ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Techex Limited v. 深交所科技成果与知识产权交易中心有限责任公司 (SZSE Technology and IP Exchange Co.,Ltd)
Case No. D2026-2348

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Techex Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Eric B. Alspaugh, APC, United States of America ("United States").

The Respondent is 深交所科技成果与知识产权交易中心有限责任公司 (SZSE Technology and IP Exchange Co.,Ltd), China, represented by CCPIT Patent & Trademark Law Office.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <techex.com> is registered with Alibaba Cloud Computing (Beijing) Co., Ltd. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 30, 2026. On June 1, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 2, 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 (Unknown Registrant) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 3, 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 June 5, 2026.

On June 3, 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 June 5, 2026, the Complainant confirmed its request for English to be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent objected to 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 Respondent in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceeding commenced on June 10, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for the Response was June 30, 2026. The due date for Response was extended until July 4, 2026 per the Respondent’s request. The Response was filed in Chinese with the Center on July 2, 2026.

On July 8, 2026, the Complainant submitted an unsolicited supplemental filing.

On July 10, 2026, the Respondent submitted an unsolicited supplemental filing.

The Center appointed Sebastian M.W. Hughes, Adam Taylor, and Dr. Hong Xue as panelists in this matter on July 29, 2026. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. Each member of 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

A. Complainant

The Complainant is a technology company headquartered in the United Kingdom, carrying on business as a provider of live video, cloud video and IP broadcast services under the trade mark TECHEX (the “Trade Mark”), including via its website at “www.techex.co.uk” and “www.techex.tv” (the “Complainant’s Website”).

The Complainant has used the Trade Mark in the United Kingdom since at least 1986. The Complainant also carries on business under the Trade Mark in the United States market, via its subsidiary incorporated in the State of Delaware.

The Complainant is the owner of two registrations in the United Kingdom for the Trade Mark - registration No. 00003975942 and registration No. 00003975949, both with the same application date of November 6, 2023 and the same registration date of February 2, 2024.

B. Respondent

The Respondent is a company incorporated in China and a subsidiary of the Shenzhen Stock Exchange, providing a wide range of Intellectual Property-related services to customers in China.

C. The Disputed Domain Name

The disputed domain name was registered on March 21, 1998. It was purchased by the Respondent on January 6, 2021.

D. Use of the Disputed Domain Name

The disputed domain name is resolved to a Chinese language website promoting the business of the Respondent (the “Respondent’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 Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, as it has made no use of the name "Techex", it is not known by the name "Techex", and its Chinese and English names do not consist of the name "Techex"; and the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith, as it is identical to the Trade Mark, it has been offered for sale at high prices over many years, and it has, at different times, been passively held.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied all three of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name. As to the first element, the Respondent contends that the Complainant's registrations for the Trade Mark in the United Kingdom postdate the date the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name, and on the Complainant's own evidence, it has never used the Trade Mark in China.

As to the second element, the Respondent contends that the disputed domain name corresponds to its English name, "SZSE Technology and IP Exchange Co., Ltd"; that the Chinese language abbreviation of its name is "科交中心", which translates into "technology exchange" in English; that the disputed domain name is derived from an abbreviation of the words "technology exchange"; and that the Respondent has made widespread use of its English language name on the Shenzhen Stock Exchange's official website, in the Respondent's brochures and marketing materials, at trade shows and exhibitions, and on the Respondent's Website.

As to the third element, the Respondent contends that the Complainant has not carried on any business in China, and the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant when it purchased the disputed domain name.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Procedural Issue: the Parties' Supplemental Filings

Unsolicited supplemental filings are usually only allowed in exceptional circumstances.

In the present proceeding, the Panel finds that the Parties have failed to demonstrate any such exceptional circumstances.

Accordingly, the Panel refuses to allow the Parties' supplemental filings. In any event, even if the Panel had admitted the Parties' supplemental filings, it would not have affected the outcome of this proceeding.

