

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Amina Corp v. 任伟 (ren wei), 任伟 (ren wei)
Case No. D2025-5355

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Amina Corp, France, represented by Coblence Avocats, France.

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

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <aminamuaddi-eu.top>, and <aminamuaddi-outlets.top> are 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 December 22, 2025. On December 22, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On December 23, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names 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 December 23, 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 amendment to the Complaint in English on December 26, 2025.

On December 23, 2025, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the Language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain names is Chinese. On December 26, 2025, the Complainant confirmed its request that English 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 amendment to the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Names Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “UDRP”), the Rules for Uniform Domain Names Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Names Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).


In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on January 7, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 27, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on January 28, 2026.

The Center appointed Douglas Clark as the sole panelist in this matter on January 30, 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

Complainant is a French company engaged in online global retail sale of shoes and accessories (such as leather goods and jewelry) for women under the brand AMINA MUADDI available in particular from the website at "www.aminamuaddi.com".

Complainant registered the domain name <aminamuaddi.com> on March 9, 2017.

Complainant is also the owner of several trademarks composed of the words "amina muaddi" or , including the following among others:

- the word International trademark AMINA MUADDI No. 1371021 designating Australia, China, Algeria, Egypt, European Union, Ghana, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, African Intellectual Property Organization, Russian Federation, Sudan, Tunisia, Türkiye, and the United States of America, registered on July 27, 2017 in classes 3, 9, 14, 18, 25, and 35;
- the word International trademark AMINA MUADDI No.1766707 registered on April 5, 2023, designating notably the European Union, China, Singapore, and the United States of America for goods and services in classes 3, 4, 9, 14, 16, 18, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26, and 35;

The Respondent is purportedly an individual located in China.

The disputed domain names are as follows:

- <aminamuaddi-outlets.top> registered on December 13, 2025; and
- <aminamuaddi-eu.top> registered on December 14, 2025.

The disputed domain names previously directed to websites which prominently displayed the Complainant's mark, reproduced photographs from the Complainant's official website, and purportedly offered the Complainant's products at substantially discounted prices. At the time of filing the complaint, the disputed domain names resolved to websites stating "This store is under construction."

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that (i) the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark; (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names; and (iii) the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain names in bad faith.

In particular, the Complainant contends that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain names to confuse and lure Internet users to its websites.

The Complainant submits that it has no affiliation with the Respondent, nor has it authorized the Respondent to register or use a domain name, which includes the Complainant's marks, and that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the registration of the disputed domain names. Rather, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has acted in bad faith in acquiring and setting up the disputed domain names, when the Respondent clearly knew of the Complainant's rights.

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 names 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 the websites the disputed domain names previously resolved to were in English and they now resolve to a site stating "This store is under construction."

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 3.1](#), 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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

In the present case, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's AMINA MUADDI trademark. The addition of "-eu" and "outlets" in the disputed domain names <aminamuaddi-eu.top> and <aminamuaddi-outlets.top> does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights, and that the Complainant has satisfied the first element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

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 3.1](#), section 2.1.

The Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activities, here claimed passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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.

The Respondent reproduced substantial portions of the Complainant’s website content, including the Complainant’s trademark, on the websites associated with the disputed domain names. By doing so, it is clear the Respondent was intentionally seeking to attract Internet users for commercial gain through the creation of a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark.

Panels have also held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activities, here claimed passing off, constitutes bad faith under the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

The Panel finds the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) 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 names <aminamuaddi-eu.top>, and <aminamuaddi-outlets.top> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Douglas Clark/

Douglas Clark

Sole Panelist

Date: February 27, 2025