

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Chin Mudra v. Jin Geng
Case No. D2026-2876

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Chin Mudra, France, represented by SANTARELLI, France.

The Respondent is Jin Geng, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <chinmudrayogafr.com> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with Name.com, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 1, 2026. On July 2, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On July 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 (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 10, 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 July 15, 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 July 27, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 16, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 27, 2026.

The Center appointed Gabriela Kennedy as the sole panelist in this matter on September 2, 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 has continuously traded under the corporate name CHIN MUDRA for many years and operates its official website at <chin-mudra.yoga> (the “Complainant’s Website”). The Complainant offers yoga clothing, yoga equipment, yoga accessories, and other goods for well-being.

The Complainant owns word and figurative trademarks for the CHIN MUDRA mark. The relevant trademark registrations include the European Union Trademark Registration No. 013411301 for CHIN MUDRA in Classes 25, 28 and 41 registered on March 24, 2015, and the European Union Trademark Registration No. 017918610 for  CHIN MUDRA in Classes 25, 28 and 41 registered on October 19, 2018 (the “Complainant’s Trademark”).

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on July 11, 2024, years after the Complainant registered the Complainant’s Trademark. At the time of the filing of the Complaint and the rendering of this Decision, the Disputed Domain Name resolves to an active website displaying the Complainant’s Trademark, and offers for sale yoga-related products and accessories at discounted prices (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:

(a) the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s Trademark. The Disputed Domain Name incorporates the Complainant’s Trademark in its entirety. The only differences are the addition of the descriptive term “yoga”, which directly refers to the field of activity of the Complainant, and the geographical abbreviation “fr”, commonly understood as referring to France. The addition of descriptive, generic or geographical terms to a complainant’s trademark does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. To the contrary, in the present case, the addition of the terms “yoga” and “fr” reinforces the association with the Complainant because yoga is precisely the field in which the Complainant operates and France is the country where the Complainant is established.

(b) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. The Complainant has never licensed, authorised or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the Complainant’s Trademark, whether in a domain name or otherwise. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant in any way and has never been commonly known by the Complainant’s Trademark. There is no evidence that the Respondent owns any trademark, trade name, company name or other intellectual property right corresponding to the term CHIN MUDRA. The Respondent is using the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a commercial website offering yoga-related products and accessories that are identical or highly similar to those covered by the Complainant’s trademark registrations, and the Respondent’s Website expressly uses the Complainant’s Trademark and prominently displays references to that sign, thereby seeking to benefit from the reputation and goodwill associated with the Complainant’s Trademark.

(c) the Respondent has registered the Disputed Domain Name and is using it in bad faith. The Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name more than nine years after the Complainant's first registration of the Complainant's Trademark and several years after registration of the Complainant's official domain name. The Disputed Domain Name reproduces the Complainant's Trademark in its entirety and merely adds the terms "yoga" and "fr", a composition that clearly demonstrates knowledge of the Complainant and an intention to target its business. The Respondent's Website operates in exactly the same commercial sector as the Complainant, namely yoga-related products, accessories and wellness products, and prominently uses the sign CHIN MUDRA, thereby falsely suggesting an economic connection with the Complainant. The Respondent is intentionally attempting to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks, corporate name and official website. The existence of actual confusion is confirmed by consumer evidence: a consumer filed a complaint through the French "SignalConso" third-party platform after placing an order on the Respondent's Website, reporting that he had paid for products, received no order confirmation and no longer had access to the account created on the Respondent's Website from which it purchased the products.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove each of the following three elements:

- (i) the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (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 by the Respondent in bad faith.

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 of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[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 Complainant's Trademark is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name. Furthermore, the generic Top-Level Domain in this case ".com", may be disregarded for the purposes of assessing confusing similarity under the first element. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, "yoga" and "fr") 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 Complainant's Trademark 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.

In the present case, the Respondent did not submit a Response. The fact that the Respondent did not submit a Response does not automatically result in a decision in favor of the Complainant. However, the Respondent’s failure to file a Response may result in the Panel drawing appropriate inferences from such default. The Panel may also accept all reasonable and supported allegations and inferences flowing from the Complainant as true (see *Entertainment Shopping AG v. Nischal Soni, Sonik Technologies*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1437](#); and *Charles Jourdan Holding AG v. AAJM*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0403](#)).

The Panel notes that there is no evidence to show that the Respondent has trademark rights corresponding to the Disputed Domain Name, or that the Respondent has become commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name. The Panel further notes that the Complainant has provided no license or authorization of any kind to the Respondent to use the Complainant’s Trademark or to apply for or use any domain name incorporating the Complainant’s Trademark. The Disputed Domain Name consisting of the Complainant’s Trademark, with the terms “yoga” and “fr”, carries a risk of implied affiliation and effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

There is also no evidence to suggest that the Respondent’s use of the Disputed Domain Name is in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or can be regarded as legitimate noncommercial or fair use. The Respondent is claiming itself as “CHIN MUDRA Soldes” (which translates to “CHIN MUDRA Sales” in English) on the “About Us” page of the Respondent’s Website, and is using the Respondent’s Website to sell or offer to sell yoga-related products similar or identical to those offered by the Complainant at discounted prices. By prominently using the Complainant’s Trademark on the Respondent’s Website and offering yoga-related goods that are similar or identical to those offered by the Complainant, the Respondent is seeking to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s Trademark and to benefit from the goodwill and reputation associated with the Complainant’s Trademark.

Even if the Respondent were to claim that it is a reseller of the Complainant’s goods, the Respondent would still fail to satisfy the cumulative requirements set out in *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#), for establishing rights or legitimate interests as a reseller. Notably, the Respondent has not disclosed on the Respondent’s Website its relationship (or lack thereof) with the Complainant, nor has the Respondent made clear that it is not affiliated with, sponsored by, or endorsed by the Complainant. Instead, on the “About Us” page of the Respondent’s Website, the Respondent claimed himself as “CHIN MUDRA Soldes” (which translates to “CHIN MUDRA Sales” in English). The Panel notes that the Respondent is not making a bona fide offering of goods and services and does not have a legitimate interest in the Disputed Domain Name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.8.

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.

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 2.13.1.

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 notes that it is difficult to conceive of any plausible use of the Disputed Domain Name by the unaffiliated Respondent that would amount to good faith use, given that the Disputed Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's Trademark in its entirety with the addition of the descriptive term "yoga", directly referencing the Complainant's goods and services, and the geographical abbreviation "fr", commonly understood as referring to France, where the Complainant is established, and that the Complainant's Trademark is reproduced on the Respondent's Website. The Respondent has registered and used the Disputed Domain Name to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's Trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement. Further, the Respondent failed to respond to the Complainant's contentions and has provided no evidence of his actual or contemplated good faith use of the Disputed Domain Name.

The Panel notes that the Disputed Domain Name was registered many years after the Complainant's Trademark was registered and put into use. The Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and the Complainant's Trademark when registering and using the Disputed Domain Name as the Respondent's Website features the Complainant's Trademark, claims itself as "CHIN MUDRA Soldes", (which translates to "CHIN MUDRA Sales" in English) and offers to sell yoga-related products that are similar or identical to those offered by the Complainant at discounted prices.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed 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 <chinmudrayogafr.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Gabriela Kennedy/

Gabriela Kennedy

Sole Panelist

Date: September 16, 2026