WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

**ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER**

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Compagnie Générale des Etablissements Michelin v. Hypelive Supho, The Hyper Company Limited, Pitsanu Supho, The Hyper Company Limited
Case No. D2026-1934

1. The Parties

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

The Respondents are Hypelive Supho, The Hyper Company Limited, Thailand and Pitsanu Supho, The Hyper Company Limited, Thailand.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <michelin-dashboard.com>, <michelintiktokdashboard.com> and <michelintt-dashboard.com> are registered with Name.com, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 5, 2026. On May 5, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On May 5, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Domain Protection Services, Inc.) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 6, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaints on May 5, 2026, and May 6, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaints 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 8, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 28, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents' default on May 29, 2026.

The Center appointed William A. Van Caenegem as the sole panelist in this matter on June 5, 2026. 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 in this matter is the Compagnie Générale des Etablissements Michelin ("Michelin"), a leading tire company, which also provides digital services, maps and guides that enhance travel. It is headquartered in Clermont-Ferrand, France, and is present in 170 countries, with more than 124,000 employees, 117 tire manufacturing facilities and sales agencies in 26 countries. Michelin North America is a 10.76 billion dollar a year company operating 19 plants in 16 locations and employs 22,000 people. It manufactures tires in six states of the United States of America (the "U.S.") and it has three plants in Nova Scotia, Canada and one plant in Queretaro, Mexico. The MICHELIN Guides are best-selling guides that rate over 30,000 establishments in over 30 territories across three continents, and more than 30 million MICHELIN Guides have been sold worldwide.

Michelin Thailand, established in 1987, is a major regional operation of the Michelin Group comprising several tire and wire manufacturing plants, employing more than 6,700 people. Michelin maintains an extensive distribution and service network throughout Thailand, including TYREPLUS service centers launched nationwide in 2009.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations including International Trademark MICHELIN No. 1713161, registered on June 13, 2022, designating among others Thailand, Australia, Canada, and covering goods and services in classes 06, 07, 09, 12, 16, 20, 35, 37, 39, 41 and 42; International Trademark MICHELIN No. 1849767, registered on December 12, 2024, designating among others Thailand, Brazil, India, and covering goods and services in classes 01, 02, 09, 12, 16, 17, 35, 42 and 43; U.S. trademark MICHELIN No. 4126565, registered on April 10, 2012, duly renewed and covering services in classes 36, 37 and 39; U.S. trademark MICHELIN No. 892045, registered on June 2, 1970, duly renewed and covering goods in class 12; and U.S. trademark MICHELIN No. 3329924, registered on November 6, 2007, duly renewed, for services in class 39.

The disputed domain names <michelintt-dashboard.com>, <michelin-dashboard.com> and <michelintiktokdashboard.com> were registered on March 10 and 11, 2026.

The Complainant operates a website at the domain name <michelin.com> registered on December 1, 1993.

The disputed domain names resolve to an identical "Michelin Dealer" login page where the trademark MICHELIN and logo are reproduced without permission.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names <michelinttdashboard.com>, <michelin-dashboard.com> and <michelintiktokdashboard.com> all reproduce in its entirety the

Complainant's well-known trademark MICHELIN, together with the descriptive terms "tt-dashboard," "dashboard," and "tiktok dashboard". These directly suggest official digital tools, administrative interfaces, or dashboards operated or endorsed by the Complainant, the latter says, including in relation to dealer or platform management systems. The disputed domain names all redirect to a common login page available at "www.michelinttdashboard.com/login", displaying the mention "Michelin Dealer" in Thai, and reproducing the MICHELIN trademark and logo, the Complainant points out. This page prompts users to enter their credentials, and the Complainant says that it thereby creates a false impression of an official and secure access portal operated by the Complainant.

The Complainant points out that it sent a notification letter to the Respondents via the registrar, via email and online forms, asserting its trademark rights and requesting the transfer of the domain names free of charge, on March 23, 2026. However, despite multiple reminders, the Complainant did not receive any response.

The Complainant maintains that the disputed domain names <michelintt-dashboard.com>, <michelin-dashboard.com>and <michelintiktokdashboard.com> are virtually identical or at least confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark MICHELIN. The Complainant adds that it is well established that where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark, or where at least a dominant feature of the relevant mark is recognizable in the domain name, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark. Previous panels have also held that the addition of generic terms to a well-known trademark does not prevent the risk of confusion between the complainants' trademark and the disputed domain name.

The Complainant also asserts that the Respondents are neither affiliated with Complainant in any way, nor have they been authorized by Complainant to use and register its trademark, or to seek registration of any domain name incorporating said trademark. The Complainant adds that the Respondents cannot claim prior rights or legitimate interest in the domain names, as the MICHELIN trademarks precede the registration of the disputed domain names by many years. The Respondents are not commonly known under the disputed domain names or under the name "Michelin", in the absence of any evidence to the contrary.

