

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Navantia, S.A. v. 任艺伟 (Yi Wei Ren)

Case No. D2025-2830

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Navantia, S.A., Spain, represented by Ubilibet, S.L., Spain.

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

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <navantia.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 July 17, 2025. On July 18, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 21, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 28, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint.

On July 28, 2025, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on August 1, 2025, reiterating its request for English to be the language of the proceedings. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant’s submission.

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 Chinese of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 4, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 24, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 29, 2025.

The Center appointed Leo (Yi) Liu as the sole panelist in this matter on September 2, 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 states that it is a Spanish State-owned company specializing in both naval and civilian shipbuilding, as well as advanced technological solutions for the maritime sector. It is recognized as one of Europe's leading manufacturers of warships, submarines, and integrated combat systems.

The Complaint further states that it has been in operation under its current name since 2005, and it is well-known in Australia, Norway, Saudi Arabia, Republic of Korea, and other countries.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademarks for NAVANTIA, including:

- Spain trademark registration No. M2633303 for NAVANTIA in Class 15, registered on June 20, 2005;
 - Spain trademark registration No. M2633300 for NAVANTIA in Class 12, registered on June 20, 2005;
 - Spain trademark registration No. M2633308 for NAVANTIA in Class 20, registered on June 20, 2005;
 - Spain trademark registration No. M2633331 for NAVANTIA in Class 43, registered on June 21, 2005;
 - Spain trademark registration No. M2633332 for NAVANTIA in Class 44, registered on June 21, 2005;
- and
- European Union Trade Mark No. 004259206 for Navantia & Design, registered on March 28, 2006.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 4, 2024. The disputed domain name redirects to a parking page offering the disputed domain name for sale for USD 1,450, as evidenced by the Complainant's screenshots.

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 identical to its well-known trademark NAVANTIA;
- 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 Proceedings

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 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 several reasons, including the fact that:

- the disputed domain name is composed of terms that emulate or approximate a Latin-origin brand name;
- proceeding in Chinese would require the Complainant to retain specialized translation services, and the time and costs required for translation of the Complaint would unfairly burden the Complainant;
- the Respondent can reasonably be expected to understand and respond to communications in English.

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

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).

The Panel notes that the Center notified the Parties in Chinese and English of the language of the proceedings and also notified the Respondent in Chinese and English of the Complaint. The Respondent did not comment on the language of the proceedings or file a Response.

The Panel is also mindful of the need to ensure that the proceedings are conducted in a timely and cost-effective manner. The Complainant would be unduly disadvantaged by having to translate the Complaint into Chinese and to conduct the proceedings in Chinese.

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

6.2 Substantive Issues

To obtain the relief it has requested, the Complainant must prove the presence of each of the three elements of the Policy: 1) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; 2) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and 3) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Based on the record submitted, 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 entirety of the mark NAVANTIA is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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.

As noted above, the disputed domain name redirects to a parking page offering the disputed domain name for sale. The Respondent has not come forward with any evidence that it has engaged in any demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services in accordance with paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy. The Respondent’s name does not correspond to the disputed domain name, and there is no evidence to support a finding that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy. Nor is the Respondent making any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name pursuant to paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy.

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 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name was registered many years after the registration of the Complainant’s trademark and currently redirects to a parking page offering the disputed domain name for sale. Such use of the disputed domain name – which is identical to the Complainant’s mark - indicates, on the balance of probabilities and noting the lack of any response, that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the Complainant or to a competitor of that Complainant, which falls squarely under the circumstances of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy. Moreover, the composition of the disputed domain name, being identical to the Complainant’s distinctive trademark, supports a finding that

that by offering the disputed domain name for sale in this case the Respondent has intended to capitalize on the reputation and goodwill inherent in the Complainant's trademark.

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 <navantia.xyz> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Leo (Yi) Liu/

Leo (Yi) Liu

Sole Panelist

Date: September 16, 2025