

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Jcdecaux SE v. 杨茜尹 (yin si bao hu)

Case No. D2026-0514

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Jcdecaux SE, France, represented by Nameshield, France.

The Respondent is 杨茜尹 (yin si bao hu), China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain names <德高. 购物> (<xn--p5t392k.xn--g2xx48c>) and <德高. 集团> (<xn--p5t392k.xn--3bst00m>) are registered with Xiamen Nawang Technology Co., Ltd (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 6, 2026. On February 6, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On February 24, 2026, 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 February 24, 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 25, 2026.

On February 24, 2026, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreements for the disputed domain names is Chinese. On February 25, 2026, the Complainant requested English to 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 English and Chinese of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on February 25, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 17, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 25, 2026.

The Center appointed Deanna Wong Wai Man as the sole panelist in this matter on April 1, 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 Jcdecaux SE, a company founded in 1964 and described as a global leader in the outdoor advertising sector. The Complainant operates in more than 80 countries and 3,918 cities, offering services across the principal segments of street furniture, transport advertising, and billboard advertising. The Complainant maintains over 1,056,833 advertising panels worldwide and employs approximately 11,650 people. It has a significant presence in China, where it operates 149,978 advertising panels across 11 cities, reaching approximately 173 million people per day. The Complainant is listed on the Euronext Paris stock exchange and forms part of the Euronext 100 index.

The Complainant has demonstrated that it owns several trademark registrations for the mark 德高 in China, including inter alia: Chinese Trademark No. 4237784 for 德高, registered on March 28, 2007; Chinese Trademark No. 4237785 for 德高, registered on March 28, 2007; and Chinese Trademark No. 23261768 for 德高, registered on March 14, 2018.

The Complainant promotes its business at the website "www.jcdecaux.com". For its Chinese market, the Complainant operates the website at "www.jcdecaux.com.cn", on which its 德高 trademark is prominently displayed.¹

The disputed domain names <德高. 集团> (<xn--p5t392k.xn--g2xx48c>) and <德高. 购物> (<xn--p5t392k.xn--3bst00m>) were registered on December 29, 2025 and January 22, 2026, respectively. The evidence on record indicates that both disputed domain names were inactive at the time of filing of the Complaint, and are still inactive at the time of drafting this Decision.

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 names. Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are identical to its 德高 trademarks, as they incorporate the mark in its entirety without addition or deletion. The Complainant submits that the applicable Top-Level Domains ".集团" and ".购物" are to be disregarded for the purpose of assessing identity or confusing similarity. The Complainant further asserts that the term "德高" has no independent meaning and is uniquely associated with the Complainant.

As to rights and legitimate interests, the Complainant essentially contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. The Complainant submits that it has not licensed or otherwise authorized the Respondent to use its trademarks, that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names, and that there is no relationship between the Complainant

¹ Noting in particular the general powers of a panel articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, it has been accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record if it would consider such information useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision, in particular to affirm or corroborate a party's contention. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.8.

and the Respondent. The Complainant further contends that the disputed domain names are inactive and that the Respondent has not demonstrated any bona fide offering of goods or services or any legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

As to bad faith of the Respondent, the Complainant essentially contends that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. The Complainant submits that, in light of the distinctiveness of its trademarks and its reputation, including in China, the Respondent must have had knowledge of the Complainant's rights at the time of registration. The Complainant further argues that the passive holding of the disputed domain names supports a finding of bad faith, as it is not possible to conceive of any plausible good faith use that would not infringe 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 English language is the language most widely used in international relations and is one of the working languages of the Center, and that requiring the Complainant to proceed in Chinese would necessitate retaining specialized translation services at a cost likely exceeding the overall cost of these proceedings, thereby imposing a significant burden.

The Respondent did not comment on the Complainant's request for 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 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 names. [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 names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are 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 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.

Based on the evidence provided, the Panel notes that the Respondent is not licensed by the Complainant in any way and is not commonly known by the disputed domain names and that there are no elements in this case that point to the Respondent having made any reasonable and demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Instead, according to the record, the disputed domain names do not currently resolve, and have not resolved in the past, to any active website. In this regard, the Panel finds that holding the disputed domain names passively, without making any use of them, does not confer any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names on the Respondent in the circumstances of this case (see in this regard earlier UDRP decisions such as *Bollore SE v. 赵竹飞 (Zhao Zhu Fei)*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-0691](#); and *Vente-Privee.Com and Vente-Privee.com IP S.à.r.l. v. 崔郡 (jun cui)*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-1685](#)).

Finally, the Panel notes that according to the Registrar’s confirmation, the Respondent’s Chinese name is 杨茜尹, which is Yang Qian (or Xi) Yin in Chinese pinyin, and the Respondent’s name in English is yin si bao hu, which has no connection with the term “德高”. Therefore, based on the available case record, the Panel cannot find that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain names.

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 the Respondent has registered the disputed domain names which are identical to the Complainant’s prior used 德高 trademarks. The Panel also notes that these trademark registrations predate the Respondent’s registration of the disputed domain names by many years. This means that even a cursory Internet or trademark search at the time of registration of the disputed domain name would have revealed the Complainant’s longstanding rights in the 德高 mark, and its use of these

marks including in China. In the Panel's view, and in the absence of any response from the Respondent, it is more likely than not that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names with the knowledge of the 德高 mark, and the Panel therefore finds that it has been demonstrated that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names 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.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the longstanding reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the disputed domain names, and the lack of response from the Respondent, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of bad faith under 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 <德高. 购物> (<xn--p5t392k.xn--g2xx48c>) and <德高. 集团> (<xn--p5t392k.xn--3bst00m>) be transferred to the Complainant.

/Deanna Wong Wai Man/

Deanna Wong Wai Man

Sole Panelist

Date: April 12, 2026