

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

B&B HOTELS v. Yiwei Ren

Case No. D2025-4032

1. The Parties

The Complainant is B&B HOTELS, France, represented by Fiducial Legal By Lamy, France.

The Respondent is Yiwei Ren, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <hotelbb.xyz> is registered with Nicnames, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 2, 2025. On October 3, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 7, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 7, 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 October 9, 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 October 13, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 7, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on November 7, 2025.

The Center appointed Andrew F. Christie as the sole panelist in this matter on November 24, 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 company incorporated on May 28, 1990 and registered in the French Registry of Commerce under No. 378 047 500. It has used the name B&B HOTELS as a brand and as a commercial name offering services of hotels, restaurants, temporary accommodations and related booking services, including through the Internet, to a wide range of customers, since 1990. The Complainant operates more than 860 hotels in France, Germany, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Belgium, Switzerland, Poland, Austria, Slovenia, Czech Republic and Brazil, with 432 of them being in France. Through that use, the Complainant has reached the top position on the French market of budget hotels, with a turnover in 2021 of more than EUR 220 million.

The Complainant owns several trademark registrations composed of the elements “BB” and “HOTEL”, including French Trademark No. 3182311 (registered February 14, 2003) for the word trademark BBHOTEL, French Trademark No. 3182312 (registered February 14, 2003) for the word trademark HOTELBB, and Portuguese Trademark No. 487526 (registered November 2, 2011) for the word trademark HOTEL BB.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 29, 2025. The Complainant provided a screenshot, dated October 2, 2025, of a Domain Tools page for the disputed domain name, showing it was being offered for sale at a price of USD 1,450. The Complainant sent a cease and desist letter to the Registrar on August 26, 2025. The Registrar responded by letter dated September 1, 2025, saying it was not able to act and suggesting the Complainant file a complaint under the Policy.

As of the date of this decision, the disputed domain name resolves to a GoDaddy parking page containing text stating “The domain name HotelBb.xyz is for sale!” and “Own it today for \$1,450”.

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.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which it has rights on the following grounds, among others. The disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant’s French Trademark Registration for the word trademark HOTELBB.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name on the following grounds, among others. The disputed domain name is currently inactive and is for sale for USD 1,450. The Respondent is currently not and has never been known under the name HOTELBB and is not currently and has never been offering any goods or services under that name. The Complainant has not licensed or authorized the Respondent in any way to use the trademarks BBHOTEL or HOTELBB. The Respondent has not adduced any evidence of legitimate use of, or demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. On the contrary, the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name for a legitimate activity, since the website is not active, but it is offering it for sale, demonstrating its lack of legitimate interests, except for gaining traffic from Internet users who will be misled by thinking that it is the Complainant’s website. The Respondent was involved in previous UDRP cases in all of which the panels found that the Respondent lacked rights or legitimate interests in domain names similar to the disputed domain name.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith on the following grounds, among others. The Respondent was aware of the existence of the Complainant's trademarks at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith, considering that the date of the registration of the disputed domain name (being June 29, 2025) is later than the date of registration of the Complainant's trademarks (dating back to 2005) and the date when the Complainant started using its trademarks (dating back to early 1990), and that B&B HOTELS is a well-known mark and a famous hotel chain in France and in Europe and the mark is widely used in this respect. The Respondent has obviously no legitimate interest in the disputed domain name as he does not intend to use it for a bona fide offering of goods or services; on the contrary, the Respondent's sole intention is an intentional attempt to attract, for commercial gain, or to defraud Internet users to third party's web sites or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the web sites or locations, which is a clear evidence of registration and use in bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. It is not possible to conceive a plausible circumstance in which the Respondent could legitimately use the disputed domain name. It is also not possible to conceive of a plausible situation in which the Respondent would have been unaware of this fact at the time of registration. The Respondent is familiar with this type of behavior as he was found to have registered and used domain names in bad faith in several previous UDRP cases. The same situation applies in the current proceedings where the disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's trademark, is not being used, and is offered for sale at USD 1,450 which is likely in excess of the documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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. It is the owner of a trademark registration for the word trademark HOTELBB.

Once the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".xyz" is ignored (which is appropriate in this case), the disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's word trademark. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's 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.

The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, is not otherwise affiliated with the Complainant, and has not been authorized by the Complainant to use its HOTELBB trademark. The Respondent has not provided any evidence that it has been commonly known by, or has made a bona fide use of, the disputed domain name, or that it has, for any other reason, rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. The disputed domain name is not being actively used by the Respondent, but rather it is being offered for sale.

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.

The evidence provided by the Complainant shows that the disputed domain was offered for sale for USD 1,450. This indicates that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring it to the Complainant or to a competitor of the Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the Respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name. According to paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy, this is evidence of bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name.

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 <hotelbb.xyz> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrew F. Christie/

Andrew F. Christie

Sole Panelist

Date: December 8, 2025