

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Urenco Limited v. JUNGYUHKOOK, JUNGYUHKOOK  
Case No. D2025-2332

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Urenco Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Keltie LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is JUNGYUHKOOK, JUNGYUHKOOK, Republic of Korea.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <urencoinc.com> is registered with Megazone Corp., dba HOSTING.KR (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 13, 2025. On June 16, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 17, 2025, 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.

On June 18, 2025, the Center informed the parties in Korean and English, that the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain name is Korean. On June 23, 2025, the Complainant submitted the amended Complaint in English, requesting English to be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent objected to the Complainant's request on June 25, 2025.

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 in English and Korean of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 27, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 17, 2025. However, the Respondent did not file any formal response. Accordingly, the Center notified the commencement of panel appointment process on July 22, 2025.

The Center appointed Moonchul Chang as the sole panelist in this matter on August 5, 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 was founded in 1970. It is a nuclear fuel company operating uranium enrichment plants in Germany, the Netherlands (Kingdom of the), United States of America ("United States"), and United Kingdom. It supplies nuclear power stations in about 15 countries.

The Complainant owns the trademarks URENCO, which were registered in numerous jurisdictions including the United Kingdom, United States, the European Union, and the Republic of Korea and internationally as follows,

- United Kingdom Registration for URENCO, No. UK00901945369, registered on 21 January 2002;
- Republic of Korea Registration for URENCO, No. 4005248990000, registered on July 9, 2002; and
- International Registration for URENCO, No. 871521, registered on November 8, 2005, with designated countries including Australia, Bahrain, Belarus, Switzerland, China, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Norway, New Zealand, Russian Federation, Singapore, Turkmenistan, Türkiye, and Ukraine.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 30, 2019, which currently resolves to a website which displays sponsored links.

#### **5. Parties' Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

The Complainant contends that:

- (a) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark URENCO.
- (b) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; and
- (c) the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name, primarily for the purpose of obtaining the benefits commercially from the confusion of Internet users that visited the site by mistake. In addition, the Respondent is engaged in a pattern of bad faith, showing the previous UDRP cases.

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

##### **B. Respondent**

The Respondent did not formally reply to the Complainant's contentions, but submitted a brief reply in Korean requesting to conduct the proceedings in Korean.

#### **6. Discussion and Findings**

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must demonstrate that the three elements enumerated in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied. These elements are that: (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark or service mark; (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.

## **6.1. Preliminary Issue: 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 proceedings shall be the language of the registration agreement. The Complaint was filed in English.

The Complainant requested that the language of the proceedings be English for following reasons: (i) in the recent case concerning the same Respondent, *Chambre Franco - Allemande de Commerce et D'industrie v. JUNGYUHKOOK*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-2104](#), the Panel finds it proper and fair to render this decision in English, (ii) in a number of other prior UDRP decisions involving the same Respondent, the UDRP panels rendered decisions in English, the Panel can take into consideration prior cases involving the respondent in a particular language. Accordingly, the Complainant requests that the proceeding in this matter be conducted in English. On the other hand, the Respondent requested that the language of the proceedings would be in Korean since he is not capable to understand English.

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 Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[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.

## **6.2. Substantive Issues**

### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

The disputed domain name includes the Complainant's trademark URENCO in its entirety, together with the addition of the term "inc" indicating an incorporated company.

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.) 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 3.0](#), section 1.7). The Panel finds that the Complainant's trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, and the addition of the term "inc" 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.) In addition, the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is disregarded under the first element test. ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1). Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the disputed domain name for the purposes of the Policy.

Therefore, the Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

### **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

Under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, the overall burden of proof is on the Complainant. However, once the Complainant presents a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, the burden of production of evidence shifts to the Respondent. ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1).

Firstly, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's contention 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. 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.

Secondly, the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or fair use of the disputed domain name under the circumstances of this case. The composition of the disputed domain name, being confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark with the addition of the term "inc", carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1) Further, the disputed domain name currently resolves to a webpage featuring various sponsored links. The Panel finds that the Respondent does not use it in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name under the circumstances of this case. ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.9)

Thirdly, there is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name. In the consideration of the above circumstances the Panel finds that the Complainant has made out a prima facie case and the Respondent failed to come forward with any appropriate evidence that might rebut the Complainant's prima facie case.

Therefore, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

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

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

Paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy requires that the disputed domain name "has been registered and is being used in bad faith". Thus, for the Complainant to succeed, a UDRP panel must be satisfied that a domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. These requirements are conjunctive; each must be proven or the Complaint fails. In addition, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.)

Firstly, the Complainant obtained the registration of trademark much earlier than the Respondent registered the disputed domain name. Having noted the composition of the disputed domain name which includes the Complainant's trademark URENCO in its entirety, it is highly likely that the Respondent has been aware of the Complainant's trademark and its goods or services. Thus, the Panel considers that the Respondent deliberately chose the disputed domain name and registered it in bad faith.

Secondly, as earlier mentioned, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks and currently resolves to a webpage featuring various sponsored links. In this circumstance the Panel considers that the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name, primarily for the purpose of obtaining the commercial benefits from the confusion of Internet users that visited the site by mistake as per paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Thirdly, the Complainant contends that the Respondent is engaged in a pattern of bad faith, showing the previous 8 UDRP cases such as *Fundación Universitaria Iberoamericana (Funiber) v. Jungyuhkook*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-2743](#); *Institut de Recherche Biologique – IRB v. Jungyuhkook*, WIPO Case No. [D2018-2125](#). The Panel finds that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name established the pattern of bad faith conduct as described under paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy. Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has satisfied 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 <urencoinc.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Moonchul Chang /*

**Moonchul Chang**

Sole Panelist

Date: August 15, 2025