on the Respondent by email the Notification of Commencement of Proceedings (“NCP”) and that the Respondent had 15 business days, on or before 3 December 2020, to submit a Response to the Complaint in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and the Supplemental Rules. The Complaint and its annexures were attached to the NCP issued by HKIAC.

The Respondent did not respond to the Complaint by the due date; and on 4 December 2020, HKIAC issued a notification of the Respondent in Default.

On 7 December 2020, HKIAC appointed Mr. Raymond HO as the sole Panelist of the Arbitration Panel in this matter. The said sole Panelist has, prior to the appointment, submitted his Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence in compliance with the Rules; and the case file was transferred by HKIAC to the said sole Panelist on the same date.

On 8 December 2020, by Procedural Order No. 1, the Arbitration Panel directed the Complainant to clarify its eligibility for the registration of the Disputed Domain Name under the Domain Name Registration Policies, Procedures and Guidelines for .hk and .香港 domain names (the “Registration Policies”) issued by HKIRC. By an email of 9 December 2020, the Complainant clarified that it was requesting for an order of cancellation of the Disputed Domain Name but not a transfer in its favour at the conclusion of these proceedings. The Respondent has not responded to the
Complainant’s clarification notwithstanding leave given to do so within 3 calendar days thereafter.

3. Factual Background

The Complainant, Waterly Pharmaceuticals Pty Ltd, was registered as an Australian private company on 7 November 2012 with a name start date of 26 October 2017 and is the holder of the business “CEMOY” registered on 24 October 2017. The Complainant uses <https://cemoy.com/> as its official website. The Complainant has distributed and promoted its CEMOY-branded products internationally, through online and physical stores. Over the years, the gross sales revenue of CEMOY-branded products in Australia has increased from AUD 3.4 million in 2017-2018 to AUD 12.8 million in 2019-2020.

The Respondent, Aither Medical Holding Limited, was incorporated in Hong Kong and CHAN KING YEUNG is its contact person. The Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name <cemoy.com.hk> on 17 January 2018 for a duration of three years up to 18 January 2021.

4. Parties’ Contentions

A. The Complainant

The Complainant’s contentions are reproduced below.

“(i) The Registrant’s Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in Hong Kong in which the Complainant has rights;

In Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Richard macLeod d/b/a/ For Sale, WIPO Case No. D2000-0662, the panel held that a domain name is “identical or confusingly similar” to a trademark for purpose of the Policy when the domain name includes the trademark, regardless of the other terms in the domain name. The disputed domain name incorporates the trademark and trade name of the Complainant “CEMOY” in
its entirety, which is readily identifiable from the disputed domain name. As such, the disputed domain name is “identical or confusingly similar” to the Complainant’s trademark “CEMOY” in which the Complainant has rights.

As shown in Attachments 6, the Complainant has registered the trademark “CEMOY” in Australia as early as 8 June 2017 and started promoting its “CEMOY”-branded products in Hong Kong as least since November 2017. The disputed domain name was registered much later on 17 January 2018.

It is submitted that the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant’s “CEMOY” trademarks in which the Complainant has right and it is highly likely that confusion will be caused on the part of the public pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

(i) The Registrant has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name;

According to Malayan Banking Berhad v. Beauty, Success & Truth International, WIPO Case No. D2008-1393, once the complainant makes such a prima facie showing, the burden of production shifts to the respondent, though the burden of proof always remains on the complainant. If the respondent fails to come forward with evidence showing rights or legitimate interests, the complainant will have established the second element of the UDRP.

The Respondent’s name, Aither Medical Holding Limited has no connection with the term “CEMOY”. No trademark registration in relation to “CEMOY” owned by the Respondent in Hong Kong or elsewhere has been revealed. Hence, the Respondent does not own any legitimate interest in “CEMOY”.

The Complainant has no relationship with the Respondent. The Complainant has never authorized the Respondent to use “CEMOY” or to register a domain name on the Complainant’s behalf. The Respondent is not in any way related to the Complainant. The Respondent has used the Complainant’s mark to register the
disputed domain name without authorization from the Complainant. The Complainant is also unaware of any trademark or other intellectual property registrations for “CEMOY” in the name of the Respondent.

