ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Chambre de Commerce Internationale v. Huang Hui, Huixue
Case No. D2026-1967

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Chambre de Commerce Internationale, France, represented by Fidal, France.

The Respondent is Huang Hui, Huixue, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <certificates-iccwbo.org> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 6, 2026. On May 7, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 7, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 8, 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 on May 11, 2026.

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 of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 13, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 2, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 3, 2026.

The Center appointed Richard C.K. van Oerle as the sole panelist in this matter on June 8, 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, the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC), is a world business organization that speaks on behalf of enterprises from all sectors in every part of the world. ICC was founded in 1919. Today, it represents over 6 million members in more than 100 countries.

The Complainant has developed a verification platform that allows users to authenticate certificates of origin and certain trade documents issued by accredited chambers of commerce within its network.

The Complainant holds numerous trademarks registrations for ICC on a worldwide basis, among others:

- ICC INTERNATIONAL CHAMBER OF COMMERCE (word/device), International Trademark Registration, registration No 590125, registered on August 10, 1992, designating Egypt, Georgia, Montenegro, Morocco, and Serbia;

- ICC (word/device), International Trademark Registration, registration No 1235263, registered on July 29, 2014, designating Australia, China, Colombia, Cuba, Egypt, Ghana, India, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Israel, Japan, Kenya, Mexico, Morocco, Norway, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Singapore, Switzerland, Tunisia, Türkiye, Ukraine and United States of America;

- ICC (wordmark), European Union Trademark Registration, registration No 000836189, registered on July 23, 2001.

All registrations have been duly renewed and are still valid. The registrations will jointly be referred to, in singular, as the "Trademark".

The Complainant reserved the domain name <iccwbo.org> (sub domain name <certificate.iccwbo.org>) since August 30, 1996; it directs on the home website of the Complainant.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 31, 2026. The Complainant has submitted evidence showing that it resolves to a website that is a copy of the Complainant's official website to a substantial extent, including through featuring the Complainant's logo, lay-out, design elements and images from the Complainant's website.

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 name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to its Trademark. The dominant and distinctive element ICC is reproduced in its entirety and identically in the disputed domain name. The word "certificates" is descriptive of the activities provided by the Complainant, which also has activities related to authentication of certificates of origin, which obviously emphasizes the fact that it is likely to cause confusion.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name resolves to an active website which is completely fraudulent. This does not amount to legitimate or bona fide conduct and supports an inference that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. There is no business or legal relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent. The Complainant has not authorized, licensed, permitted or otherwise consented to the Respondent's use of the Trademark in the disputed domain name.

The Respondent is deliberately using the identity of ICC and aims to create confusion with the Complainant in order to give credibility to request personal information from users and to its scams and phishing operations.

The disputed domain name leads to an active website:

- it reproduces the Complainant's website identically;

- it refers to the Complainant's Trademark ICC for identical activities;

- the website reproduces the color blue/white which is the Complainant's main, well-known and distinctive colors ;

- the content of the website contains fake tabs "Privacy Policy" "Terms of Service" which are not working while clicking on it.

Thus, the Respondent sought to make use of the reputation of the Complainant and registered the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Respondent has reproduced the Trademark on its website promoting similar services and providing the Complainant's exact email address. It is apparent that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating confusion with the Complainant's Trademark, company name and domain name.

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

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that a complainant must prove each of the following three elements in order to succeed in its Complaint:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trade mark 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. The Respondent's default does not by itself mean that the Complainant is deemed to have prevailed. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.3.

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. 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 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.

Although the addition of other terms, here “certificates” and “wbo”, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms 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.

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 name. 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 name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Respondent used the disputed domain name for a website that mimicked and substantially copied content from the Complainant’s official website, while prominently featuring the Trademark and purporting to offer identical services. The only difference between both the disputed domain name

<certificates-iccwbo.org> and the sub-domain name of the Complainant <certificate.iccwbo.org> is the replacement of the “.” dot with a hyphen “-“, which will not be detected by the relevant public. Noting the impersonating nature of the content at the disputed domain name, consumers are likely to believe that the disputed domain name is related to, or affiliated with, or the Complainant, and this is not the case. The Respondent therefore registered and uses the disputed domain name intending to cause confusion with the Complainant. Accordingly, the Respondent cannot establish any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and cannot prevail under the Policy.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here impersonation/ passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1.

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.

As considered above under section 6.B., the website to which the disputed domain name resolves, imitates the Complainant’s website, as the website prominently displays the Complainant’s stylized logo, copied design elements and images from the Complainant’s website, creating a clear impression of being the Complainant’s own legitimate website. It is apparent that the Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain name to trade-off the Complainant’s goodwill in its Trademark and to confuse consumers into

believing that the disputed domain name is the Complainant, or is affiliated or associated with the Complainant, which is not the case. The Respondent attempts to take commercial advantage of the Complainant's Trademark and reputation and to trade off the Complainant's goodwill.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here impersonation/passing off, constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes 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 name <certificates-iccwbo.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Richard C.K. van Oerle/
Richard C.K. van Oerle
Sole Panelist
Date: June 10, 2026.