

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

The Procter & Gamble Company, Braun GmbH v. Wang Rong Case No. D2025-2682

1. The Parties

The Complainants are The Procter & Gamble Company, United States of America (“United States”) (the “First Complainant”) and Braun GmbH, Germany (the “Second Complainant”), represented by Studio Barbero S.p.A., Italy.

The Respondent is Wang Rong, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <braunstore.top> is registered with Hongkong Kouming International Limited (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 8, 2025. On July 9, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 14, 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 (liu shen) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on July 14, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainants to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainants filed an amendment to the Complaint in English on July 15, 2025.

On July 14, 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 July 15, 2025, the Complainants confirmed its request that English be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainants’ submission.

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 Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 18, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 7, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 14, 2025.

The Center appointed James Wang as the sole panelist in this matter on August 22, 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 First Complainant is a manufacturer of a wide range of consumer goods across diverse sectors, including health care, hair care, cosmetics, laundry and fabric care. With a presence in approximately 80 countries, the First Complainant owns more than 60 brands.

The Second Complainant is a wholly owned subsidiary of First Complainant and the owner of multiple BRAUN trademark registrations, including:

- China trademark registration No. 37903302A, registered on March 28, 2020;
- International Trademark Registration No. 652027, registered on November 14, 1995;
- International Trademark Registration No. 650428, registered on November 14, 1995; and
- International Trademark Registration No. 400415, registered on May 23, 1973.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 4, 2025 and previously resolved to a website prominently featuring the BRAUN trademark and offering purported BRAUN products for sale at low prices. At the time of this decision, the disputed domain name no longer resolves to any active website.

On January 16, 2025, the Complainants sent a Cease-and-Desist letter to the Respondent, demanding cessation of any use of the disputed domain name and its transfer to the Complainants. Despite subsequent reminders, the Respondent did not respond.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainants

The Complainants contend that they have satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainants contend that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the trademark in which the Complainants have rights. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 was filed in English. The Complainants requested that the language of the proceeding be English.

The Respondent did not make any 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 Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.5.1).

Considering the Center has already sent Chinese-English dual language case-related communications to the Parties, including communications regarding the language of the proceeding, and thereby given the Respondent an opportunity to comment on or to oppose the Complainants' request and arguments, and considering the Respondent's default and lack of reaction after having been given a fair chance to comment or oppose, together with the fact that the disputed domain name consists of only Latin letters instead of Chinese characters, using the English term "store", the Panel finds it would not be unfair to proceed in English as requested by the Complainants.

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 Elements

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainants must prove that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainants have 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.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The applicable Top-Level Domain ("TLD") in a domain name is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is typically disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. Therefore, the TLD ".top" shall be disregarded under the confusing similarity test in this case. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

The Complainants have provided evidence that the Complainants own multiple BRAUN trademark registrations.

The disputed domain name incorporates the entirety of the Complainants' BRAUN trademark. As the BRAUN trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainants' trademark. The addition of "store" into the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7 and 1.8.

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

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the often impossible

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. 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.

According to the Complaint, the Respondent is not a licensee, authorized agent of the Complainants or in any other way authorized to use the Complainants’ BRAUN trademark. There is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name previously resolved to a website prominently featuring the BRAUN trademark and offering purported BRAUN products for sale at low prices. Such use of the disputed domain name does not confer any rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent.

The Panel finds that the Complainants have made a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, and the Respondent failed to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Moreover, the Panel finds that the nature of the disputed domain name is inherently misleading and carries a risk of implied affiliation. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Given the distinctiveness of the Complainants’ BRAUN trademark and the way of the previous use of the disputed domain name, it would be inconceivable that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainants’ trademark at the time of the registration. The Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

The disputed domain name previously resolved to a website prominently featuring the BRAUN trademark and offering purported BRAUN products for sale at low prices, which indicates that the Respondent had an intent to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion. Such conduct constitutes bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The Panel noticed that at the time of this decision, the disputed domain name no longer resolves to any active website. However, this does not prevent a finding of the Respondent’s bad faith.

Having reviewed the record and also given the Respondent’s lack of response to the Complainants’ Cease-and-Desist letter and the present proceeding, the Panel finds the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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

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 <braunstore.top> be transferred to the Complainants.

/James Wang/

James Wang

Sole Panelist

Date: September 5, 2025