

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION RELATED TO THE REQUEST TO CHANGE THE LANGUAGE OF THE ADR PROCEEDING

Milipol v. Brands2C, Jan sluyts

Case No. DEUL2026-0006

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Milipol, France, represented by Cabinet Beau de Loménie, France.

The Respondent is Brands2C, Jan sluyts, Belgium.

2. The Domain Name, Registry and Registrar

The disputed domain name is <milpol.eu>.

The Registry of the disputed domain name is the European Registry for Internet Domains (“EURid” or the “Registry”). The Registrar of the disputed domain name is Combell NV.

3. Procedural History

The Request to Change the Language of the ADR Proceeding (the “Request”) was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) pursuant to the .eu Alternative Dispute Resolution Rules (the “ADR Rules”), Paragraph A(3)(b), on July 9, 2026. On July 10, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registry a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 13, 2026, the Registry 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 and contact information in the Request. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 17, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registry, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Request. The Complainant filed an amended Request on July 17, 2026.

In accordance with the ADR Rules, Paragraph A(3)(b)(3), the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Request, and the proceedings commenced on July 21, 2026. In accordance with the ADR Rules, Paragraph A(3)(b)(4), the due date for Response was August 2, 2026. The Respondent submitted a response on July 22, 2026. Accordingly, the Center acknowledged receipt of the Response on July 22, 2026.

The Center appointed Richard C.K. van Oerle as the sole panelist in this matter on July 30, 2026, in accordance with the ADR Rules, Paragraph A(3)(b)(4). 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 ADR Rules, Paragraph B(5).

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is an Economic Interest Group (GIE), based in Paris, France.

The Respondent is located in Belgium.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 26, 2026.

The Registry confirmed that the language of the registration agreement of the disputed domain name is Dutch.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

According to the Complainant the circumstances justifying this request are the following:

- The present dispute concerns the Complainant's MILIPOL trade mark, protected by, inter alia, European Union Trade Mark registrations having effect throughout the European Union. The dispute is therefore inherently cross-border in nature and is not confined to the Dutch-speaking market. In these circumstances, English constitutes an appropriate and neutral language for the conduct of the present ADR Proceeding.
- Requiring the Complainant to translate the Complaint and all supporting evidence into Dutch would result in substantial additional costs and unnecessary delay, contrary to the principles of procedural economy and proportionality.
- The disputed domain name does not currently resolve to an active website containing substantive content in Dutch. Instead, it merely displays the message "Please stand by while configuration is in progress". Accordingly, there is no indication that Dutch is the natural language of the dispute. Granting the present request would not prejudice the Respondent.
- The Respondent will be duly notified of these proceedings and will remain free to submit a Response and any supporting evidence in Dutch should it consider this appropriate.
- Furthermore, the Netherlands is internationally recognized for the very high level of English proficiency of its population. English is extensively used in business, higher education and cross-border commercial communications. Although this factor is not, by itself, determinative, it further supports the conclusion that conducting the present ADR Proceeding in English would not place the Respondent at any disadvantage.

B. Respondent

On July 22, 2026, the Respondent submitted a response confirming his agreement to change the language of the proceedings to English.

6. Discussion and Findings

The Registry having confirmed that the language of the registration agreement of the disputed domain name is Dutch, the Complainant duly filed a formal request that the language of the proceeding be changed to English.

In accordance with Paragraph A(3)(a) of the ADR Rules, “unless otherwise agreed by the Parties, or specified otherwise in the Registration Agreement, the language of the ADR Proceeding shall be the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name. In the absence of an agreement between the Parties, the Panel may in its sole discretion, having regard to the circumstances of the ADR Proceeding, decide on the written request of a Complainant that the language of the ADR Proceeding will be different than the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name”.

Given that the Respondent agreed that the proceedings will be conducted in English, the Parties have reached an agreement that the language of the ADR proceeding shall be English.

Therefore, having regard to the above circumstances, the Panel accepts that the language of the ADR Proceeding will be English and therefore different from the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain name.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with Paragraph A(3)(b)(6) of the ADR Rules, the Panel orders that the language of the ADR proceeding shall be English and any future submission by the Parties (including the submission of a new Complaint) regarding the disputed domain name <milpol.eu> shall be made in the language of the ADR Proceeding in accordance with paragraph A(3)(c) of the ADR Rules.

This Panel's decision shall be final and not subject to appeal.

/Richard van Oerle/

Richard van Oerle

Sole Panelist

Date: August 6, 2026