

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Compagnie des Montres Longines, Francillon S.A. v. wen yunhui
Case No. D2025-3331

1. The Parties

Complainant is Compagnie des Montres Longines, Francillon S.A., Switzerland, internally represented .

Respondent is wen yunhui, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <longines-us.shop> is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com ("Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center ("Center") on August 19, 2025. The same day, the Center transmitted by email to Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 20, 2025, Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name that differed from that in the Complaint (e.g., the Complaint named an "unknown" as Respondent). The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on August 20, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by Registrar and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on August 26, 2025, naming "wen yunhui" as Respondent.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy ("Policy"), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy ("Rules"), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy ("Supplemental Rules").

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 27 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 16, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on September 17, 2025.

The Center appointed Debra J. Stanek as the sole panelist in this matter on September 19, 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

Complainant is an internationally-known watch company established in Switzerland in 1832. It owns numerous registrations for the LONGINES mark, including:

- United States of America registration number 65109, registered September 10, 1907, for watches and watch-related goods.
- Japan registration number 238793, registered December 7, 1932, for clocks and watches, watch and clock parts and accessories.
- European Union registration number 000226233, registered October 2, 1998, for timekeeping instruments and jewelry, among other things.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 7, 2025. At the time the Complaint was filed and at the time of this Decision, it is used with a website that displays the LONGINES mark, offering LONGINES watches for sale.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

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

In particular:

- The LONGINES mark is clearly recognizable in the disputed domain name, which consists of the mark followed by a hyphen and the geographical term "us," referring to the United States.
- There is no evidence that Respondent is known by the disputed domain name, and Complainant has not authorized Respondent's use.
- Respondent is using the disputed domain name for a website that copies Complainant's official website, including the display of the LONGINES logo, product photographs, and other content, impersonating Complainant. The website includes an "About Us" page that expressly identifies the website operator as Complainant.
- Respondent is impersonating Complainant to defraud consumers. Complainant has received complaints from consumers regarding products ordered through Respondent's website—including that products are not delivered after payment.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

To prevail under the Policy a complainant must prove, as to the domain name at issue, that: (a) it is identical or confusingly similar to a mark in which the complainant has rights, (b) respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect to it, and (c) it has been registered and is being used in bad faith. Policy, paragraph 4(a). A respondent's failure to respond does not automatically result in a finding for the complainant; the complainant continues to have the burden of establishing each element. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.3. The Panel may, however, draw appropriate inferences from the default. See Rules, paragraph 14(b).

The Panel determines that "wen yunhui" is the appropriate Respondent. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.4.5 (in cases involving a privacy service, Panel has discretion to determine appropriate respondent).

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 Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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 disputed domain name is not identical to Complainant's mark. Despite the addition of "-us," however, the entirety of the LONGINES mark is reproduced and recognizable within the disputed domain name. Although the addition of "-us" may bear on the assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

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 Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in proceedings under the Policy 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 remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

The Panel finds Complainant has established that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Complainant's evidence shows that Respondent uses the disputed domain name with a replica of Complainant's website, including the LONGINES mark, images of Complainant's products, a copyright notice identifying Complainant, and other content, which is falsely represented as being operated by Complainant. Consistent with the views of other panels, see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1, the Panel finds that such use does not confer rights or legitimate interests on Respondent.

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 list in paragraph 4(b) is not exhaustive; 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.

Respondent's copying of the content of Complainant's website for the website used with the disputed domain name -- including representing that Complainant operates that website -- makes it clear that Respondent was well aware of, and specifically targeted, Complainant's LONGINES mark to attract visitors who would believe the website was Complainant's. Under these circumstances, the Panel finds Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name is in bad faith.

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 <longines-us.shop> be transferred to Complainant

/Debra J. Stanek/

Debra J. Stanek

Sole Panelist

Date: October 3, 2025