

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Compagnie Générale des Etablissements Michelin v. Lucia Zamora Rosado Case No. D2023-0762

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Compagnie Générale des Etablissements Michelin, France, represented by Dreyfus & associés, France.

The Respondent is Lucia Zamora Rosado, Mexico.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <michelinmalecon.com> is registered with IONOS SE (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 21, 2023. On February 21, 2023, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 22, 2023, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name, which differed from the named Respondent (1&1 Internet Inc) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 1, 2023, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. On the same date, the Center requested clarification regarding the Language of the Proceeding. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on March 2, 2023, and requested English to be the Language of the Proceeding.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “UDRP”), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 3, 2023. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 23, 2023. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 28, 2023.

The Center appointed Pablo A. Palazzi as the sole panelist in this matter on March 31, 2023. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant, Compagnie Générale des Etablissements Michelin., is a company incorporated in France. It is a world leading tire company, which is dedicated to enhancing its clients' mobility, sustainably, designing and distributing the most suitable tires, services and solutions for its clients' needs. The Complainant is present in 170 countries, has more than 124,000 employees and operates 117 tire manufacturing facilities and sales agencies in 26 countries.

The Complainant has exclusive rights in MICHELIN, and MICHELIN related marks (hereinafter "MICHELIN marks"). The Complainant is the exclusive owner of numerous MICHELIN marks worldwide, such as an International trademark registration for MICHELIN registered on June 11, 2001 (International trademark registration number 771031) covering Mexico.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 12, 2022, and resolves to an inactive website.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant is of the opinion that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its MICHELIN trademark.

Furthermore, the Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

Finally, it is argued that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists three elements, which a complainant must satisfy in order to succeed. The Complainant must satisfy that:

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

A. Language of the Proceeding

The Complaint was filed in English but the language of the registration agreement is Spanish.

Paragraph 11(a) of the Rules stipulates that: “[u]nless otherwise agreed by the Parties, or specified otherwise in the Registration Agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the Registration Agreement, subject to the authority of the Panel to determine otherwise, having regard to the circumstances of the administrative proceeding.”

Paragraph 10(b) and (c) of the Rules stipulate, respectively, that:

“(b) In all cases, the Panel shall ensure that the Parties are treated with equality and that each Party is given a fair opportunity to present its case.

(c) The Panel shall ensure that the administrative proceeding takes place with due expedition. It may, at the request of a Party or on its own motion, extend, in exceptional cases, a period of time fixed by these Rules or by the Panel.”

Whilst there is a language requirement that is provided for in paragraph 11(a) of the Rules, the Panel has to balance that against the other considerations of ensuring that the proceeding takes place with due expedition and that the parties are treated fairly and given a fair opportunity to present their case. The Panel is of the view that the language requirement should not cause any undue burden on the parties or undue delay (see *Whirlpool Corporation, Whirlpool Properties, Inc. v. Hui'erpu (HK) electrical appliance co. Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-0293](#); *Solvay S.A. v. Hyun-Jun Shin*, WIPO Case No. [D2006-0593](#)).

The Complainant requested that English be the language of the proceeding for the following reasons:

- (i) To proceed in Spanish, the Complainant would have to retain the services of a translator, which would pose a cost that will be higher than the overall cost of the administrative proceeding. This places a high financial burden on the Complainant. It would also cause undue delay.
- (ii) The Complainant is located in France and has no knowledge of Spanish.
- (iii) English is the primary language for “international relations” and is one of the working languages of the Center.

The Respondent has not provided a response despite being duly informed of this petition.

The Panel has duly considered the circumstances of this case and the relevant policy considerations in arriving at its decision that English shall be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent has been given a fair opportunity to present its case and to date, it has not indicated a preference to have the Complaint and this proceeding conducted in Spanish. The Panel believes that the Respondent would not be prejudiced if English is adopted as the language of the proceeding.

B. Identical or Confusingly Similar

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant’s trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1

The Panel finds the entirety of the MICHELIN mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

While the addition of other terms like “malecon” may bear on the assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

C. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

While the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the often impossible task of “proving a negative”, requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a *prima facie* case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a *prima facie* case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted Complainant’s *prima facie* showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel considers that the record of this case reflects that:

- before any notice to the Respondent of the dispute, the Respondent did not use, nor made demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name or a name corresponding to the disputed domain name in connection with a *bona fide* offering of goods or services. Paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.2.
- the Respondent (as an individual, business, or other organization) has not been commonly known by the disputed domain name. Paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.3.
- the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue. Paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.4.
- the record contains no other factors demonstrating rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in the disputed domain name.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

D. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular but without limitation, that if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

Complainant’s MICHELIN trademark registrations significantly predate the registration date of the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds that the MICHELIN marks have widespread reputation as a world leading tire company. See *Compagnie Générale des Etablissements Michelin v. Mai Miyota*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-3336](#). As

mentioned above, MICHELIN marks are registered internationally, including international trademarks covering Mexico. It is not conceivable that the Respondent would not have had actual notice of the MICHELIN marks at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name (in 2022). The Panel therefore finds that the MICHELIN mark is not one that a trader could legitimately adopt other than for the purpose of creating an impression of an association with the Complainant.

The Panel therefore concludes that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website or location or of a product or service on the Respondent's website or location. Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

In addition, Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the nonuse of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith in the circumstances of this proceeding.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <michelinmalecon.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Pablo A. Palazzi/

Pablo A. Palazzi

Sole Panelist

Date: April 14, 2023