

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

SEB S.A. v. 徐辉 (xuhui), 林智鑫 (Zhixin Lin), 马磊
Case No. D2026-2818

1. The Parties

The Complainant is SEB S.A., France, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondents are 徐辉 (xuhui), China; 林智鑫 (Zhixin Lin), China; and 马磊 (Ma Lei), China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <krupsaustralia.com>, <krupshungary.com>, and <krupsnorge.com> are registered with Xin Net Technology Corp. The disputed domain names <krupspolska.com>, <krupsromania.com>, <krupssuomi.com>, and <krupsturkiye.com> are registered with Guizhou Zhongyu Zhike Network Technology Co., Ltd. These disputed domain names shall be referred to as the “Original Disputed Domain Names”. The disputed domain name <krups-turkiye.com> (the “Additional Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with Vantage of Convergence (Chengdu) Technology Co., Ltd. All disputed domain names are hereinafter referred to as the “Disputed Domain Names”. Guizhou Zhongyu Zhike Network Technology Co., Ltd and Xin Net Technology Corp. are hereinafter referred to as the “Original Registrars”. Vantage of Convergence (Chengdu) Technology Co., Ltd. is hereinafter referred to as the “Additional Registrar”.

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 29, 2026 regarding the Original Disputed Domain Names. On June 29, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Original Registrars requests for registrar verification in connection with the Original Disputed Domain Names. On June 30, 2026 and July 10, 2026, the Original Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Original Disputed Domain Names which differed from the named Respondents (Registrant Information Redacted, The RDAP server redacted the value) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 10, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the Original 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 Original Disputed Domain Names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint in English on July 14, 2026 regarding the Original Disputed Domain Names.

On July 10, 2026, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the Original Disputed Domain Names is Chinese. On July 14, 2026, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding. The Respondents 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 Respondents in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 15, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 4, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents' default on August 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Deanna Wong Wai Man as the sole panelist in this matter on August 12, 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.

On August 12, 2026, the Center received a supplemental filing from the Complainant requesting the addition of the Additional Disputed Domain Name to the proceeding. Under the Panel's instruction, on August 18, 2026, the Center transmitted to the Additional Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Additional Disputed Domain Name. On August 19, 2026, the Additional Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Additional Disputed Domain Name which differed from the named Respondents (徐辉 (Xu Hui) and 林智鑫 (Zhixin Lin)) and contact information in the amended Complaint. On August 20, 2026, having considered the need to ensure that the Parties were treated with equality and that each Party was given a fair opportunity to present its case, the Panel issued Procedural Order No. 1 pursuant to paragraphs 10(a) and 10(b) of the Rules. The Panel directed the Complainant to amend the Complaint by August 25, 2026, to add the Additional Disputed Domain Name and the disclosed registrant information, and to provide any further arguments in view thereof, and directed the Respondents to file any response to the Complainant's submission by September 4, 2026. On August 20, 2026, the Complainant filed its amended Complaint pursuant to Procedural Order No. 1. The Respondents did not file any response.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is the holding company of Groupe SEB, a group active in the field of small domestic appliances, including kitchen electrical appliances, home and personal care products, and cookware. The history of Groupe SEB dates back to 1857, when Antoine Lescure established a tinware workshop in Selongey, France, and the group was incorporated in 1973 with SEB S.A. as its holding company. Groupe SEB has a presence in 150 countries, employs approximately 31,000 people, and operates 47 industrial sites and 1,200 retail stores. In 2024, Group SEB reported sales of EUR 8,266 million. The KRUPS brand was founded in 1846 by Robert Krups as a German manufacturer of high-precision scales and subsequently developed into a brand associated with coffee appliances and associated products, and was acquired by Groupe SEB in 2001.

The Complainant owns an international trademark portfolio for the KRUPS marks, including but not limited to, European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 000188714 for the word mark KRUPS, registered on October 30, 1998, in Classes 7, 9, 11, 21, 37, and 41. The Complainant also owns Chinese Registration No. 168887 for the word mark KRUPS, registered on December 30, 1982, in Class 9.

