

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Compagnie Générale des Etablissements Michelin v. Qingqing Yu
Case No. D2026-0103

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Compagnie Générale des Etablissements Michelin, France, represented by Dreyfus & associés, France.

The Respondent is Qingqing Yu, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <bibendum.store> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 12, 2026. On January 12, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 12, 2026, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 13, 2026, 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 on January 13, 2026.

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 of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on January 15, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 4, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 11, 2026.

The Center appointed Knud Wallberg as the sole panelist in this matter on February 19, 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 corporation established in 1889. It is a leading global tire company dedicated to designing and distributing tires, services, and mobility solutions, as well as providing maps and travel guides. It employs more than 124,000 people worldwide and operates over 117 tire manufacturing facilities and sales agencies in 26 countries. The Complainant Michelin entered into China in 1989 with a first representative office in Beijing and the Complainant now has several subsidiaries in China.

The Complainant offers and supplies goods and services under its BIBENDUM trademark (the “Mark”), which represents the Complainant’s mascot, also known as the “Michelin Man”, which was introduced in 1894. It is the proprietor of a number of trademark registrations for the Mark around the world, including International Trademark Registration No. 326563, registered on November 18, 1966, covering goods and services in classes 06, 07, 08, 10, 11, 12, 16, 17, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28 and 34 designating several jurisdictions, including Germany and Italy; and - International Trademark Registration No. 709584, registered on March 18, 1999, covering goods in class 25, designating several jurisdictions, including Austria, Spain, and Türkiye.

The Complainant also operates, among other domain names, <bibendum.fr>, registered on January 26, 2004.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 13, 2025, and resolves to a Registrar resale page offering it for sale.

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 the disputed domain name is identical to its Mark, reproducing the Mark in its entirety with only the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain “.store”, which does not avoid a finding of confusing similarity. It states that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, is neither affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant, and is not commonly known by the name “Bibendum”. The Complainant further asserts that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Complainant thus submits that it is inconceivable that the Respondent did not have the Complainant’s trademarks in mind at the time of registration of the disputed domain name, just as the fact that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to redirect Internet users to a reseller’s platform where the disputed domain name is offered for sale constitutes bad faith use.

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 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.

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 3.1](#), 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 that 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.

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 the strong international reputation of the Complainant and its marks, as well as the identical composition of the disputed domain name, such that the Panel finds the Respondent most likely registered the disputed domain name with prior knowledge of the Complainants and the Complainant's marks.

Furthermore, the disputed domain name is offered for sale or lease at a price likely in excess of the holder's out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name, which is in an indication of bad faith. Paragraph 4(b)(i) 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 <bibendum.store> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Knud Wallberg/

Knud Wallberg

Sole Panelist

Date: March 5, 2026