

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Jcdecaux SE v. 刘伟 (liuwei)  
Case No. D2025-4284

### 1. The Parties

The Complainant is Jcdecaux SE, France, represented by Nameshield, France.

The Respondent is 刘伟 (liuwei), China.

### 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <jcdecaux.team> is registered with DNSPod, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 20, 2025. On October 21, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 22, 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 28, 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 in English on October 28, 2025.

On October 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. On October 28, 2025, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding. 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 October 28, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 17, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on November 28, 2025.

The Center appointed Linda Chang as the sole panelist in this matter on December 3, 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**

Established in 1964, the Complainant is a global outdoor advertising company and has been offering solutions that combine urban development and provision of public services in more than 80 countries, for over 60 years. The Complainant is listed on the Euronext Paris stock exchange and is part of the Euronext 100 index. The Complainant states that it is currently the only group present in the three principal segments of outdoor advertising market, namely, street furniture, transport advertising, and billboard advertising and has over 1 million advertising panels in airports, rail and metro stations, shopping malls, on billboards and street furniture. The Complainant employs over 12,000 people worldwide and generated EUR 3,935.3 million in 2024. The Complainant entered into China in 2005 and has been the leading outdoor advertising company in China, with around 150,000 advertising panels in 11 cities.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for JCDECAUX trademark, including:

- The International trademark JCDECAUX Registration No. 803987, registered on November 27, 2001, in classes 6, 9, 11, 19, 20, 35, 37, 38, 39, 41, and 42;
- The Chinese trademark JCDECAUX Registration No. 31062028, registered on March 7, 2019, in class 35.

The Complainant owns the domain name <jcdecaux.com> that incorporates its JCDECAUX trademark. The domain name was registered on June 23, 1997.

The disputed domain name <jcdecaux.team> was registered on October 15, 2025, and resolves to an inactive website.

#### **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:

- i) the disputed domain name includes the Complainant's JCDECAUX trademark in its entirety, without any addition or deletion. Thus, the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's JCDECAUX trademark;
- ii) the Respondent has not been commonly known by the disputed domain name;
- iii) the Respondent has no affiliation with the Complainant, and the Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use the JCDECAUX trademark for any reason or in any manner;
- iv) the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive website. The Respondent did not use the disputed domain name and has no demonstrable plan to use the disputed domain name;
- v) given the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant and its JCDECAUX trademark, it is inconceivable that the Respondent could have registered the disputed domain name without actual knowledge of the Complainant and its JCDECAUX trademark; and

vi) the disputed domain name is not actually used but has been set up with Mail Exchange records. It is inconceivable that the Respondent will be able to make any good faith use of the disputed domain name, including as part of an email address.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **6.1 Preliminary Issue: 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 Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including the fact that 1) the English language is the language most widely used in international relations and is one of the working languages of the Center; 2) the disputed domain name is formed by words in Roman characters, not in Chinese script; 3) using Chinese as language of the proceeding would unfairly disadvantage and burden the Complainant and delay the proceedings and adjudication of this matter; 4) the Complaint is written in English but the Center informed the Respondent in Chinese and English and afforded the Respondent the opportunity to comment on the Complainant's request of using English as the language of the proceeding and to submit Response in either Chinese or English.

The Respondent did not make any specific 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).

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 Issues**

#### **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 available records, the Complainant has shown rights in respect of the JCDECAUX trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".team", as a standard registration requirement, should be disregarded in the assessment of confusing similarity under the Policy.

The dominant part of the disputed domain name is "jcdecaux" which incorporates the entirety of the Complainant's JCDECAUX trademark and is exactly the same as the JCDECAUX trademark. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's JCDECAUX trademark 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.

The information in the case file shows that:

- through the Complainant’s continuous and extensive use and advertising of the JCDECAUX trademark, the Complainant and its JCDECAUX trademark have gained a high reputation;
- the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive website, without any actual use or demonstrable plan to use the disputed domain name by the Respondent, which cannot be deemed as bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use;
- there is no evidence proving that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name;
- the nature of the disputed domain name, which is identical to the Complainant’s JCDECAUX trademark and to the dominant component of the Complainant’s prior domain name <jcdecaux.com>, carries a high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant; and
- no other factors demonstrate any rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in the disputed domain name.

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 Complainant obtained the trademark registration for JCDECAUX as early as November 27, 2001, which significantly predates the registration date of the disputed domain name (October 15, 2025). According to the Complainant’s evidence, the Panel accepts that the JCDECAUX trademark has gained a high reputation and distinctiveness through the Complainant’s continuous and extensive use and advertising. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name that is identical to the Complainant’s JCDECAUX trademark. Bearing in mind that the Complainant’s JCDECAUX

trademark is a coined word and the Complainant has business operations in China and has been well reputed and recognized in China where the Respondent reportedly resides, the Panel determines that the Respondent was aware or should have been aware of the Complainant's rights to JCDECAUX trademark at the time of registering the disputed domain name, and bad faith is found.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but 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.

The disputed domain name resolves to an inactive website and is passively held by the Respondent. Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available records, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's JCDECAUX trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name which is identical to the Complainant's JCDECAUX trademark, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

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 <jcdecaux.team> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Linda Chang/*

**Linda Chang**

Sole Panelist

Date: December 17, 2025