ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
SEBIM v. kang-woo,lee
Case No. D2026-4278

1. The Parties

The Complainant is SEBIM, France, represented by CABINET LAVOIX, France.

The Respondent is kang-woo,lee, Republic of Korea.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <sebim.com> is registered with HANGANG Systems Inc. dba Doregi.com (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 23, 2026. On September 23, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 27, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Complainant had requested English to be the language of the proceeding within its Complaint. The Center verified that the 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, in English and Korean, and the proceedings commenced on September 30, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 20, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 21, 2026.

The Center appointed Kathryn Lee as the sole panelist in this matter on October 23, 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 is a French company specializing in highly engineered valves, pumps, and actuators for use in the power, oil, and gas, general industry, and water and wastewater sectors. The Complainant has used SEBIM as the brand name for its safety valves since the 1960s and based on the submitted evidence, in 1983, nuclear contracts were awarded to SEBIM for export to the Republic of Korea. The Complainant was acquired by the Weir Group in 1998 and then by Trillium Flow Technologies in 2019. Trillium Flow Technologies has had presence in the Republic of Korea through its subsidiary Trillium Flow Technologies Korea, Inc. since 2010. In 2026, the Complainant was acquired by the French company FRAMATOME and its corporate name was changed from Trillium Flow Technologies France SAS to SEBIM with effect from June 2, 2026.

The Complainant owns trademark registrations for a figurative mark consisting of the text GROUPE SEBIM and a design: French trademark registration number 3727694 filed on April 6, 2010 and registered on September 24, 2010, and European Union Trade Mark registration number 009371295, filed on September 13, 2010 and registered on June 23, 2011. The Complainant also owns <sebim.fr>, registered on April 13, 2007.

The Respondent appears to be an individual with an address in the Republic of Korea. Screenshots submitted by the Complainant link the Respondent's name, email address, and telephone number to a website offering domain names for sale. A reverse-WhoIs search associates the Respondent's email address with 768 domain names.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 7, 2010 and does not currently resolve to any active website with content. An archived capture dated June 20, 2013 shows it resolving to a generic page offering it for sale. A Sedo listing captured on September 15, 2026 invited offers with a minimum of USD 9,860.

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 name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its registered marks because "SEBIM" is their dominant and distinctive element and is reproduced in its entirety in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant also contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant submits that the Respondent is not authorized to use its marks, is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and has not used or made demonstrable preparations to use it in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. The Complainant bases its arguments on the absence of an active website and on the Respondent's activity as a seller of domain names.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant relies on the distinctiveness and history of the SEBIM brand, its use in the Republic of Korea since the 1980s, the proximity of the disputed domain name's registration to the filing of the trademark applications on April 6, 2010 and September 13, 2010, and the establishment of a Korean group subsidiary on December 29, 2010. The Complainant further relies on the sale negotiations, the amount allegedly sought by the Respondent, the Respondent's portfolio of other domain names allegedly corresponding to third-party marks, and passive holding. Specifically, the Complainant states that its agent

offered USD 10,000 for the disputed domain name in February 2026 and received a counteroffer of USD 2,334,339 from the Respondent.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Korean. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including the fact that the Respondent operates a website offering domain names for sale which is partially written in English, and requiring translation would impose substantial additional costs and delay.

The Respondent did not make any specific submissions with respect to the language of the proceeding.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.5.1).

The evidence shows that the Respondent is operating a domain-sales website containing an English invitation to make inquiries. Further, the Center notified the Respondent in both English and Korean and expressly permitted a response in either language, and the Respondent neither objected to the Complainant's request nor submitted a response. The Panel considers that these circumstances support conducting the proceeding in English without unfair prejudice to the Respondent.

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

6.2. Substantive Matters

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 name. 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.

"SEBIM" is the prominent word element of the Complainant's figurative GROUPE SEBIM marks and is reproduced in its entirety in the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

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

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

In view of the Panel's findings under the third element of the Policy, the Panel considers it unnecessary to address the second element.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel is of the opinion that the evidence in the case file as presented does not indicate that the Respondent's aim in registering the disputed domain name was to profit from or exploit the Complainant's trademark.

The Complainant's French trademark registration and its historical use of the GROUPE SEBIM mark predate the registration of the disputed domain name. The Panel has considered the mark's distinctiveness and its historical use in the specialist industrial sector. The Complainant's brochure references a 1983 contract for export of SEBIM products to Republic of Korea, but the historical evidence does not sufficiently establish that the Respondent was likely to have known of the brand in 2010. The proximity of the disputed domain name registration to the trademark applications by itself does not establish knowledge, either. Further, the Korean subsidiary was incorporated after the disputed domain name was registered. There is no evidence that, at the time of registration, the Respondent knew of its planned establishment or of any connection between that subsidiary and the GROUPE SEBIM mark.

In addition, panels have found that the practice of registering a domain name for resale (including for a profit) does not by itself support a claim that the respondent registered the domain name in bad faith with the primary purpose of selling it to the trademark owner (or its competitor). WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.1. The Panel notes that the disputed domain name consists of a short, five-letter designation capable of being pronounced in two syllables. Its composition may give it appeal for uses unrelated to the Complainant, although this does not establish that the Respondent selected it for such a purpose.

As for the negotiations, they were initiated by the Complainant's agent, and the submitted correspondence does not establish that the Respondent knew that the prospective buyer was the Complainant. The counteroffer alleged by the Complainant is substantial. Even accepting the Complainant's account of that counteroffer, however, the amount sought in 2026 does not, without further evidence of targeting, establish that the Respondent selected the disputed domain name in 2010 to exploit the Complainant's mark. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.1.

Furthermore, online searches show use of "sebim" by other parties, such as the French string instruments maker established in 1956 and Turkish software company established in 2004.

The Panel has also considered the Complainant's evidence concerning the Respondent's purported domain name portfolio, including the registrations identified as corresponding to third-party marks. Although that evidence raises some questions and is relevant to the overall assessment, with the exception of a few outliers the vast majority of the hundreds of domain names potentially registered by the Respondent corresponded to dictionary or descriptive terms and there was no apparent targeting of the Complainant's industry or other factors that would point to knowledge of the Complainant; so the Panel does not consider it sufficient, together with the other circumstances of this case, to establish that the Respondent targeted the Complainant when registering this particular disputed domain name. The record contains no website content referring to the Complainant, its products, or its competitors.

Taking the evidence as a whole, the Panel is not satisfied on the balance of probabilities that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name to target the Complainant.

The Panel finds that the third element of the Policy has not been established.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Kathryn Lee/
Kathryn Lee
Sole Panelist
Date: November 6, 2026