The Complainant adds that the Respondents did not demonstrate use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain names or name corresponding to the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The domain names in dispute resolve to a website that creates a false affiliation with Complainant, the Complainant asserts. This is due to the presence of the MICHELIN trademark and logo on the website, which Internet users are likely to wrongly believe is therefore an official website of the Complainant. Such circumstances do not represent a use in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services. The Complainant contends that the Respondents are not accurately disclosing their relationship with the trademark, by falsely suggesting it is the trademark owners and its website is an official website. For that reason, the Complainant says that the Respondents are making an obvious non-legitimate use of the disputed domain names, with intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers from the Complainant's official website.

The Complainant also points out that it is well known throughout the world, making it unlikely that the Respondents were not aware of the Complainant's rights in the MICHELIN trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain names. Further, considering the composition of the disputed domain names that entirely reproduce the Complainant's trademark MICHELIN associated to descriptive terms, the Complainant says that it is impossible that the Respondents did not have the Complainant's trademark and company name in mind while registering the disputed domain names. Bad faith has previously been found to exist where a domain name is so obviously connected with a well-known trademark that its very use by someone with no connection to the trademark suggests opportunistic bad faith

Additionally, the Complainant points out that UDRP panels have consistently held that the incorporation of a complainant's trademark in its entirety together with terms closely connected to its business or digital ecosystem may constitute evidence of bad faith, as it demonstrates an intent to capitalize on a complainant's reputation and goodwill.

The Complainant points out that its MICHELIN trademark registrations significantly predate the registration dates of the disputed domain names, and that previous panels have established that knowledge of a complainant's intellectual property rights, including trademarks, at the time of registration of the disputed domain name proves bad faith registration. In any case, a simple search via Google or any other search engine using the keyword "michelin" demonstrates that all first results relate to the Complainant's products or news.

Additionally, the Complainant points out that panels have considered that in the absence of any license or permission to use such a widely known trademark, no actual or contemplated bona fide or legitimate use of the domain name could reasonably be claimed. The website to which the disputed domain names resolve at "www.michelintt-dashboard.com/login" reproduces the Complainant's trademark and logo, and prompts users to enter their credentials, thereby creating a false impression of an official and secure access portal operated by the Complainants. The Complainant maintains that the Respondents did everything to make its website look official and therefore created a strong likelihood of confusion for MICHELIN. Previous panels have considered that in the absence of any license or permission from Complainant to use such widely known trademarks, no actual or contemplated bona fide or legitimate use of the disputed domain names could reasonably be claimed, the Complainant points out.

Moreover, there is no doubt that many Internet users attempting to visit the Complainant's websites have ended up on the web page set up by Respondents, the Complainant claims, since the confusing similarity means that diversion of internet traffic will necessarily results, from the Complainant's site to that of the Respondents. The Complainant concludes that it is more likely than not that the Respondents' primary motive in registering and using the disputed domain names was to capitalize on or otherwise take advantage of the Complainant's trademark rights, through the creation of initial interest confusion.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant has requested the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel accepts that the disputed domain names are likely under common control for the following reasons. 1. the similar composition of each of the domain names: They are very similar in structure, each incorporating the Complainant's trademark MICHELIN in its entirety, combined with descriptive terms that either describe or allude to the same concepts (with the terms "tt-dashboard," "dashboard," and "tiktok dashboard"). 2. The timing and registration details: the disputed domain names were registered within a very short period of time — from March 10 to 11, 2026 — through the same Registrar. They were registered for the same one-year term and list the same organization registrant details

"The Hyper Company Limited". 3. Most significantly, the three disputed domain names resolve to the identical login page available at "www.michelintt-dashboard.com/login", displaying the mention "Michelin Dealer" in Thai, and reproducing the Complainant's trademark and logo. In view of the above, it is likely that Respondents are the same person or, at least, that they are under common control.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

A. 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 names. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1, that being the trademark MICHELIN.

Although the addition of other terms here, "dashboard", "tt-dashboard" and "tiktokdashboard" may bear on the assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 1.8 and 1.12.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. 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.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving that a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the difficult 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 (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, in this case a fake login page / impersonation, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered disputed domain names that incorporate the distinctive MICHELIN mark of the Complainant, at a time when that mark was already long used by the Complainant and well established in many markets around the world. The notoriety of the mark stems from its use not only in relation to tire sales but also in relation to the famed MICHELIN dining guides, which were widely known at the time of registration of the disputed domain names. The composition of the disputed domain names also suggests that the Respondent was well aware of the existence of the MICHELIN trademark and the Complainant's exclusive rights therein.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here claimed as linking to an imitation login page that reproduces the MICHELIN mark and logo constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitute bad faith under the Policy. The only use that the disputed domain names is made to serve by the Respondent is some nefarious attempt at deceiving and taking advantage of Internet users looking for the legitimate web presence of the Complainant.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

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 names <michelin-dashboard.com>, <michelintiktokdashboard.com> and <michelintt-dashboard.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/William A. Van Caenegem/
William A. Van Caenegem
Sole Panelist
Date: June 19, 2026