The Original Disputed Domain Names were all registered on January 12, 2026. The evidence includes screenshots showing that at the time of filing of the Complaint, the Original Disputed Domain Names resolved, or had previously resolved, to websites using the KRUPS name and branding and purportedly displaying KRUPS-branded products for sale. The websites featured product images, product listings and prices, together with shopping and account functionality. The Additional Disputed Domain Name was registered on July 13, 2026, after the filing of the present proceeding. According to the evidence submitted, the Additional Disputed Domain Name also directed to substantially the same website as the Original Disputed Domain Names. However, upon the Panel's review on the date of this Decision, all the disputed domain names are inactive or direct to error websites.

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 it has rights in the KRUPS trademark by virtue of its trademark registrations in various jurisdictions. The Complainant submits that the Disputed Domain Names incorporate the KRUPS trademark in its entirety and merely add geographical terms. It contends that the addition of such geographical terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

With respect to the second element, the Complainant contends that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Names. In particular, the Complainant states that it has not licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondents to use the KRUPS trademark or to register domain names incorporating it, and that there is no affiliation between the Parties. The Complainant further contends that the Respondents are not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Names and that the associated websites do not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. It relies in particular on the websites displaying the KRUPS name, logo, and images of KRUPS products, together with product listings and prices, in a manner designed to give the impression of an official regional website.

With respect to the third element, the Complainant contends that the Disputed Domain Names were registered and are being used in bad faith. It relies on the fact that the Disputed Domain Names were all registered on January 12, 2026 and July 13, 2026, respectively, reproduce the KRUPS trademark in its entirety, and combine that mark with geographical terms corresponding to particular jurisdictions. The Complainant further relies on the use of the Disputed Domain Names for websites that imitate the Complainant's branding and offer KRUPS-branded products for sale, and contends that such use was intended to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant and to attract Internet users for commercial gain. The Complainant also relies on the registration of multiple KRUPS-formative Disputed Domain Names as evidence of a pattern of conduct and refers to prior UDRP proceedings involving two of the Respondents.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Preliminary Issues

A. Addition of the Additional Domain Name

On August 12, 2026, the Center received a supplemental filing from the Complainant requesting that the addition of the Additional Disputed Domain Name be added to the proceeding. Requests to for addition of domain names to a complaint after it has been notified to the respondent and the proceedings have formally commenced are generally not encouraged. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions, ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.12.2. In this case, however, noting the Additional Disputed Domain Name was registered after the Complaint was filed, and resolved to a website that is virtually identical to those websites associated with the Original Disputed Domain Names. The Panel decided to accept the Additional Disputed Domain Name and Procedural Order No. 1 was therefore issued to ensure that the Parties were treated with equality and that each Party was given a fair opportunity to present its case.

B. Consolidation of the Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant 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. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.11.2.

The Panel has carefully reviewed all elements of this case, giving particular weight to the following elements and facts: (a) the disputed domain names all consist of the Complainant's KRUPS trademark together with geographical terms, with <krups-turkiye.com> differing from <krupsturkiye.com> only by the addition of a hyphen; (b) the Originally Disputed Domain Names were all registered on the same day, January 12, 2026, while <krups-turkiye.com> was registered on July 13, 2026, after <krupsturkiye.com> had been taken down and after the filing of the present proceeding; (c) the Disputed Domain Names previously resolved to substantially identical websites displaying the Complainant's KRUPS mark and images of KRUPS products and purportedly offering them for sale; and (d) the disclosed registrants are all based in China and the email addresses associated with these registrants present the same format, i.e., letters followed by numbers@hotmail.com.

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.

C. Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreements for the Disputed Domain Names is Chinese. Pursuant to paragraph 11(a) of the Rules, in the absence of an agreement between the Parties or unless otherwise

specified in the Registration Agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the Registration Agreement.

The Complaint and amended Complaints were filed in English. The Complainant requested that English be the language of the proceeding, submitting, among other arguments, that the Disputed Domain Names comprise Latin characters only, that the websites associated with the Disputed Domain Names are not in Chinese and contain content in different languages, including English, and that the Respondent is targeting a number of jurisdictions outside China. The Complainant further submits that it is unable to communicate in Chinese and that translation of the Complaint would unfairly disadvantage and burden the Complainant and delay the proceeding and adjudication of this matter.

