

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

TEFAL v. Rebecca Bevins, 高源 (yuan gao), 马磊 (lei ma), 林智鑫 (zhixin lin / lin zhi xin / linzhi xin), 王清晓 (qingxiao wang)
Case No. D2026-1568

1. The Parties

The Complainant is TEFAL, France, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondents are Rebecca Bevins, Germany, 高源 (yuan gao), China, 马磊 (lei ma), China, 林智鑫 (zhixin lin / lin zhi xin / linzhi xin), China, 王清晓 (qingxiao wang), China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <tefalaustralia.com>, <tefalcz.com>, <tefalnederland.com>, <tefalpolska.com>, <tefalromania.com>, and <tefalturkiye.com> are registered with Chengdu West Dimension Digital Technology Co., Ltd.

The disputed domain names <tefalchile.com>, <tefaldanmark.com>, <tefalitalia.com>, <tefalnz.com>, <tefalportugal.com>, <tefalslovensko.com>, <tefalsouthafrica.com>, <tefalsverige.com>, and <tefaluk.com> are registered with Vantage of Convergence (Chengdu) Technology Co., Ltd.

The disputed domain name <tefalcolombia.com.co> is registered with Key-Systems GmbH.

The disputed domain names <tefalfrance.com>, <tefahungary.com>, <tefalireland.com>, and <tefalphilippines.com> are registered with Xin Net Technology Corporation.

Chengdu West Dimension Digital Technology Co., Ltd., Vantage of Convergence (Chengdu) Technology Co., Ltd., Key-Systems GmbH, and Xin Net Technology Corporation are separately and collectively referred to below as the “Registrar”.

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 14, 2026. On the same day, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar requests for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On April 14, 15, 16, and 20, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names that differed from the named Respondent (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and

contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 20, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaints for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all disputed domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint in English on April 24, 2026.

On April 20, 2026, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreements for all the disputed domain names except <tefalcolombia.com.co> is Chinese. On April 24, 2026, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding. The Respondents did not submit any comment on the Complainant's request.

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 Respondents in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 1, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 21, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents' default on May 23, 2026.

The Center appointed Matthew Kennedy as the sole panelist in this matter on June 4, 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 cookware and small appliance manufacturer. Among other things, it produces non-stick cookware marketed as "Tefal" (derived from the terms "Teflon" and "aluminium"). The Complainant holds the following trademark registrations:

- International trademark registration number 286209 for TEFAL, registered on July 11, 1964, designating multiple jurisdictions, including Germany;
- Chinese trademark registration number 1053424 for a stylized TEFAL mark, registered on July 14, 1997;
- European Union trademark registration number 009617771 for TEFAL, registered on June 3, 2011; and
- United States of America trademark registration number 6392510 for a stylized red TEFAL mark (the "Tefal logo"), registered on June 22, 2021.

The above trademark registrations are current. The Complainant also uses domain names, including <tefal.fr> and <tefal.com>, in connection with websites where it provides information about itself and its products. Its global website associated with the domain name <tefal.com> links to local websites for specific countries.

The Respondents are named in the Registrar's Whois database as various individuals.

The disputed domain names were registered on the dates and in the names shown in the following table.

Date of registration	Disputed domain name	Registrant name
January 19, 2026	<tefalaustralia.com>	马磊 (lei ma)
January 19, 2026	<tefalchile.com>	高源 (yuan gao)
January 19, 2026	<tefalcolombia.com.co>	Rebecca Bevins
January 19, 2026	<tefalcz.com>	高源 (yuan gao)
January 19, 2026	<tefaldanmark.com>	马磊 (lei ma)
January 19, 2026	<tefalfrance.com>	林智鑫 (lin zhi xin / linzhi xin)
January 19, 2026	<tefahungary.com>	林智鑫 (lin zhi xin / linzhi xin)
January 19, 2026	<tefalireland.com>	林智鑫 (lin zhi xin / linzhi xin)
January 19, 2026	<tefalitalia.com>	马磊 (lei ma)
January 19, 2026	<tefalnederland.com>	马磊 (lei ma)
January 19, 2026	<tefalnz.com>	林智鑫
January 19, 2026	<tefalphilippines.com>	林智鑫 (lin zhi xin / linzhi xin)
January 19, 2026	<tefalspolska.com>	林智鑫 (zhixin lin)
January 19, 2026	<tefalportugal.com>	马磊 (lei ma)
January 19, 2026	<tefalromania.com>	高源 (yuan gao)
January 19, 2026	<tefalsouthafrica.com>	高源 (yuan gao)
January 19, 2026	<tefalsverige.com>	高源 (yuan gao)
January 20, 2026	<tefalturkiye.com>	王清晓 (qingxiao wang)
January 21, 2026	<tefalslovensko.com>	王清晓 (qingxiao wang)
January 21, 2026	<tefaluks.com>	王清晓 (qingxiao wang)

At the time when the Complaint was filed, the disputed domain names resolved to similar websites that prominently displayed the red Tefal logo and offered for sale TEFAL-branded goods. The homepages all displayed the same hero image and the same product layout. The websites were in different languages, and prices were displayed in different currencies, according to the market to which each website was directed. The website favicons displayed a red “T” as in the Tefal logo, alongside the TEFAL mark.

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 confusingly similar to its TEFAL mark.

The Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. The Respondents are not sponsored by, or affiliated with, the Complainant in any way. Furthermore, the Complainant has not licensed, authorized, or permitted the Respondents to use the Complainant’s trademarks in any manner, nor to register domain names incorporating the Complainant’s trademark. The associated websites have purposely been designed to deceive Internet users into believing that they are associated with the Complainant. The Respondents’ purpose is to fool unsuspecting visitors into divulging their personal information.

The disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. The Respondents have used the disputed domain names to impersonate the Complainant, presumably in connection with the sale of counterfeits and/or as part of a phishing scam. The Respondents have registered at least 20 domain names

that each infringe upon the Complainant's TEFAL trademark, which demonstrates a pattern of cybersquatting.

B. Respondents

The Respondents did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Preliminary Issues

A. Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are under common control and requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that the disputed domain names follow a naming pattern that combines the TEFAL trademark with a country name or abbreviation; that all the disputed domain names were registered in a brief three-day period, all resolve to similar websites, and all but one resolve to websites hosted on Cloudflare servers. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names and associated websites are under common control.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

B. Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name <tefalcolombia.com.co> is English and for all the other 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 and amended Complaint were filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including that it is unable to communicate in Chinese and translation of the Complaint would unfairly disadvantage and burden it and delay the proceedings; such additional delay poses continuing risk to the Complainant and unsuspecting consumers seeking it or its products; the disputed domain names are all comprised of Latin characters; and some of the associated websites feature text in English.

Despite the Center having sent an email regarding the language of the proceeding, and Written Notice of the Complaint, in both Chinese and English, the Respondent did not make any submissions with respect to the language of the proceeding. Moreover, the Panel has already found that all the disputed domain names are under common control, and the language of the Registration Agreement for one of them is in English while some of the associated websites are in English.

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 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

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that a complainant must prove each of the following elements with respect to the disputed domain name:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The burden of proof of each element is borne by the Complainant.

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. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a TEFAL trademark for the purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

Each disputed domain name incorporates the TEFAL mark as its initial element. Despite the addition of a country name or abbreviation, variously "Australia", "Chile", "Colombia", "CZ" (short for "Czech Republic"), "Danmark" (meaning "Denmark"), "France", "Hungary", "Ireland", "Italia" (meaning "Italy"), "Nederland" (meaning "the Netherlands"), "NZ" (short for "New Zealand"), "Philippines", "Polska" (meaning "Poland"), "Portugal", "Romania", "Slovensko" (meaning "Slovakia"), "South Africa", "Sverige" (meaning "Sweden"), "Turkiye", or "UK" (meaning "United Kingdom"), the TEFAL mark is recognizable within each disputed domain name. The only additional component in each disputed domain name is a generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") extension (".com") or, in one case, a Second-Level Domain ("2LD") extension (".com.co") which, as a standard requirement of domain name registration, may each be disregarded in the assessment of confusing similarity for the purposes of the Policy. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the TEFAL mark for the purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7, 1.8, and 1.11.1.

Therefore, 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. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

In the present case, the disputed domain names combine the TEFAL mark with a country name or abbreviation, implying that they will resolve to websites for TEFAL products operated by, or affiliated with, the Complainant directed at the country so named. The associated websites prominently display the Complainant’s Tefal logo and offer for sale the Complainant’s TEFAL-branded products, giving the impression that they are indeed the Complainant’s official websites for the countries so named. Yet the Complainant submits that the Respondent is not sponsored by, or affiliated with, it in any way. Whether the products offered for sale on the websites are genuine or counterfeit, the websites give a false impression of their source or affiliation. In view of these circumstances, the Panel does not consider that the Respondent is using the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Nor is the Respondent making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names.

Further, the Respondent is identified by the names shown in the table in Section 4 above, none of which resembles the disputed domain names. Nothing on the record indicates that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain names.

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 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. The fourth circumstance is as follows:

“(iv) by using the [disputed] domain name, [the respondent has] intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [the respondent’s] 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 [the respondent’s] web site or location.”

In the present case, the disputed domain names were registered in 2026, years after the registration of the Complainant's marks, including in China and Germany, where the Respondent is ostensibly based. The TEFAL mark is a portmanteau term with no apparent meaning other than as a reference to the Complainant and its products. Each disputed domain name wholly incorporates the TEFAL mark and combines it with a country name or abbreviation and resolves to a website that prominently displays the Complainant's Tefal logo, and TEFAL-branded products. In view of these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names with the Complainant's mark in mind.

As regards use, the disputed domain names resolve to websites that prominently display the Complainant's TEFAL mark and Tefal logo and offer for sale the Complainant's TEFAL-branded products, giving the false impression that they are websites operated by the Complainant or an affiliate. Accordingly, the Panel finds that, by using the disputed domain names, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website or of a product on its website, within the terms of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Therefore, 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 <tefalaustralia.com>, <tefalchile.com>, <tefalcolombia.com.co>, <tefalcz.com>, <tefaldanmark.com>, <tefalfrance.com>, <tefalthungary.com>, <tefalireland.com>, <tefalitalia.com>, <tefalnederland.com>, <tefalnz.com>, <tefalphilippines.com>, <tefalpolkska.com>, <tefalportugal.com>, <tefalromania.com>, <tefalslovensko.com>, <tefalsouthafrica.com>, <tefalsverige.com>, <tefalturkiye.com> and <tefaluk.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Matthew Kennedy/

Matthew Kennedy

Sole Panelist

Date: June 12, 2026