

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

The Procter & Gamble Company, Braun GmbH v. 徐红梅  
Case No. D2026-1598

### 1. The Parties

The Complainants are The Procter & Gamble Company, United States of America, and Braun GmbH, Germany, represented by Studio Barbero S.p.A., Italy.

The Respondent is 徐红梅, China.

### 2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <braun-hrvatska.com>, <braun-hungary.com>, <braun-malaysia.com>, <braun-norge.com>, and <braunturkiyetr.com> are registered with Vantage of Convergence (Chengdu) Technology Co., Ltd. (the “Registrar”).

### 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 15, 2026. On April 16, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On April 17, 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 (Not Available) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on April 18, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainants to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainants filed an amendment to the Complaint in English on April 20, 2026.

On April 18, 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 April 20, 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 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 Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on April 27, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 17, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 23, 2026.

The Center appointed Rachel Tan as the sole panelist in this matter on May 29, 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 Complaint is filed in the names of the two Complainants. The First Complainant is The Procter & Gamble Company, and the Second Complainant is Braun GmbH (collectively, the "Complainants"). The Complainants are related companies and sell shaving and other consumer products worldwide under the BRAUN trademark. The First Complainant is the parent company of the Second Complainant.

The First Complainant, founded in 1837, is one of the largest companies in the world and manufactures a wide range of consumer goods in diverse areas such as healthcare, hair care, cosmetics, laundry and fabric care. The First Complainant is present in about 80 countries and operates in the field of cleaning agents, personal care and hygienic products with over 60 brands.

The Second Complainant, founded in 1921, began as a small engineering workshop, later entering the radio industry in 1929 and expanding in the 1950s into electric shavers and kitchen appliances. By the 1960s, BRAUN had become an internationally renowned brand for small electrical appliances, characterized by technical innovation and long-lasting quality. The Second Complainant claims that it is world famous as a design brand and has received over 100 internationally recognized design prizes for its products and holds more than 8,000 active patents.

The Complainants claim that they operate within an extensive sales network consisting of more than 100,000 employees in over 180 countries and through their distribution channels BRAUN branded products are distributed worldwide, including in Türkiye, Hungary, Malaysia, Norway, and Croatia. In the last fiscal year, the Complainants invested over USD 180 million to promote the BRAUN trademark. In addition to traditional advertising, the BRAUN trademark has been promoted online, with a strong presence on major social media platforms such as Facebook, X (formerly Twitter), and YouTube.

The Second Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for BRAUN trademark, including:

- International trademark BRAUN Registration No. 652027, registered on November 14, 1995, in Classes 11, 14, 16, 21, 26, 35 and 37;
- International trademark BRAUN Registration No. 650428, registered on November 14, 1995, in Classes 1, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11;
- European Union trademark **BRHUN** Registration No. 007393382, registered on June 16, 2009, in Classes 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 16, 21, 26, 35 and 37.

The Complainants own numerous domain names incorporating their BRAUN trademark, including <braun.com> (registered on June 24, 1997) and <braun-clocks.com> (registered on March 25, 2010). Both domain names have been used as the Complainants' official websites to promote the BRAUN trademark and related products.

The five disputed domain names were registered on three dates: <braun-malaysia.com> on November 4, 2025, <braun-hrvatska.com>, <braun-hungary.com>, and <braunturkiyetr.com> on November 19, 2025, and <braun-norge.com> on November 21, 2025. Presently, all disputed domain names resolve to inactive

webpages. According to the Complainants' evidence, all disputed domain names previously resolved to websites displaying the Complainants' BRAUN trademark and allegedly selling and offering the Complainants' BRAUN products at low prices.

## **5. Parties' Contentions**

### **A. Complainants**

The Complainants contend that they have satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain names.

Notably, the Complainants contend that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainants' BRAUN trademark. The disputed domain names incorporate the whole of the Complainants' BRAUN trademark and differ only by adding geographic terms "hungary", "hrvatska" (referring to "Croatia" in Croatian), "norge" (referring to "Norway" in Norwegian), "Malaysia" and "turkiyetr" (consisting of "turkiye", referring to "Türkiye" and "tr", referring to the abbreviation for "Türkiye") and hyphens. The additional geographical terms and hyphens are insufficient to reduce the identity or confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the Complainants' BRAUN trademark. Instead, they may increase confusion by leading Internet users into believing that the disputed domain names are owned by the Complainants or their affiliates/authorized resellers for the Hungary, Croatia, Norway, Malaysia, and Türkiye markets. The generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is an instrumental element and shall be disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. Therefore, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainants' BRAUN trademark.

The Complainants further contend that the Respondent is not a licensee or an authorized agent of the Complainants or in any other way authorized to use the Complainants' BRAUN trademark. Further, the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names. The Respondent has been resolving the disputed domain names to the websites displaying the Complainants' BRAUN trademark and offering purported BRAUN products for sale at discounted prices, without publishing any disclaimer of non-affiliation with the Complainants. The fact that the BRAUN products featured on the website associated with the disputed domain names are offered at very low prices suggests that the Respondent may be engaging in the sale of counterfeits. The Respondent's use of the disputed domain names indicates the Respondent's intention to obtain commercial gain from selling the purported BRAUN products featured on the websites associated with the disputed domain names and trading on the reputation of the Complainants and the BRAUN trademark, which cannot be considered a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names.

