

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Trioworld Industrier AB v. 任艺伟 (Yi Wei Ren)  
Case No. D2025-1974

### 1. The Parties

The Complainant is Trioworld Industrier AB, Sweden, represented by Abion AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is 任艺伟 (Yi Wei Ren), China.

### 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <trioworld.xyz> is registered with Chengdu West Dimension Digital Technology Co., Ltd. (the "Registrar").

### 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 16, 2025. On May 19, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 20, 2025, 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 (Redirected for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 23, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint in English on May 28, 2025.

On May 23, 2025, the Center informed the Parties, in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. On May 28, 2025, the Complainant confirmed its request that English be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the language of the proceeding.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 in English and Chinese of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 30, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 19, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 20, 2025.

The Center appointed Matthew Kennedy as the sole panelist in this matter on June 27, 2025. 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 manufacturer specializing in high-performance plastic film products for industrial, agricultural, and consumer use. It holds European Union trademark registration number 018819056 for a figurative mark featuring the textual element TRIOWORLD, registered on May 26, 2023, specifying goods and services in classes 16, 17, 22, 35, 40, and 42. That trademark registration is current. The Complainant's promotes its business at "www.trioworld.com".<sup>1</sup>

The Respondent is an individual based in China. According to evidence presented by the Complainant, prior UDRP panels have found that the Respondent registered and was using other domain names in bad faith. See *Sopra Steria Group v. 任艺伟 (Yi Wei Ren)*, WIPO Case No. [DCO2023-0099](#); *Ninja Global Ltd. v. 任艺伟 (Yi Wei Ren)*, WIPO Case No. [DME2024-0009](#); *Syngenta Participations AG v. 任艺伟 (Yi Wei Ren)*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-0982](#); *Mölnlycke Health Care AB v. 任艺伟 (Yi Wei Ren)*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-4671](#); and *Syensqo S.A. v. 任艺伟 (Yi Wei Ren)*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-4743](#).

The disputed domain name was registered on November 4, 2024. It resolves to a landing page on a domain name broker's website that advertises it for sale. The price to "buy now" is USD 1,450. There is also an option to "lease to own" the disputed domain name for USD 100 per month.

The Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Registrar, marked to the attention of the Respondent, on January 21, 2025.

#### 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 figurative TRIOWORLD mark.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant has not given the Respondent any permission to register the Complainant's trademark as a domain name or to use or present an offering of goods and services under the Complainant's trademark.

---

<sup>1</sup>Noting in particular the general powers of a panel articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, it has been accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record if it would consider such information useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.8.

The disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. The fact that the Respondent is already attempting to sell the disputed domain name, despite having registered it less than five months ago, indicates that the Respondent never had any intention to use the disputed domain name in any legitimate manner, but rather to commercially profit by registering a domain name identical to an existing trademark.

## **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 Chinese. 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 and amendment to the Complaint were filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including the fact that translation of the Complaint would create significant additional costs for the Complainant and delay the proceeding, and prior UDRP proceedings against the Respondent were conducted in English.

Despite the Center having sent the notification of the Complaint email including instructions regarding the language of the proceeding in both Chinese and English, the Respondent did not make any submission with respect to the language of the proceeding or indicate any interest in otherwise participating in 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 3.0](#), section 4.5.1.

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. The Panel would have accepted a Response in Chinese, but none was filed.

### **6.2 Substantive Issues**

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that a complainant must demonstrate each of the following elements:

- (i) the disputed 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 the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The burden of proof of each element is borne by the Complainant.

## **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. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a figurative TRIOWORLD trademark for the purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1. Given that the figurative elements of the trademark cannot be reflected in a domain name for technical reasons, the Panel will not take them into account in the assessment of confusing similarity for the purposes of the first element of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.10.

The dominant and sole textual element of the mark (i.e., TRIOWORLD) is reproduced within the disputed domain name. The only additional element in the disputed domain name is a generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") extension (".xyz") which, as a standard requirement of domain name registration, may be disregarded in the assessment of confusing similarity for the purposes of the first element of the Policy. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7 and 1.11.1.

Therefore, 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 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. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

In the present case, the disputed domain name is used to resolve to a landing page offering it for sale. The Panel does not consider this to be a use in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services that would create a right or legitimate interest for the purposes of the Policy. Nor is this a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Moreover, the Registrar has verified that the Respondent's name is "任艺伟 (Yi Wei Ren)", which does not resemble the disputed domain name. Nothing on the record indicates that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

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 name. 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 name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Based on the record, 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. The first such circumstance is as follows:

“(i) circumstances indicating that [the respondent has] registered or [the respondent 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 respondent’s] documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the [disputed] domain name;”

In the present case, the disputed domain name was registered in 2024, after the registration of the Complainant’s figurative TRIOWORLD mark. The disputed domain name incorporates the dominant and sole textual element of that mark (“Trioworld”), adding only a gTLD extension. While “trio” and “world” are two dictionary terms, “trioworld” itself is not a dictionary term but a coined term with no apparent meaning other than as a reference to the Complainant, its company group, and their products. According to evidence presented by the Complainant, the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of bad faith registration of domain names incorporating third party trademarks. The Respondent provides no explanation for the registration of the disputed domain name. In view of these circumstances, the Panel finds on balance that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the TRIOWORLD mark in mind.

The Respondent uses the disputed domain name only to offer it for sale. The asking price is USD 1,450 which, in the Panel’s view, is likely to be more than the Respondent’s out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name. Given this and the findings above, the Panel finds that the circumstances of this case fall within the terms of paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy.

Therefore, 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 name <trioworld.xyz> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Matthew Kennedy/*

**Matthew Kennedy**

Sole Panelist

Date: July 7, 2025