ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Bureau Veritas v. 义乌市茵烁灯具商行(个体工商户) (Yi Wu Shi Yin Shuo Deng Ju Shang Xing Ge Ti Gong Shang Hu)
Case No. D2026-0214

1. The Parties

Complainant is Bureau Veritas, France, represented by Dennemeyer & Associates SAS, France.

Respondent is 义乌市茵烁灯具商行 (个体工商户) (Yi Wu Shi Yin Shuo Deng Ju Shang Xing Ge Ti Gong Shang Hu), China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <bvajc.com> is registered with Chengdu West Dimension Digital Technology Co., Ltd. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on January 20, 2026. On January 20, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 21, 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 (redacted for privacy / Registration Private) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on January 21, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint in English on January 22, 2026.

On January 21, 2026, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. On January 22, 2026, Complainant confirmed its request that English be the language of the proceeding. Respondent did not submit any comment on Complainant's submission.

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 Respondent in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on January 27, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 16, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on February 23, 2026.

The Center appointed Yijun Tian as the sole panelist in this matter on March 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

A. Complainant

Complainant, Bureau Veritas, is a company incorporated in France. Founded in 1828, it is also known worldwide as "BV" and is a global leader in testing, inspection and certification ("TICS") services. Complainant operates through over 1,600 offices and laboratories, employs more than 82,000 people, and provides auditing, certification, inspection and conformity assessment services in over 140 countries.

Complainant has rights in the BV and BUREAU VERITAS marks, as well as related marks. Complainant owns numerous BV trademarks worldwide, including, inter alia, the French trademark registered on September 30, 1985 (registration number 1325013), the Chinese trademark registered on October 14, 2025 (registration number 77835857), and the International trademark registered on July 31, 1998 (registration number 699212) (Annex 7 to the Complaint). Complainant is also the owner of the French trademark BUREAU VERITAS, registered on September 30, 1985 (registration number 1325015) (Annex 6 to the Complaint). The BV and BUREAU VERITAS marks enjoy extensive recognition among both professionals and the general public.

B. Respondent

Respondent is 义乌市茵烁灯具商行 (个体工商户) (Yi Wu Shi Yin Shuo Deng Ju Shang Xing Ge Ti Gong Shang Hu), China.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 6, 2026. According to the Complaint and the evidence provided by Complainant, the disputed domain name previously resolved to a website purporting to be 广州必维技术检测有限公司 (which may be translated as Guangzhou Bi Wei Testing Co., Ltd.) offering services under the BV mark. Respondent deliberately attempted to create an affiliation with Complainant by using Complainant's images, including images displaying Complainant's BUREAU VERITAS mark.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's BV trademark. The disputed domain name incorporates the BV trademark in its entirety. The mere addition of the term "ajc" does not provide adequate distinction to negate the conclusion that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark BV.

Complainant contends that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to it.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name 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.

From the evidence presented on the record, no agreement appears to have been entered into between Complainant and Respondent to the effect that the language of the proceeding should be English. Complainant filed initially its Complaint and amended Complaint in English, and has requested that English be the language of the proceeding for the following main reasons:

(a) The disputed domain name consists entirely of Latin characters and follows an English-readable format, indicating Respondent's likely familiarity with English.

(b) It constitutes a typographical variation ("typosquatting") of Complainant's domain name <bvjc.com>, which targets an international audience, supporting the inference of an English-language context.

(c) Complainant operates globally in over 140 countries, with English as its primary working language; using English promotes procedural efficiency.

(d) Requiring translation into Chinese would impose disproportionate cost and delay, contrary to UDRP principles of fairness and procedural economy.

(e) There is no indication that Respondent would be prejudiced by the use of English.

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 (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.5.1).

On the record, Respondent appears to be located in China and thus presumably not a native English speaker, but considering the following aspects, the Panel has decided that the language of the proceeding shall be English: (a) the disputed domain name is registered in Latin characters (e.g., "bv" and "ajc"), rather than Chinese script; (b) the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") of the disputed domain name is ".com", so the disputed domain name seems to be prepared for users worldwide, particularly in English-speaking countries; (c) the disputed domain name resolves to a predominantly Chinese-language webpage that nevertheless contains English terms such as "About our company", "Our team", "Contact us", and "Message" (Annex 9 to the Complaint), indicating a degree of familiarity with English; (d) the Center has notified Respondent of the language of the proceeding in both Chinese and English, and Respondent did not comment on Complainant's request that English be the language of the proceeding; and (e) the Center also notified Respondent in both Chinese and English of the Complaint, and informed Respondent that it would accept a Response in either English or Chinese, but Respondent chose not to file any Response.

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: Three Elements

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 Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 Complainant's BV mark is recognisable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

While the addition of the term "ajc" may bear on the assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8.

Based on the available record, 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 Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

While 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 often impossible 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. 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 record, the Panel finds Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent has not rebutted 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.

More specifically:

(i) there has been no evidence adduced to show that Respondent has used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Respondent has not provided evidence or reasons to justify the choice of the term "bv", which is the same as Complainant's BV trademark, in the disputed domain name. There has been no evidence to show that Complainant has licensed or otherwise permitted Respondent to use the BV trademark or to register or use any domain name incorporating the BV or BUREAU VERITAS marks;

(ii) there has been no evidence adduced to show that Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name. There has been no evidence adduced to show that Respondent has any registered

trademark rights with respect to the disputed domain name. Respondent registered the disputed domain name on January 6, 2026, after the BV mark was registered in France (since 1985) and in China (since 2024). The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's BV marks; and

(iii) there has been no evidence adduced to show that Respondent was making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. By contrast, the disputed domain name previously resolved to a website purporting to offer services under the BV and BUREAU VERITAS marks. Respondent deliberately attempted to create an affiliation with Complainant by using Complainant's images, including images displaying Complainant's BUREAU VERITAS mark. Therefore, Respondent has attempted to make profits through the Internet traffic attracted to the website under the disputed domain name incorporating Complainant's trademark.

Based on the available record, 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 Respondent has registered and used the disputed 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.

Based on the information provided by Complainant, the Panel finds that Complainant has a reputation in the BV marks with regard to its products and services. It is not conceivable that Respondent would not have had Complainant's trademark in mind at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name (in 2026). This has been reinforced by the fact that the disputed domain name incorporates Complainant's BV trademark entirely, and that the use of Complainant's trademark on the website under the disputed domain name.

Respondent has used the website to purportedly offer services under the BV mark. Additionally, Respondent deliberately attempted to create an affiliation with Complainant by using Complainant's images, including images displaying Complainant's BUREAU VERITAS mark. Accordingly, the Panel concludes that Respondent is using a confusingly similar disputed domain name with the intention to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant. Such use constitutes bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Based on the available record, 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 <bvajc.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Yijun Tian/
Yijun Tian
Sole Panelist
Date: April 1, 2026