

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

IPSOS v. Yiwei Ren  
Case No. D2025-4603

### 1. The Parties

The Complainant is IPSOS, France, represented by Novagraaf France, France.

The Respondent is Yiwei Ren, China.

### 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ipsos.site> is registered with Atak Domain Hosting Internet ve Bilgi Teknolojileri Limited Sirketi d/b/a Atak Teknoloji (the “Registrar”).

### 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 6, 2025. On November 7, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 8, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that the 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 December 3, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 23, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on December 24, 2025.

The Center appointed Nayiri Boghossian as the sole panelist in this matter on January 2, 2026. 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 operating in the field of surveys, market research and marketing worldwide. The Complainant owns trademark registrations for IPSOS in numerous jurisdictions such as the following:

1. European Union Trademark Registration No. 005583621, registered on January 10, 2008; and
2. European Union Trademark Registration No. 018161418, registered on May 22, 2020.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 22, 2025, and resolves to an inactive website. The evidence submitted by the Complainant shows that the disputed domain name was offered for sale for USD 1,450.

#### **6. 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 confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. The disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's trademark. The ".site" is a required extension for domain names.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is neither affiliated with the Complainant nor has been authorized by the Complainant to register the disputed domain name. The Respondent does not own any rights in the IPSOS trademark. The Respondent knew of the Complainant and its trademark.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website and is offered for sale at USD 1,450. The Complainant's trademark is well known and has no dictionary meaning. A cease-and-desist letter was sent to the Respondent and remained unanswered.

##### **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.

The entirety of the mark 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.

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.

While the resale of domain names consisting of acronyms, dictionary words, or common phrases can be bona fide and is not per se illegitimate under the UDRP, here the Panel notes that the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant’s distinctive trademark, was registered almost two decades after the registration of the trademark, and is offered for sale at a price likely exceeding the Respondent’s out-of-pocket expenses, absent evidence to the contrary.

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 must have been aware of the Complainant’s trademark as it is well-known and the Complainant’s trademark was registered almost two decades before the registration of the disputed domain name.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that 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 Panel finds applicable the circumstances set out in UDRP paragraph 4(b)(i), namely that “The respondent has registered or acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the respondent’s documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name”.

This conclusion is drawn from the fact that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name almost two decades after the Complainant’s registration of the trademark and has offered it for sale for a price likely exceeding the Respondent’s out-of-pocket expenses, absent evidence from the Respondent to the contrary.

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 <ipsos.site> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Nayiri Boghossian/*

**Nayiri Boghossian**

Sole Panelist

Date: January 14, 2026