

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

BEL v. yang li min
Case No. D2026-0382

1. The Parties

The Complainant is BEL, France, represented by KALLIOPE Law Firm, France.

The Respondent is yang li min, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <babybel-minis.net> is registered with Gname 012 Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 29, 2026. On January 29, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 30, 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 (Not Identified) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 30, 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 in English on February 2, 2026.

On January 30, 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 February 2, 2026, 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 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 in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on February 13, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 5, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 11, 2026.

The Center appointed Joseph Simone as the sole panelist in this matter on March 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, BEL, is a well-known publicly traded French company in the agri-food industry, especially known for the manufacturing and marketing of processed cheeses. The Complainant is one of the major players in the international market, with a presence in 30 countries through its subsidiaries. Its products are distributed in more than 120 countries.

The Complainant has a portfolio of trade mark registrations for the BEL and MINI BABYBEL marks, including the following:

- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 003136975 for BEL, registered on July 26, 2004, in Classes 29, 30, and 43;
- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 006243951 for MINI BABYBEL, registered on June 5, 2008, in Class 29; and
- International Trade Mark Registration No. 813988 for BEL, registered on October 2, 2003, designating inter alia Australia, Japan, Republic of Korea, China, Russian Federation, and Viet Nam.

The disputed domain name <babybel-minis.net> was registered on April 5, 2025. The Complainant has submitted evidence showing that the disputed domain name has been used to operate a website offering gambling services. At the time of this decision, the disputed domain name continued to resolve to the same website.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the three elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name registered by the Respondent is confusingly similar to the Complainant's MINI BABYBEL marks.

The Complainant asserts that it has not authorized the Respondent to use the MINI BABYBEL mark, and there is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent has used, or has undertaken any demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, but rather, as the Complainant further contends, has used it to operate a website offering gambling services.

The Complainant also claims there is no evidence that the Respondent has any connection to the MINI BABYBEL mark, and that there is no plausible good faith reason for the Respondent to have registered the disputed domain name. The Complainant therefore argues that the registration and any use of the disputed domain name must be in bad faith.

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 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.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for the following reasons:

- Requiring the Complainant to submit the Complaint in Chinese would place a significant financial burden on the Complainant; and
- The disputed domain name is solely comprised of Latin characters.

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

Having considered the circumstances, 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 this 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 Panel acknowledges that the Complainant has established rights in the MINI BABYBEL trade marks. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

Disregarding the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".net", the disputed domain name is comprised of the term "babybel-minis", which incorporates the Complainant's MINI BABYBEL trade mark in its entirety, albeit in reverse order. The inclusion of the letter "s" after "mini" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7, 1.9, and 1.11.1.

The Panel therefore finds that the Complainant has satisfied the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy in establishing its rights in the MINI BABYBEL trade marks and in showing that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its marks.

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.

In this case, the Complainant asserts that it has not authorized the Respondent to use its trade marks and there is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent has used, or undertaken any demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Having reviewed the available records, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Respondent did not file a response and has therefore failed to assert factors or put forth evidence to establish that it enjoys rights or other legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent is not affiliated or connected with the Complainant in any manner, and the Complainant has not granted the Respondent any license or authorization to use or register a domain name incorporating the Complainant’s MINI BABYBEL trade marks. The Respondent did not respond to the Complaint and did not provide any information or factors that could potentially establish prior rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Under these circumstances, the Respondent’s conduct in directing the disputed domain name to a gambling website further supports the lack of legitimate or genuine use. Such direction to a gambling site indicates a clear intent to exploit the Complainant’s marks for commercial gain, which contradicts any claim that the disputed domain name was registered to facilitate noncommercial or bona fide activities.

Based on the foregoing as well as the Panel’s findings below, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The third and final element that a complainant must prove is that the respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy states that any of the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, shall be considered as evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith:

- (i) circumstances indicating that the respondent registered or acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant (the owner of the trade mark or service mark) or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the respondent’s documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or
- (ii) circumstances indicating that the respondent registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trade mark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) circumstances indicating that the respondent has registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) circumstances indicating that the respondent is using the domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the

respondent's website or location or of a product or service on its website or location.

The examples of bad faith registration and use set forth in paragraph 4(b) of the Policy are not meant to be exhaustive of all circumstances in which bad faith may be found. Other circumstances may also 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.

In the present case, the Panel finds that the registration of the disputed domain name, which is confusingly similar to the Complainant's MINI BABYBEL trade marks, indicates the Respondent's awareness of the Complainant and its trade mark rights. The disputed domain name was registered more than two decades after the Complainant established rights in its marks. The Panel finds it improbable that the Respondent was not aware of the MINI BABYBEL mark, since a quick Internet search would have revealed the existence of the MINI BABYBEL mark and the Complainant's products. The Respondent also used the disputed domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by directing such users to a gambling website. Such activities constitute bad faith acts for purposes of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

For reasons discussed under this and the preceding heading, the Panel believes that the Respondent's conduct in this case constitutes bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(iii) 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 <babybel-minis.net> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Joseph Simone/

Joseph Simone

Sole Panelist

Date: April 7, 2026