Based on the above, the Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in respect of the disputed domain name pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

(ii) the Registrant’s Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith;

According to paragraph 4(b) of the Policy, the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, if found to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith:

(i) circumstances indicating that the Registrant has registered or has acquired the Domain Name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the Domain Name registration to the Complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark, or to a competitor of that Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the Registrant’s documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the Domain Name; or

(ii) the Registrant has registered the Domain Name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding Domain Name, provided that the Registrant has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) the Registrant has registered the Domain Name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the Domain Name, the Registrant has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Registrant’s web site or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Registrant’s web site or location or of a product or service on the Registrant’s web site or location.
The Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith. The trade name and trademark “CEMOY” is a coined expression with no dictionary meaning created by the Complainant. The Respondent’s registration of the disputed domain name containing the word “cemoy” which is identical to the Complainant’s “CEMOY” marks as listed above can hardly be said to be a mere coincidence.

In addition, the Respondent have actual knowledge of the existence of the Complainant and its brand “CEMOY”. The webpage hosted under the disputed domain name displayed the Complainant’s marks “CEMÔY” and “CEMOY” without the Complainant’s authorization. This constitutes trademark infringement. As the Complainant is also the owner of the copyright subsisting in the mark “CEMÔY”, the Respondent’s unauthorised use of the mark “CEMÔY” also constitutes copyright infringement.

Moreover, the manager of the disputed domain name has actual knowledge of the Complainant’s existence, as well as its trade name and trademarks. According to the Whois record on HKDNR (Attachment 3), CHAN KING YEUNG is the manager of the disputed website. The Complainant has found that videos featuring “CEMOY” products and trademarks have been uploaded by CHAN KING YEUNG on YouTube (Attachment 11, e.g. CHAN KING YEUNG uploaded a video on CEMOY at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=namQI_JvTdU on 12 September 2018 which is a copy of the Complainant’s Youtube Video which was first published on 19 August 2018 on YouTube at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_forKo3Z-N4 (screenshots of the video and a comparison of CHAN’s video and the Complainant’s YouTube Video are shown in Attachment 12). This also constitutes copyright infringement.

As shown in page 10 of Attachment 13, the webpage hosted under the disputed domain name states the address of CEMOY as “Chanlor Pharmaceutic Pty Ltd, Level 29, 2 Chiefly Square, Sydney NSW 2000, Australia”. Chanlor Pharmaceutic Pty Ltd (“CPPL”) is a company affiliated to the Complainant. In particular, the
director of the Complainant, YAHAN WANG, is also the director of CPPL (See Attachment 14). The Complainant has granted CPPL an exclusive license to use its trademarks worldwide. The fact that the Respondent has stated the name of CPPL in the website also shows that they have clear knowledge of the “CEMOY” brand and the operation of the same and are seeking to mislead consumers into believing that they are an authorised licensee of the Complainant.

All these show that the Respondent obviously have knowledge of the Complainant’s brand/trademark “CEMOY” and “CEMOY”. Thus, the Respondent’s registration of the disputed domain name which is identical to the Complainant’s trade name and trademark in its entirety can hardly be a coincidence but instead is a bad faith registration based on its actual knowledge of the existence of the Complainant to take advantage of the fame and goodwill of the Complainant’s brand. The Respondent’s act may also constitute passing off.

The disputed domain name directs to a website which distributes and sells products bearing the Complainant’s “CEMOY” and “CEMOY” marks allegedly from the Complainant. To determine whether a middleman or distributor registered the domain name incorporating a prior trademark with bona fide, the following criteria should be satisfied at the same time: (1) Respondent must actually be offering the goods or services at issue on the website of the disputed domain name; (2) Respondent must be selling goods that only bear the trademark which has been incorporated in the disputed domain name, otherwise, it could be using the trademark to bait internet users and redirect them for promotion of other goods; (3) the respondent’s relationship with the trademark owner must be stated on the website, it should not misrepresent that the website is the Complainant’s website, or that the website is an official website when in fact it is the website of a distributor or agent; (4) The Respondent must not use the disputed domain name to monopolize the market. (Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc., WIPO Case No. D2001-0903; Page 15; Experian Information Solutions, Inc. v. Credit Research Inc., WIPO Case
The website did not specify the Respondent’s relationship with the Complainant. More importantly, the Complainant has never authorised the Respondent to act as its distributor in Hong Kong. These points to the fact that the Respondent took advantage of the disputed domain name to mislead the general public into thinking that the products of the Respondent are authorized by the Complainant, which seriously damaged the reputation of the Complainant and undermined public interest.