The Complainants further contend that the Complainants' BRAUN trademark has been used for over 100 years and is well-known worldwide. It is inconceivable that the Respondent was not aware of the Complainants' BRAUN trademark at the time of registering the disputed domain names. Moreover, the fact that the websites associated with the disputed domain names display the Complainants' BRAUN trademark and purportedly offer BRAUN products, indicates that Respondent was fully aware of the Complainants and the BRAUN trademark when registering the disputed domain names. The Respondent's use of the disputed domain names clearly demonstrates that the Respondent's purpose in registering and using the disputed domain names has been to intentionally attempt to attract Internet users seeking Complainants' BRAUN products to the websites associated with the disputed domain names for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainants' BRAUN trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the websites associated with the disputed domain names and the goods offered on the websites.

### **B. Respondent**

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainants' contentions.

## 6. Discussion and Findings

### 6.1 Procedural Issues – Language of the Proceedings

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 Complainants requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including the facts that 1) the disputed domain names contain Latin characters and the websites associated with the disputed domain names contain English terms; 2) English is widely recognized as the international language of commerce and is frequently accepted in UDRP proceedings; 3) using Chinese as language of the proceeding would unfairly disadvantage and burden the Complainants and delay the proceedings and adjudication of this matter.

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 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 Complainants' trademark and the disputed domain names. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainants have shown rights in respect of the BRAUN trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The gTLD ".com" as a standard registration requirement should be disregarded in the assessment of confusing similarity under the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

The entirety of the Complainants' BRAUN trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain names. While the geographic terms "hungary", "hrvatska" (referring to "Croatia" in Croatian), "norge" (referring to "Norway" in Norwegian), "Malaysia" and "turkiyetr" (consisting of "turkiye", referring to "Türkiye" and "tr", referring to the abbreviation for "Türkiye") and hyphens are included, the BRAUN trademark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain names. The Panel finds that the extra terms and hyphens do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the BRAUN trademark. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the BRAUN trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.8.

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.

The information in the case file shows that:

- the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainants and has not been authorized to use the Complainants' BRAUN trademark in any form;
- there is no evidence proving that the Respondent holds any trademark rights corresponding to the disputed domain names, or has been commonly known by the disputed domain names;
- the disputed domain names previously all resolved to the websites displaying the Complainants' BRAUN trademark and allegedly sold and offered the Complainants' BRAUN products at low prices, without any prominent and accurate explanation of the relationship (or lack thereof) between the Parties. Such use of the disputed domain names indicates the Respondent's intention to divert Internet traffic to the websites associated with the disputed domain names by misleading Internet users into believing that the websites associated with the disputed domain names are operated or endorsed by the Complainants, which cannot be deemed as a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use;
- based on the Complainants' evidence, the purported BRAUN products featured on the websites associated with the disputed domain names were offered at low prices. In the absence of any reasonable explanation from the Respondent, it is likely that the Respondent was offering counterfeit products through those websites. Such conduct does not confer any rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent in respect of the disputed domain names. See *Pointe Noir Pty Ltd v. Parker Martin*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-3053](#);
- the nature of the disputed domain names, incorporating the Complainants' BRAUN trademark, together with the geographic terms “hungary”, “hrvatska” (referring to “Croatia” in Croatian), “norge” (referring to “Norway” in Norwegian), “Malaysia” and “turkiyetr” (consisting of “turkiye”, referring to “Türkiye” and “tr”, referring to the abbreviation for “Türkiye”) where the Complainants have business operations, carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainants. When considered alongside the Respondent's previous use of the disputed domain names, it affirms the Respondent's intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain names and the Complainants as to the origin or affiliation of the websites associated with the disputed domain names; and
- no other factors demonstrate any rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in the disputed domain names.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainants have established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainants' 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.

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 Complainants obtained the trademark registration for BRAUN as early as November 14, 1995, which significantly predates the registration dates of the disputed domain names (November 4, 2025, November 19, 2025, and November 21, 2025). According to the Complainants' evidence, the Panel accepts that the Complainants, and the BRAUN trademark have gained a certain degree of reputation and recognition worldwide through their extensive use and advertising. The Respondent registered the disputed domain names that fully incorporate the Complainants' BRAUN trademark and resolved them to websites displaying the Complainants' BRAUN trademark and allegedly selling and offering the Complainants' BRAUN products at low prices. Given these circumstances, the Panel determines that the Respondent had actual knowledge of the Complainants and its BRAUN trademark at the time of registering the disputed domain names, and bad faith is found.

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 disputed domain names resolve to inactive webpages at the time of the Decision but were used to host websites displaying the Complainants' BRAUN trademark and allegedly selling and offering the Complainants' BRAUN products at low prices. The Panel holds that by selecting domain names confusingly similar to the Complainants' BRAUN trademark, and using them in the manner as described, the Respondent obviously has intended to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the disputed domain names and the associated websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainants' BRAUN trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the websites associated with the disputed domain names, which constitutes bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. In addition, the Respondent was likely using the websites associated with the disputed domain names to offer counterfeit products. The registration and use of domain names for such a purpose involves registration and use in bad faith. See *Pointe Noir Pty Ltd v. Parker Martin*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-3053](#).

Given the circumstances above, the current non-use of the disputed domain names does not prevent the Panel's finding of the Respondent's bad faith.

The Panel finds that the Complainants have 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 <braun-hrvatska.com>, <braun-hungary.com>, <braun-malaysia.com>, <braun-norge.com>, and <braunturkiyetr.com> be transferred to the Second Complainant, Braun GmbH.

*/Rachel Tan/*

**Rachel Tan**

Sole Panelist

Date: June 12, 2026