The Respondent did not make any 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 ([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. Findings on the Merits

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 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, "australia", "hungary", "norge", "polska", "romania", "suomi", or "turkiye", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Names 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 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.

The Panel notes that the Complainant has not licensed, authorized or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its KRUPS trademark or to register any domain name incorporating that trademark. Further, there is no evidence that the Respondent is affiliated with the Complainant in any way, or that it has been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Names within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy. The Panel also finds that there is no evidence that the Respondent has used, or made demonstrable preparations to use, the Disputed Domain Names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Instead, based on the evidence, the Disputed Domain Names were previously used to resolve to websites displaying the Complainant's KRUPS trademark, as well as images of KRUPS-branded goods, in a manner that falsely suggested an affiliation with the Complainant. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.

As to the fact that the Disputed Domain Names currently resolve to inactive websites, the Panel finds that holding the disputed domain names passively, without making any active use of them, also 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](#)). The evidence shows that the disputed domain names had previously been used for websites displaying the Complainant's KRUPS branding and products, and the current inactivity therefore does not alter the Panel's finding concerning the Respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests.

The Panel further notes that the composition of the Disputed Domain Names, combining the Complainant's KRUPS trademark with geographical terms, namely "australia", "hungary", "norge" ("Norway"), "polska" ("Poland"), "romania", "suomi" ("Finland"), or "turkiye", carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant by suggesting that the Disputed Domain Names identify the Complainant's official websites for the respective jurisdictions. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

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.

In the present case, the Panel finds that, on the balance of probabilities, the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Names with knowledge of the Complainant and its KRUPS trademark. The KRUPS trademark had already been registered and used for many decades before the registration of the Disputed Domain Names, including in China since 1982, and the evidence indicates that KRUPS has a longstanding international reputation. The Panel considers that the evidence in the present case supports a finding that the Complainant's KRUPS trademark was well known at the time the Disputed Domain Names were registered to support an inference of knowledge on the part of the Respondent. Additionally, a simple trademark database or Internet search conducted prior to registration would easily have disclosed the Complainant's longstanding trademark rights. These conclusions are further confirmed by the subsequent use of the Disputed Domain Names, which indeed the Complainant's trademark and images of KRUPS-branded products were presented on the websites associated with the Disputed Domain Names, confirming

that the Respondent was clearly aware of the Complainant and its trademark when registering the Disputed Domain Names.

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 Panel finds that the Respondent has used the Disputed Domain Names to intentionally attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the associated websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's KRUPS trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of those websites and the products offered on them. The websites at the Disputed Domain Names prominently displayed the Complainant's KRUPS trademark, together with images of KRUPS-branded goods, and purportedly offered those goods for sale. In the circumstances of the case, the Panel finds that such conduct falls within the scope of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, which constitutes direct evidence of bad faith under the Policy. In addition, panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, including passing off, constitutes evidence of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

As to the fact that the Disputed Domain Names are currently directing to inactive or error pages, 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 distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the Disputed Domain Names, the unlikelihood of bona fide use, and prior use of the Disputed Domain Names, 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.

Finally, the Panel also notes that the registrants of the Disputed Domain Names were previously named as respondents in UDRP proceedings. In particular, 马磊 and 林智鑫 (Zhixin Lin) were respondents in *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), WIPO Case No. [D2026-1568](#), and 徐辉 (xuhui) was named in *Loop B.V. v. Joanne Stubbs, Whoisprotection.cc, Domain Admin, Robert Eberhardt, Becker Adler, Eisenberg Fiedler, Herzog Goldschmidt, Hertzog Ostermann, 吴鹤 (wu yi / wuyi), Fraser Oliver, Oliver Fraser, 徐景波, 黄保传, 徐辉*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-0360](#). Although each case must be decided on its own facts, the Panel considers the findings in these prior proceedings to provide additional reasons to recognize the Respondent's bad faith in the present case.

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 <krupsaustralia.com>, <krupshungary.com>, <krupsnorge.com>, <krupspolska.com>, <krupsromania.com>, <krupssuomi.com>, <krupsturkiye.com>, and <krups-turkiye.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Deanna Wong Wai Man/

Deanna Wong Wai Man

Sole Panelist

Date: September 9, 2026