

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

BEL v. firman hidayat
Case No. D2025-2503

1. The Parties

The Complainant is BEL, France, represented by KALLIOPE Law Firm, France.

The Respondent is firman hidayat, Singapore.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <bel-foodservice.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 25, 2025. On June 25, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 25, 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 (Registration Private / Domains By Proxy, LLC / DomainsByProxy.com) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 26, 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 amended Complaint on June 27, 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 of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 2, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 22, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 23, 2025.

The Center appointed Kateryna Oliynyk as the sole panelist in this matter on July 30, 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 French limited company created in 1865, headquartered in France. The Complainant is a well-known publicly traded company from the agri-food industry, especially in the manufacturing and marketing of processed cheeses. The Complainant is a major player in the food industry with the local presence in thirty countries through its subsidiaries and its trademarked products are distributed in more than 120 countries with the websites “groupe-bel.com” and “belfoodservice.com”.

The Complainant holds the registered trademark rights for the BEL trademark, based, inter alia, on the following trademark registrations:

- French Trademark Registration No. 3220907 for BEL (word) registered on April 15, 2003, for goods and services in International Classes 29, 30 and 43;
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 003136975 for BEL (word) registered on July 26, 2004, for goods and services in International Classes 29, 30 and 43;
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 008285082 for BEL (figurative) registered on November 10, 2009, for goods and services in International Classes 16, 29 and 35;
- International Trademark Registration No. 813988 for BEL (word) registered on October 2, 2003, for goods and services in International Classes 29, 30 and 43;
- International Trademark Registration No. 1020556 for BEL (figurative) registered on August 3, 2009, for goods in International Classes 29 and 30;
- International Trademark Registration No. 1510727 for BEL' FOR ALL FOR GOOD (figurative) registered on November 7, 2019, for goods and services in International Classes 29, 30 and 35.

The Complainant operates its official websites under the domain names <belfoodservice.fr> and <belfoodservice.com> since 2004.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 22, 2020, and leads to a website offering online gaming services. Upon website navigation, the website is blocked by the browser which issues a warning about suspicious or potentially illicit content.

The Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter regarding the disputed domain name to the Registrar on May 30, 2025, which remained unanswered.

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.

Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's BEL trademark as the disputed domain name includes the Complainant's BEL trademark in its entirety.

The Complainant further contends that the addition of generic terms such as “food” and “service” to the Complainant’s BEL trademark in the disputed domain name just intensifies the likelihood of confusion as it refers directly to “Bel Food Services”, a subsidiary of the Complainant, being an innovative player in the institutional and commercial catering sector.

The Complainant further contends that the disputed domain name is identical to its domain names <belfoodservice.fr> and <belfoodservice.com> which redirect to active websites about the Complainant's activity and products.

Rights or legitimate interests

The Complainant contends that the Respondents lack any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

According to the Complainant's contentions, the Respondent has not used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, and has not been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted by the Complainant to register the disputed domain name.

Registration and Use in Bad Faith

The Complainant further contends that the Complainant’s trademark registrations predate the registration of the disputed domain name. Prior panel decisions have found that awareness of a complainant’s trademark at the time of domain registration can indicate bad faith. The Respondent knew or should have known about the Complainant’s prior rights when registering and using the disputed domain name.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is being used in an attempt to intentionally attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs the Panel as to the principles the Panel is to use in determining the dispute: “[a] Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.”

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that the Complainant must prove each of the following:

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

Considering that the Respondent did not reply to the Complainant’s contentions, in order to determine whether the Complainant has met its burden as stated in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Panel bases its decision on the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy and the Rules.

Under paragraph 5(f) and paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, if a respondent does not submit a response, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel shall decide the dispute based upon the complaint, and where a party does not comply with any provision of the Rules, the Panel “shall draw such inferences therefrom as it considers appropriate”.

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 of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 1.7.

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

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

Although the addition of other terms here, "food" and "service", may bear on 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 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Moreover, the generic Top-Level Domain ".com" in the disputed domain name is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded for the purpose of determining whether a domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark.

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. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), 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 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.

The Panel notes that there is no evidence that the Respondent (as an individual, business, or other organization) is commonly known under the BEL trademark. Paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.3.

Further, the Panel notes that neither license nor authorization appear to have been granted to the Respondent to make any use of the Complainant's BEL trademark, or to apply for registration of the disputed domain name by the Complainant.

The Respondent's election of the disputed domain name, which consists of the Complainant's trademark combined with the terms associated with the Complainant's business and which imitates the naming pattern of the Complainant's domain names <belfoodservice.fr> and <belfoodservice.com>, shows that the Respondent has targeted the Complainant, its trademark, and its business. Therefore, the Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation, and the Respondent's conduct cannot be considered a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

Upon navigation of the website under the disputed domain name, the browser does not load the website but instead triggers a security warning. The message explains that the link has been blocked because it may be harmful, or suspicious, including potential risks of spam, phishing, malware, or other unlawful content. The Panel find that this cannot be considered a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

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 Panel is satisfied that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant's BEL trademark when it registered the disputed domain name. In accordance with section 3.1.4 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), the Panel considers that the inclusion of the Complainant's BEL trademark in the disputed domain name creates a presumption of bad faith registration.

The Respondent, when registering the disputed domain name, has targeted the Complainant's business and its BEL trademark with the intention to confuse Internet users and capitalize on the fame of the Complainant's trademark for its own monetary benefit, by imitating the naming pattern of the official domain names used by the Complainant. The fact that there is a clear absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with no credible explanation for the Respondent's choice of the disputed domain name is also a significant factor to consider that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith (as stated in section 3.2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#)).

Accordingly, the Panel holds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the website.

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 <bel-foodservice.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Kateryna Oliinyk/

Kateryna Oliinyk

Sole Panelist

Date: August 18, 2025