Further, the Complainant has registered and been using <cemoy.com> as their official website. The domain name incorporates the word element “CEMOY” in its entirety. When the general public perform an internet search for the keywords such as “CEMOY” or “CEMOY HONG KONG”, the website titled “CEMOY | 香港官方網站” (translation: CEMOY | Hong Kong Official Website) hosted under the disputed domain name will appear. The general consumers will thus be misled into believing that the disputed domain name is the Hong Kong version of the Complainant’s official website or that the Registrant is in anyway associated with the Complainant. The Complainant engages in the business of cosmetics of which source and reputation are of prime importance. The reputation of the Complainant will be severely damaged and the general public’s interest will be compromised if they are misled into believing that there is some sort of relationship between the Complainant and the disputed domain name. It is clear that the Respondent registered the domain name for the purpose of disrupting the business of the Complainant. The situation stipulated in paragraph 4(b)(iii) of the Policy has been satisfied.

As discussed in section (ii) above, the Respondent has no legitimate interest in the trade name / trademark “CEMOY”. On the other hand, the Complainant, through its extensive use of the “CEMOY” marks across the globe have already acquired a certain level of fame worldwide including in Hong Kong. As such it is obvious that the Respondent’s registration of the disputed domain name is an intentional attempt
to attract, for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the disputed website. The situation stipulated in paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy has been satisfied.

Based on the above, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith by the Respondent.”

References to Attachments in the Complainant’s submissions are those Attachments exhibited to the Complaint and are not reproduced herein.

Based on the above submissions, the Complainant requests that the Disputed Domain Name be ordered to be cancelled under the Policy.

B. The Respondent
The Respondent did not respond to the Complaint.

5. Discussion and Findings by the Arbitration Panel

Preliminary issues

Paragraph 14 of the Rules provides that (a) in the event that a Party, in the absence of exceptional circumstances as determined by the Arbitration Panel in its sole discretion, does not comply with any of the time periods established by the Rules, the Supplemental Rules or the Arbitration Panel, the Arbitration Panel shall proceed to a decision on the Complaint; and (b) if a Party, in the absence of exceptional circumstances as determined by an Arbitration Panel in its sole discretion, does not comply with any provision of, or requirement under the Rules, the Supplemental Rules or any request from an Arbitration Panel, the Arbitration Panel may draw such inferences therefrom as it considers appropriate.
On the evidence contained in the case file of this matter, the Arbitration Panel is satisfied that the NCP of the Complaint was duly served on the Respondent by HKIAC in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and the Supplementary Rules.

Based on the confirmation given by the Registrar, the Arbitration Panel finds that the language of the proceedings in this matter is English.

In accordance with Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, the Arbitration Panel shall decide the Complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted to it and in accordance with the Policy, the Rules, the Supplemental Rules, the eligibility requirements of the relevant Domain Name Category and the law which the Arbitration Panel deems applicable.

**Substantive issues**

According to Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant has the burden of proving that:

(i) the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trade mark or service mark in Hong Kong in which the Complainant has rights; and

(ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name; and

(iii) the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith; and

(iv) if the Disputed Domain Name is registered by an individual person, the Registrant does not meet the registration requirements for that individual category of Domain Name.

The Arbitration Panel will make its findings in the paragraphs below.

(1) **Identical/confusing similarity**

The first question that arises for determination is whether the Complainant has a trademark or service mark in Hong Kong in which it has rights.
Based on the documentary evidence produced in the Complaint, prior to the date of registration of the Disputed Domain Name in January 2018, the Complainant had registered two trademarks in Australia as set out below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trademark</th>
<th>class</th>
<th>Registration No.</th>
<th>Date of Registration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEMOY</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1848461</td>
<td>2017-06-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEMÔY</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1865358</td>
<td>2017-08-16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But these Australian trademarks are not registered in Hong Kong. There is no evidence that the Complainant has any registered trademark for its CEMOY brand in Hong Kong. The Complainant admits that it has no corporate registration in Hong Kong. The Arbitration Panel therefore finds that the Complainant has no registered trademark for its CEMOY brand in Hong Kong.

