

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

SAFRAN v. Yiwei Ren

Case No. D2025-5049

1. The Parties

The Complainant is SAFRAN, France, represented by Ebrand France, France.

The Respondent is Yiwei Ren, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <sagemcom.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 December 4, 2025. On December 5, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 6, 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 10, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 30, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 2, 2026.

The Center appointed Ugur G. Yalçiner as the sole panelist in this matter on January 7, 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, Safran, is an international high-technology group operating in the aviation, defense and space sectors. The Complainant is the owner of the SAGEMCOM trademark and has granted a worldwide and exclusive license over this mark to SAGEMCOM Broadband SAS, a French company active in the telecommunications and connected devices market.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademark registrations consisting of the term SAGEMCOM, some of which are listed below:

- International trademark SAGEMCOM with registration No. 1023960, registered on July 30, 2009, designating, amongst others, China (where the Respondent resides) in classes 9, 38 and 42; and
- European Union Trade Mark SAGEMCOM with registration No. 007562739, registered on March 8, 2010, in classes 9, 11, 38 and 42.

The Complainant also owns several domain names incorporating the mark SAGEMCOM, including <sagemcom.com> (registered on January 26, 2009), <sagemcom.us> (registered on February 10, 2009), and <sagemcom.fr> (registered on January 26, 2009). These domain names resolve to the official website at “www.sagemcom.com/en”, which is used to promote the activities of the French company SAGEMCOM Broadband SAS operating under the SAGEMCOM trademark.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 22, 2025. According to Annex 15 of the Complaint, at the time of filing, the disputed domain name resolved to a GoDaddy page on which it was offered for sale for USD 1,450. As of the date of this Decision, the disputed domain name does not resolve to any active 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. The Complaint includes the following contentions:

(i) Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical to its SAGEMCOM trademark, as it reproduces the mark in its entirety without any addition or alteration. The Complainant further submits that the term “sagemcom” is not a dictionary or generic word and that Internet searches for this term exclusively refer to the Complainant and its trademark, confirming that the Respondent targeted the Complainant’s mark when registering the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant’s trademark within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

(ii) Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant alleges that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name is not used in connection with any bona fide offering of goods or services but merely resolves to a GoDaddy page on which it is offered for sale for a high price, which previous UDRP decisions recognize as evidence of a lack of rights or legitimate interests. The Complainant further asserts that the Respondent is not commonly known by the name “sagemcom”, as Internet and company database searches show that this term refers exclusively to the Complainant, and WIPO Global Brand Database searches confirm that only the Complainant owns rights in the SAGEMCOM mark. The Respondent holds no SAGEMCOM trademark and has never been authorized by the Complainant to use this mark, and therefore cannot claim any legitimate interest in the disputed domain name.

(iii) Registration and Use in Bad Faith

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, as it reproduces the Complainant's SAGEMCOM trademark in its entirety and was registered in order to prevent the Complainant from reflecting its mark in a corresponding domain name. The Complainant further alleges that the Respondent has been the subject of multiple UDRP decisions ordering the transfer of domain names, which constitutes a pattern of bad faith conduct. Moreover, the disputed domain name resolves to a webpage on which it is offered for sale for USD 1,450, showing that it was registered primarily for the purpose of selling it for profit based on the Complainant's well-known trademark. In addition, the configuration of MX servers allows the disputed domain name to be used for email, creating a serious risk of impersonation and phishing, and misleading Internet users into believing that communications originate from the Complainant. Despite cease-and-desist letters sent on October 13, 2025 and November 3, 2025, the Respondent provided no response. Accordingly, the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the three elements are present:

- (i) the disputed domain name registered by the Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 names. 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 for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1. The Panel is satisfied that the Complainant is the owner of the SAGEMCOM trademarks registered around the world.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark SAGEMCOM, without any addition. In this regard, the Panel considers that the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's trademark, as it consists of the Complainant's trademark in its entirety. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

It is an accepted principle that Top-Level Domains, in this case ".site", are to be typically disregarded in the consideration of the issue of whether a domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a complainant's trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.

In the light of the above, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's registered trademarks and that the requirements in paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy are fulfilled.

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 Respondent does not have any registered trademarks or trade names, and no license or authorization of any other kind has been given to the Respondent by the Complainant to use its registered trademark.

The Panel also notes that there is no evidence of the Respondent’s demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name or a name corresponding to the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Rather, according to the Complainant’s assertions and Annex 15 of the Complaint, the disputed domain name redirected to a GoDaddy page on which it was offered for sale for USD 1,450. In these circumstances, where the Respondent has registered a domain name identical to the Complainant’s distinctive trademark and has offered it for sale, the Panel finds that there is no plausible basis for any bona fide offering of goods or services or for any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

As a result, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy are therefore fulfilled by the Complainant.

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 is satisfied with the relevant evidence filed by the Complainant showing that it owns trademark rights for SAGEMCOM, which has been registered and used for many years prior to the registration of the disputed domain name.

Considering the distinctiveness of the Complainant’s trademark together with the Internet search results and screenshots submitted by the Complainant, a simple online search for the term “sagemcom” would have revealed the Complainant and its trademark. The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent could not credibly have been unaware of the Complainant’s trademark at the time the disputed domain name was registered. In addition, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name redirected to a GoDaddy page on which it was offered for sale for USD 1,450, which is indicative of a registration primarily for the purpose of selling the domain name for valuable consideration in excess of the Respondent’s out-of-pocket costs. In these circumstances, the Panel is satisfied that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with

the intention of taking unfair advantage of the Complainant's trademark.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name is currently not actively used; however, such non-use does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. In assessing this issue, the Panel takes into account the following circumstances: (i) the highly distinctive nature of the SAGEMCOM trademark; (ii) the Respondent's apparent intent to take unfair advantage of the Complainant's trademark, including by offering the disputed domain name for sale; (iii) the absence of any evidence of good-faith use or rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent; and (iv) the implausibility of any legitimate actual or contemplated use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent.

The Panel also takes into account the Complainant's contention that the Respondent has been the subject of multiple UDRP proceedings brought by different trademark owners, all of which resulted in decisions against the Respondent. The Panel considers that this conduct demonstrates a clear pattern of abusive domain name registrations and corroborates a finding of bad faith in the present case.

The Complainant alleges that it sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent on October 13, 2025, followed by a reminder on November 3, 2025, prior to the filing of the Complaint, to which the Respondent did not reply. Referring to the panel's approach in *Bayerische Motoren Werke AG v. (This Domain is For Sale) Joshuathan Investments, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2002-0787](#), and in light of the circumstances of the present case, the Panel considers that the Respondent's failure to respond to the Complainant's communications further supports a finding of bad faith.

Having considered all the facts in this case, the Panel finds that the Complainant has sustained its burden of proof in showing that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 <sagemcom.site> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ugur G. Yalçiner/

Ugur G. Yalçiner

Sole Panelist

Date: January 13, 2026