6.2. Procedural 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 several reasons, including the fact that the Complainant is a United Kingdom company, the disputed domain name is composed of Latin characters, the Respondent uses an English language name and acronym which demonstrates familiarity with English, translating the Complaint and annexes into Chinese would involve disproportionate costs and cause delay, and proceeding in English will not unduly prejudice the Respondent as it may file a Response in Chinese.

The Respondent requested that the language of the proceeding be Chinese for several reasons, contending that the reasons relied upon by the Complainant are unfounded and should be rejected by the Panel, the Rules stipulate that the language of the proceeding is Chinese, and that, unless the Complainant submits the Complaint and annexes in Chinese, the proceeding should be terminated immediately.

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:

(i) It will accept the filing of the Complaint in English;

(ii) It will accept the filing of the Response in Chinese; and

(iii) It will render this Decision in English.

6.3. Substantive Elements of the Policy

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 trade mark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark 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 identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

The jurisdiction where the trade mark is valid is not considered relevant to panel assessment under the first element. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.1.2.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

In light of its finding in respect of the third element of the Policy, it is not necessary for the Panel to make any finding in respect of the second element of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The evidence in the case file as presented does not indicate that the Respondent's aim in registering the disputed domain name was to profit from or exploit the Complainant's trade mark.

According to the declaration of the Complainant's Chief Executive Officer filed together with the Complaint, the Complainant has used its Trade Mark in the United Kingdom and in the United States. Prior to May 2023, the Complainant contracted with its United States customers from the United Kingdom; and from May 2023, the Complainant has conducted business with its United States customers via its United States subsidiary, incorporated in the State of Delaware.

There is no clear evidence that the Complainant has ever conducted any business in China or in the Chinese language market, nor does the Complainant possess any registered trade mark rights in China. Although the Complainant has provided evidence to demonstrate common law or unregistered trade mark rights in the United Kingdom, its registrations for the Trade Mark in the United Kingdom postdate the date the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name.

The historical offers to sell the disputed domain name by prior registrants, and the historical passive holding of the disputed domain name by prior registrants, are not relevant to consideration of the third element.

Furthermore, the Respondent has put forward a plausible reason for selection of the disputed domain name independently of the Complainant, namely as an abbreviation of the English version of its name.

In all the circumstances, the Panel is unable to conclude that the Respondent has targeted the Complainant and its Trade Mark in acquiring the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds the third element of the Policy has not been established.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Sebastian M. W. Hughes
Sebastian M. W. Hughes
Presiding Panelist

/Adam Taylor/
Adam Taylor
Panelist

/Hong Xue
Hong Xue
Panelist (Concurring**)**
Date: August 20, 2026

Concurring Opinion by Dr. Hong Xue

The Panelist with minority view presents the following concurring opinion with respect to the discovery under the paragraph 4(a)(iii).

The Complainant contends that "[I]n 2024, Uniregistry indicated that approximately USD 4,000 might allow the broker to re-engage the seller" and "[I]n 2025, VPN.com communicated that the then-current owner was not interested in selling in five figures and asked whether there was 'an opening 6 figures offer'".

The Panelist notes that the Complainant contends against not only "[T]he historical offers to sell the disputed domain name by prior registrants" as discovered in the Decision, but the suspect offering for sale after the Respondent had acquired the registration of the disputed domain name in 2022.

The Panelist finds that the Complainant's evidence is unable to conclusively prove that it was the Respondent that had negotiated with the so-called broker regarding selling the disputed domain name.

In addition, even though the Respondent had, hypothetically, offered to sell the disputed domain name to any highest bidder in an open market, its act would not by itself support a claim that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith with the primary purpose of selling it to a trademark owner (or its competitor). WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.1

Given that the Respondent is only operating in China where the Complainant has neither common law or registered trademark right over "techex", the Respondent's mere offers to sell the disputed domain name for a profit, not targeting the Complainant's trademark would not be considered to violate paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.1.

/Hong Xue/
Hong Xue
Panelist (Concurring**)**
Date: August 20, 2026