

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

IRO v. 任伟(renwei), 任伟 (ren wei)

Case No. D2025-4533

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is IRO, France, represented by Fiducial Legal By Lamy, France.

The Respondent is 任伟(renwei), 任伟(ren wei), China.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <iroparis-outlets.shop> is registered with Xin Net Technology Corporation (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 3, 2025. On November 4, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 5, 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 (Domain Protection Services, Inc.) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 17, 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 November 21, 2025.

On November 17, 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 November 18, 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 November 21, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 11, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on December 15, 2025.

The Center appointed Hong Yang as the sole panelist in this matter on December 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 Complainant, IRO, is a French company incorporated in 2010. The origin of the IRO brand dates back to 1999 and the products under the IRO mark were launched in 2005. The Complainant's products such as clothing apparel and accessories are branded under trademarks of IRO, IRO.JEANS, etc, and are being distributed worldwide through the Complainant's numerous shops and corners in Europe, North America, Asia, and Africa, including in the region where the Respondent reportedly resides.

The Complainant owns various trademarks containing the terms "Iro", "Iro Paris" or "Iro-Jeans.Paris" globally, including the following: French Trademark Registration No. 99800550 for IRO (word), registered on December 17, 1999; European Union Trademark Registration No. 010711191 for IRO PARIS (figurative), registered on May 9, 2015; and China Trademark Registration No. 39965769 for IRO-JEANS.PARIS (word), registered on March 7, 2021.

The Complainant operates its official website under the domain name <iroparis.com>, which was registered on April 1, 2012.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 5, 2025. At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website purportedly offering wearing products identical or similar to the Complainant, some of which bearing the Complainant's IRO mark. Most of the products were offered at "clearance" prices amounting to 80% off. The top banner of the website displays prominently the Complainant's IRO mark and the products images in the website included designed photos used by the Complainant in its official website. At the "Company Info" page, there were introduction texts exclusively about the IRO brand.

#### **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.

##### **B. Respondent**

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

#### **6. Discussion and Findings**

##### **6.1 Procedural 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 Complainant is a French company not comprehending Chinese, and English would be the best language for both parties in the proceeding; and (2) the Respondent was involved in another UDRP proceeding, *Benda Bili v. 任伟 (ren wei), 许春幼 (xu chunyou), 黄浩 (huang hao)*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3156](#), where the Complainant was also a French company and where the language of the proceeding was originally Chinese and was accepted to be changed into English.

The Respondent has, moreover, been notified by the Center, in both Chinese and English, of the language of the proceeding and of the Complaint. The Respondent did not make any submissions with respect to the language of the proceedings, nor did the Respondent file any Response in Chinese or English.

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.

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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, "outlets" and the hyphen "-", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The applicable generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD"), here ".shop" in the disputed domain name does not impact this finding, since the gTLD, as a standard registration requirement, is generally disregarded in the assessment under the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

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.

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 notes that the composition of the disputed domain name itself affirms the Respondent’s intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant’s trademark as to the origin or affiliation, incorporating the IRO PARIS mark in full and merely adding a hyphen and the term of “outlets”, which closely relates to the Complainant’s field of business. Further, the available record shows that the Respondent is not affiliated or otherwise authorized to use the IRO PARIS mark or held any registration of the IRO PARIS mark anywhere. There is no evidence indicating that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name resolved to a website which without authorization prominently displayed the Complainant’s IRO trademark, used designed product photographs from the Complainant, and made impression about being “IRO” in the Company Info page. The website under the disputed domain name offered the Complainant’s purported products for sale widely at disproportionately low prices. The Panel infers that there is likelihood that the products offered for sale are counterfeit products. The overall circumstances indicate the Respondent’s attempt to impersonate the Complainant. The Panel is convinced that the Respondent has attempted to gain unfair revenues from targeting the Complainant, creating a likelihood of confusion. Such use cannot constitute any bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here claimed impersonation, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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 Respondent has used without any license or authorization the Complainant’s IRO PARIS mark in full in the disputed domain name plus a related term with a hyphen. The Complainant’s trademark IRO PARIS is widely used in multiple jurisdictions, including the location where the Respondent resides, and the Complainant’s registration and use of its marks much predate the Respondent’s registration of the disputed domain name. Moreover, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s domain name <iroparis.com>. This signals the Respondent’s intention to target the Complainant and trade off its famous mark. Thus, the Panel considers that the Respondent must have known of the Complainant’s mark at the time of registering the disputed domain name.

Further, considering the use of the disputed domain name analyzed in Section 6.2 B above, the Panel finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website. The disputed domain name was thus registered and used in bad faith, according to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of 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 <iroParis-outlets.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Hong Yang/*

**Hong Yang**

Sole Panelist

Date: January 6, 2026