In the official website of the Complainant www.cemoy.com Hong Kong is not even one of the multiple cities that the Complainant markets its CEMOY brand products. In order to establish unregistered or common law trademark rights for purposes of the Policy, the Complainant must show that its “CEMOY” mark has become a distinctive identifier which consumers in Hong Kong associate with the Complainant’s products. (See paragraph 1.3 of WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.0). There is no evidence in the Complaint to show any distribution or marketing of the Complainant’s “CEMOY” brand products in Hong Kong such as (i) the duration and nature of use of the mark, (ii) the amount of sales under the mark, (iii) the nature and extent of advertising using the mark, (iv) the degree of actual public (e.g., consumer, industry, media) recognition, and (v) consumer surveys so as to establish any secondary meaning or goodwill of the Complainant’s “CEMOY” mark in Hong Kong. The Arbitration Panel therefore concludes that the Complainant has no unregistered or common law trademark rights for its CEMOY brand in Hong Kong.
There is however a legal basis for the Complainant’s contention that it has copyright subsisting in one of its CEMOY trademarks registered in Australia. Unlike trademark “CEMOY”, trademark CEMÔY is not a word mark. It is an artwork and there is copyright subsisting in the artistic work (the “Artwork”); and as such the Arbitration Panel accepts the Complainant’s contention and finds that the Complainant owns the copyright subsisting in the Artwork of Australian trademark registration no. 1865358 and such copyright is protected in Hong Kong without registration under Copyright Ordinance, Cap. 528.

The second question that arises for determination is whether the Disputed Domain Name may be said to be identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant’s copyright subsisting in the Artwork of trademark registration no. 1865358 of which the Complainant has rights. Obviously, the Disputed Domain Name contains the entire word CEMOY” of the Artwork as its only distinctive component, and it is confusingly similar or identical to the Artwork of which the Complainant has rights in Hong Kong. It is established that the suffix “com.hk” can be ignored in making this determination. The Arbitration Panel therefore concludes that the Disputed Domain Name is identical to the Complainant’s Artwork of trademark registration no. 1865358 of which the Complainant has rights.

Based on the above findings, the Complainant has satisfied the requirement of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

(2) Rights or Legitimate Interests of Respondent

The Arbitration Panel accepts the Complainant’s submission as stated in paragraph 2.1 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“WIPO Overview 3.0”), that once a complainant establishes a prima facie case in respect of the lack of rights or legitimate interests of a respondent, the respondent then carries the burden of demonstrating that it has rights
or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Where the respondent fails to do so, a complainant is deemed to have satisfied Paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

The Respondent has not responded to the Complaint.

Based upon the statements, documents and submissions in the Complaint, the Arbitration Panel finds that a prima facie case has been made out that the Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name.

Paragraph 4(d) of the Policy provides as follows:

“Any of the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, if found by an Arbitration Panel to be proven based on its evaluation of all evidence presented to it, shall demonstrate the Registrant’s rights or legitimate interests to the Domain Name for purposes of Paragraph 4(a)(ii):

(i) before any notice to the Registrant of the dispute, the Registrant’s use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services in Hong Kong; or

(ii) the Registrant (as an individual, business, or other organization) has been commonly known by the Domain Name, even if the Registrant has acquired no trade mark or service mark rights in Hong Kong; or

(iii) the Registrant has trademark or service mark rights that the mark is identical to the Domain Name the Registrant is holding; or

(iv) the Registrant is making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the Domain Name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trade mark or service mark at issue; or

(v) If the Domain Name is registered in one of the Individual Domain Name Categories, the Domain Name registered must be the Registrant’s own “individual name”, which can be either (1) the Registrant’s legal name, or (2) a name by which the Registrant is commonly known and can include, for example, a pseudonym the Registrant uses if the Registrant is an author or a painter, or a stage name if the
Registrant is a singer or actor, or the name of a fictional character if the Registrant has created or can otherwise show it has rights in such fictional character.”

