

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

BAL DU MOULIN ROUGE v. 任艺伟 (Yi Wei Ren)

Case No. DME2025-0013

1. The Parties

Complainant is BAL DU MOULIN ROUGE, France, represented by CASALONGA, France.

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

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <moulinrouge.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 May 22, 2025. On May 22, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 23, 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 (Anonymous / REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on June 2, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint.

On June 2, 2025, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. Complainant filed an amended Complaint in English on June 3, 2025, confirming its request that English be the language of the proceedings. Respondent did not submit any comment on 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 Respondent in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 5, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 25, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on July 1, 2025.

The Center appointed Yijun Tian as the sole panelist in this matter on July 15, 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

A. Complainant

Complainant is a company incorporated in France. Established in 1889, it is a world-renowned entertainment venue celebrated for its iconic cabaret performances and widely recognized as the birthplace of the modern can-can dance. Operating under the name "Moulin Rouge", Complainant offers musical dance shows and event services to a global audience. With a history spanning over 125 years, it has become one of the most famous and enduring cabarets in the world.

Complainant is the registered owner of numerous MOULIN ROUGE trademarks worldwide, reflecting its longstanding and internationally recognised brand. These include International Trademark Registration No. 1016676, registered on June 12, 2009, designating countries such as Australia, China, and Japan; United States ("US") Trademark Registration No. 3931511, registered on March 15, 2011; and European Union ("EU") Trademark Registration No. 000110437, registered on November 5, 1998. Complainant is also the owner of, among others, the domain names <moulinrouge.com> and <moulinrouge.fr>.

B. Respondent

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

The disputed domain name <moulinrouge.me> was registered on November 14, 2024. According to the Complaint and supporting evidence, the disputed domain name does not resolve to any active website but instead redirects to a standard registrar parking page operated by GoDaddy. This page explicitly offers the disputed domain name for sale at a price of USD 1,450 (see Annex 17 to the Complaint).

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical to its registered trademark. The disputed domain name incorporates Complainant's trademark in its entirety. The country-code Top-Level Domain ("ccTLD") ".me" should be disregarded in the assessment of identity or confusing similarity.

Complainant contends that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to it.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Language of the Proceedings

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 proceedings shall be the language of the registration agreement.

From the evidence presented on the record, no agreement appears to have been entered into between Complainant and Respondent to the effect that the language of the proceedings should be English. Complainant filed initially its Complaint and amended Complaint in English, and has requested that English be the language of the proceedings for the reason that the disputed domain name <moulinrouge.me> is entirely in Latin script and reproduces Complainant's MOULIN ROUGE trademark, suggesting Respondent's familiarity with English or French and an intentional targeting of Complainant's brand. The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name redirects to a GoDaddy parking page presented in English, listing the disputed domain name for sale in USD, further indicating Respondent's understanding of English and intent to engage with an international audience. Translation into Chinese would cause unnecessary delay and cost, with no clear procedural benefit, especially given the evidence of Respondent's likely English comprehension.

Respondent did not make any submissions with respect to the language of the proceedings.

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).

On the record, Respondent appears to be located in China and thus presumably not a native English speaker, but considering the following aspects, the Panel has decided that the language of the proceedings shall be English: (a) the disputed domain name is registered in Latin characters, rather than Chinese script; (b) the ccTLD of the disputed domain name is ".me", so the disputed domain name seems to be prepared for users worldwide, particularly English-speaking countries; (c) the webpage which the disputed domain name redirected to are in the English language; (d) the Center has notified Respondent of the language of the proceedings in both Chinese and English; (e) the Center also notified Respondent in both Chinese and English of the Complaint, and informed Respondent that it would accept a response in either English or Chinese, but Respondent chose not to file any response.

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceedings shall be English.

6.2 Substantive Issues: Three Elements

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 Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 Panel finds the entirety of the MOULIN ROUGE mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. More specifically, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, 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 Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

While the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognised that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the often impossible 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. 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 record, the Panel finds Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent has not rebutted 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.

More specifically,

(i) while aggregating and holding for resale domain names consisting of acronyms, dictionary words, or common phrases can be bona fide and is not per se illegitimate under the Policy, given the reputation of Complainant’s trademark and its online presence, the Panel finds, on the balance of probabilities, that Respondent is attempting to take advantage of Complainant’s trademark in order to generate profit, which cannot give rise to rights or legitimate interests. Notably, Respondent has not provided evidence of reasons to justify the choice of the terms “moulin rouge”, which, as combined, is Complainant’s MOULIN ROUGE trademark that enjoys long-standing prior use, in the disputed domain name. Nor has Respondent based in China claimed (let alone produced evidence) that the disputed domain name has been or is intended to be put to any use related to any dictionary meaning in the French language of the terms comprising it. There has been no evidence to show that Complainant has licensed or otherwise permitted Respondent to use the MOULIN ROUGE or to apply for or use any domain name incorporating the MOULIN ROUGE marks;

(ii) there has been no evidence adduced to show that Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name. There has been no evidence adduced to show that Respondent has any registered trademark rights with respect to the disputed domain name.

(iii) there has been no evidence adduced to show that Respondent was making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Notably, the disputed domain name redirected to a webpage where the disputed domain name was offered for sale. In the circumstances, Respondent’s use of Complainant’s mark to redirect users to an aftermarket website where it is offered for sale would not support a claim to rights or legitimate interests.

Based on the available record, 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 Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

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 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

In this case, Respondent registered the disputed domain name on November 14, 2024, long after Complainant's MOULIN ROUGE trademark had been registered, including its EU registration dating back to 1998. The disputed domain name is identical to Complainant's trademark. Given the longstanding fame and global recognition of the MOULIN ROUGE mark, it is inconceivable that Respondent was unaware of Complainant's rights at the time of registration.

Furthermore, the evidence submitted with the Complaint shows that the disputed domain name redirects to a standard registrar parking page operated by GoDaddy, which explicitly offers the disputed domain name for sale at USD 1,450 (Annex 17 to the Complaint). This supports the inference, in the circumstances of this case, that Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the intention of profiting from Complainant's trademark.

Thus, the Panel concludes, on the balance of probabilities, that Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name is primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the disputed domain name to Complainant or to a competitor of Complainant, for valuable consideration likely in excess of the documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name. Such use constitutes bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 <moulinrouge.me> be transferred to Complainant.

/Yijun Tian/

Yijun Tian

Sole Panelist

Date: July 29, 2025