

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Julius Blum GmbH v. Le Trung Hieu  
Case No. D2026-0129

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Julius Blum GmbH, Austria, represented by Torggler & Hofmann Patentanwälte GmbH & Co KG, Austria.

The Respondent is Le Trung Hieu, Viet Nam.

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

The disputed domain name (“Disputed Domain Name”) <blumvietnam.net> is registered with P.A. Viet Nam Company Limited (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 13, 2026. On January 14, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On January 17, 2026, 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.

On January 19, 2026, the Center informed the parties in Vietnamese and English, that the language of the registration agreement for the Disputed Domain Name is Vietnamese. On January 21, 2026, the Complainant confirmed its request that English be the language of the proceeding and filed an amendment to the Complaint in English. 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 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 Vietnamese of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on January 26, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 15, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 18, 2026.

The Center appointed Duy Khanh Nguyen as the sole panelist in this matter on February 24, 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 was founded in 1952 and currently is one of the largest manufacturers of furniture fittings in the world. It currently employs approximately 9,500 people all over the world.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations that consist of or contain the word “blum” (the “BLUM trademarks”) for furniture related products in many jurisdictions around the world, including, but not limited to the International Registrations No. 996626 (registered on November 18, 2008), No. 598611 (registered on February 16, 1993), and No. 1171363 (registered on April 29, 2013) all designating Viet Nam.

Additionally, the Complainant is the owner of the domain name <blum.com> and maintains an active website at “www.blum.com”.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on November 17, 2022. In accordance with the evidence presented by the Complainant, the Disputed Domain Name resolves to an active website prominently displaying the Complainant’s logo mark, and purportedly offering for sale and advertising hardware products, in particular furniture fittings.

#### **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 it has strong rights in and to the BLUM trademarks, and the Disputed Domain Name is nearly identical and confusingly similar to the Complainant’s BLUM trademarks as the Disputed Domain Name fully incorporates the Complainant’s mark BLUM and the additional geographical suffix “vietnam” does not eliminate a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s BLUM trademarks.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name since the Complainant has never licensed or in any way authorized the Respondent to register or use its trademark BLUM as a domain name.

Finally, the Complainant asserts that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Firstly, the Complainant indicates that the Respondent intentionally registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith and with the fraudulent intent to lure Internet users into believing that the Respondent is, or is affiliated with, the Complainant. Secondly, the Complainant asserts that when registering the Disputed Domain Name, the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant given that the Complainant has been doing business in Viet Nam for over 20 years, the Disputed Domain Name has been designed to imply that there is an affiliation between the Respondent and the Complainant or that the Complainant endorses the Respondent’s activities even though no such affiliation or endorsement exists.

##### **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 Registration Agreement for the Disputed Domain Name is Vietnamese. Pursuant to paragraph 11 of the UDRP Rules, unless otherwise agreed by the parties, the default language of the proceeding is the language of the registration agreement, subject to the authority of the panel to determine otherwise.

The Complainant filed the Complaint in English, requesting the language of the proceeding to be such on the grounds that the Respondent is familiar with English as the website at the Disputed Domain Name contains English content. In addition, the Complainant, being an international company, is familiar with English as well.

The Respondent did not make any 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. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.5.1.

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel finds that it is appropriate to exercise its discretion and allow the proceedings to be conducted in 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.

The Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name fully incorporates the Complainant's BLUM trademarks and is combined with the word "Vietnam". In this context, the Panel finds that the addition of the term "Vietnam" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

In addition, it is well-established that the Top-Level Domain (i.e., ".net") may be disregarded for this purpose.

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.

In the absence of prior agreement between the parties, resellers, distributors, or service providers may establish rights or legitimate interests in a domain name through a bona fide offering of goods and services. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.8. This must align with specific criteria outlined in the decision *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#) ("Oki Data").

In the present case, the Panel finds that there is no statement or disclaimer clarifying the actual relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent. On the contrary, the Respondent's website prominently displays the Complainant's logo mark. Therefore, the Respondent cannot be considered to be making a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Moreover, the Panel finds that the composition of the Disputed Domain Name incorporating the Complainant's trademark in its entirety with the addition of a geographic term "vietnam" carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

Regarding paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy, the Panel finds no evidence indicating that the Respondent has been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name.

Finally, it is clear that the Respondent is using the Disputed Domain Name with the purpose of selling furniture hardware products. Hence, the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.4.

For these reasons, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name.

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.

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 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has proved that the Respondent has registered and used the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith. The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions and, therefore, did not refute the Complainant's contentions.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Complainant holds registered BLUM trademarks globally, including in Viet Nam and the Complainant has been doing business in Viet Nam for over 20 years. The Disputed Domain Name fully incorporates the Complainant's BLUM trademarks, adding the geographical identifier "Vietnam" at the end. It is implausible that the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name coincidentally. Upon reviewing the website associated with the Disputed Domain Name,

where the Complainant's BLUM trademarks are used prominently, the Panel finds that the Respondent was well aware of the Complainant and its BLUM trademarks when registering the Disputed Domain Name. In the Panel's view, the registration of the Disputed Domain Name is an attempt by the Respondent to capitalize on the Complainant's goodwill. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

The Disputed Domain Name still resolves to an active website offering furniture hardware products bearing the BLUM trademarks, which clearly creates a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's BLUM trademarks.

This misleading conduct is a clear indication of bad faith registration and use within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

## **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 <blumvietnam.net> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Duy Khanh Nguyen/*

**Duy Khanh Nguyen**

Sole Panelist

Date: March 5, 2026