

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Indutrade AB v. 任艺伟 (Yi Wei Ren)

Case No. DME2025-0007

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Indutrade AB, Sweden, represented by Abion AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is 任艺伟 (Yi Wei Ren), China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <indutrade.me> is registered with Chengdu West Dimension Digital Technology Co., Ltd. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 3, 2025. On April 3, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 7, 2025, 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 (Redirected for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 7, 2025, 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 amendment to the Complaint in English on April 15, 2025.

On April 7, 2025, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. On April 15, 2025, the Complainant confirmed its request that English be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant’s submission.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 English and Chinese of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on April 15, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 5, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 15, 2025.

The Center appointed Jonathan Agmon as the sole panelist in this matter on May 19, 2025. 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 is an international industrial group that develops and acquires companies that have high-tech-know-how and an ability to build enduring, close relationships with customers and suppliers.

The Complainant owns various trademarks for INDUTRADE worldwide, including the following:-

- Benelux Trademark registration no. 653771 for  **Indutrade**, applied for on February 1, 2000;
- European Union Trademark registration no. 015067861 for INDUTRADE, registered on May 18, 2016;
- European Union Trademark registration no. 018243638 for  **Indutrade** registered on September 10, 2020;

The Complainant operates in primary domain name <indutrade.com>, registered on November 26, 1996.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 14, 2024, and at the time of filing the Complaint, redirected to a Godaddy.com website where it is advertised for sale.

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 composed of the Complainant's INDUTRADE trademark along with the country code Top-Level Domain ("ccTLD") ".me", and is confusingly similar to the Complainant's INDUTRADE trademark.
- The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant. The Complainant has not given the Respondent any permission to register the trademark as a domain name or to offer goods or services under the INDUTRADE trademark. There is no evidence that any legitimate use is being made of the disputed domain name. The Complainant believes that the Respondent's website is designed to deceive visitors into believing that the Respondent is associated with or endorsed by the Complainant.
- The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant's trademarks were registered and used by the Complainant long before the Respondent became the owner of the disputed domain name. This implies that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademarks and business at the time of registering the disputed domain name. Given that the Complainant holds several

trademarks within the online casino industry, it is unlikely that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant and its trademarks and/or activities at the time of registering the disputed domain name. The Complainant believes that it is likely that the Respondent is trying to take advantage of the Complainant's trademark to draw traffic to the Respondent's website, and therefore submits that the disputed domain name was registered to commercially profit from the likelihood of confusion between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name is currently listed for sale for the price of USD 1,450. The fact that the Respondent is putting up the disputed domain name for sale less than five months after its registration shows that Respondent had no intent to use the disputed domain name in good faith, but had intended to commercially profit by registering a domain name which was identical to an existing trademark.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 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:

- If the Complainant has to translate the Complainant into a different language, the translation would entail significant additional costs for the Complainant and delay proceedings.
- The ccTLD of the disputed domain name is ".me", which is the ccTLD of Montenegro, which suggests that the Respondent may be targeting consumers in Montenegro. Coupled with the fact that the Respondent's website is in English, and the price of the disputed domain name is quoted in United States of America Dollars, it is likely that the Respondent has knowledge of languages other than Chinese.
- Conducting the proceedings in English would promote efficiency and a timely resolution, as both Parties are likely to be familiar with the English language due to its widespread usage in international business and communication.
- The English language is commonly used internationally and would be considered neutral for both Parties, and it would be fair to both parties that the language of the proceedings be English.

The Respondent did not make any specific 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 (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#))), 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 Substantive Issues

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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), 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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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 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 3.0](#), 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.

There is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Complainant's registration of its trademark(s) predates the registration of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name redirects to a GoDaddy.com webpage where it is being offered for sale for USD 1,450, a sum that likely exceeds the Respondent's out-of-pocket registration costs. There is no objective evidence showing that the Respondent is using or has made any preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or for a legitimate noncommercial or fair use purpose.

The Panel also finds that the use of the Complainant's INDUTRADE trademark in its entirety carries a high risk that the disputed domain name would be perceived by Internet users to be affiliated with the legitimate holder of the trademark, i.e. the Complainant. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1. It has been held by prior UDRP panels that where a domain name consists of a trademark, such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. This is especially so since the chosen ccTLD is the country code for Montenegro, which would likely give the impression to Internet users that the disputed domain name was the official website for the Complainant in Montenegro.

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 the Respondent registered the disputed domain name long after the Complainant registered its INDUTRADE trademark. Given the distinctiveness of the Complainant's mark and its goodwill, it is highly unlikely that the Respondent did not know of the Complainant and its INDUTRADE trademark prior to the registration of the disputed domain name.

Further, the disputed domain name resolves to a GoDaddy.com webpage where it is being offered for sale for USD1,450, a sum that likely exceeds the Respondent's out-of-pocket registration costs. This is an indication of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy.

The Panel also notes (1) that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name using an incomplete address (the courier service was not able to deliver the Written Notice due to "bad address"), (2) that the Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter dated January 2, 2025, and did not file any response, and (3) that the Respondent has past bad conduct engaging in a pattern of registering domain names corresponding to marks held by third parties (see for example, *Sopra Steria Group v. 任艺伟 (Yi Wei Ren)*, WIPO Case No. [DCO2023-0099](#), *E. Remy Martin & C° 诉 任艺伟 (Yi Wei Ren)*, WIPO Case No. [DME2023-0016](#), *Talend S.A.S. v. 任艺伟 (Yi Wei Ren)*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-4700](#), and [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) section 3.1.2). These are evidence of bad faith, and the Panel draws adverse inferences accordingly.

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 <indutrade.me> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Jonathan Agmon/
Jonathan Agmon
Sole Panelist
Date: June 2, 2025