Based on the documentary evidence, statements of facts and submissions presented by the Complainant, the Arbitration Panel finds that the Artwork is shown prominently on the top page of the Respondent’s www.cemoy.com.hk website; and at the end page of this website, there appears under “Address” the name and address of the following company, namely, “Chanlor Pharmaceutical Pty Ltd, Level 29, 2 Chiefly Square, Sydney NSW 2000, Australia”. By the Complainant’s own admission, the Complainant has granted CPPL an exclusive license to use its trademarks worldwide. There is however no relationship whatsoever between the Complainant and the Respondent as affirmed by the Complainant. There is no evidence that the Respondent has been authorized by the Complainant to use the mark “CEMOY” in the Artwork to register or use the Disputed Domain Name nor to distribute the Complainant’s CEMOY brand products. The Arbitration Panel therefore concludes that none of the circumstances in paragraph 4(d) existed. As such, the Arbitration Panel concludes that the prima facie case that the Respondent lacks any rights and legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name has not been rebutted.

Accordingly, the Complainant has satisfied the requirement of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

(3) Bad Faith

In order to establish bad faith for the purposes of the Policy, the Complainant must show that the Disputed Domain Name was registered in bad faith and has been used in bad faith.

The Arbitration Panel accepts the Complainant’s submission that any of the circumstances set out in sub-paragraph (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv) of paragraph 4(b) of the Policy, if found to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.
Having regard to all the relevant circumstances and documentary evidence in the present case and after taking into consideration paragraph 4(b) of the Policy, the Arbitration Panel accepts the Complainant’s submission that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and had been used in bad faith by the Respondent. The appearance of “CEMOY | 香港官方網站 - cemoy.com.hk” in Chinese or “CEMOY | Hong Kong Official – cemoy.com.hk” in English when a person searches for the word “CEMOY” in internet that diverts to the website of the Respondent wwwcemoy.com.hk, coupled with the prominent Artwork shown right in the centre of the top page of this website, are misleading and would create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s CEMOY mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the disputed website. The Complainant has categorically stated that it has not authorized the Respondent to distribute the Complainant’s CEMOY brand products nor to register and use the Disputed Domain Name for such a distribution. Even if the Respondent has been sub-licensed by CPPL to use the Complainant’s CEMOY trademarks in Hong Kong (which there is no such evidence in this case and the Arbitration Panel does not make any of such a finding), adopting the principles enunciated in Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc., WIPO Case No. D2001-0903, it must be regarded as bad faith registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name by the Respondent as the Respondent has misrepresented its website as the official website of the Complainant in Hong Kong and nothing has been said in the Respondent’s website that the Respondent is merely a middleman if it were so sublicensed by CPPL to use the Complainant’s trademarks.

Based on the above findings, the Arbitration Panel concludes that the Respondent has registered and used the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith under paragraph 4(b) (iv) of the Policy.

Accordingly, the Complainant has satisfied the requirement of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

(4) Registration requirements for that individual category of domain name
As the Disputed Domain Name is not a 個人.hk domain name as referred to in Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, Paragraph 4(a)(iv) of the Policy is therefore not applicable.

For all the reasons aforesaid, the Arbitration Panel concludes that the Complainant has satisfied all the requirements under Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

(5) Eligibility Requirements under the Registration Policies

In addition to Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Arbitration Panel has also considered the eligibility requirements under paragraph 3 of the Domain Name Registration Policies, Procedures and Guidelines for .hk and 香港 domain names (the “Registration Policies”) issued by HKIRC effective 15 July 2020. However, as the Complainant is not seeking an order for the transfer of the Disputed Domain Name from the Respondent to the Complainant, it is therefore not necessary for the Arbitration Panel to consider if the Complainant meets the eligibility requirements under the Registration Policies as a registrant of the Disputed Domain Name.

6. AWARD

For all the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(a) of the Policy and Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, the Arbitration Panel AWARDS, ORDERS AND DIRECTS that Disputed Domain Name <CEMOY.COM.HK> be CANCELLED.

Date of Issue: 23 December 2020
Place of arbitration: Hong Kong

___________________________________________
Raymond HO
Sole Panelist of the Arbitration Panel
Date: 23 December 2020