

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Chambre de Commerce v. Tao Jing
Case No. DME2025-0033

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Chambre de Commerce, Luxembourg, represented by Arendt & Medernach S.A., Luxembourg.

The Respondent is Tao Jing, Afghanistan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <cclu.me> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 12, 2025. On November 13, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 14, 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 (NameCheap, Inc.) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 28, 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 amended Complaint on December 1, 2025.

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 December 2, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 22, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on December 24, 2025.

The Center appointed Warwick A. Rothnie as the sole panelist in this matter on January 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 is the Chambre de Commerce, Luxembourg. Amongst other things, it operates a website at “www.cc.lu”. From the Panel’s inspection of the website, it appears to offer information about setting up and operating a business in Luxembourg.¹

It is the owner of European Registered Trademark No. 018865175:



This trademark was registered on September 13, 2023, in respect of goods and services in international classes 16, 35, 36, 41, and 45.

According to the Whois report, the disputed domain name was registered on May 18, 2025.

When the Complaint was filed, the disputed domain name resolved (at least transiently) to a website displaying the Complainant’s trademark and appearing to replicate the Complainant’s website. When the Panel navigated to the website, however, the website transitioned after a very short period into a very different landing page in Chinese, a partial screen shot of which is shown below.



¹ In the exercise of the Panel’s powers under paragraph 10 of the Rules: see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), section 4.8.

It is not entirely clear to the Panel what this website conveys. The Google Translate function, however, translates the characters:

“至高赔率 1.9999
新人首存送彩金”

as “Up to 1.9999 odds; new users receive a bonus on their first deposit.” So, it appears that the website is some sort of gambling or “investment” website.

5. Discussion and Findings

No response has been filed. The Complaint and Written Notice have been sent, however, to the Respondent at the electronic and physical coordinates confirmed as correct by the Registrar in accordance with paragraph 2(a) of the Rules. Delivery to the email address provided by the Registrar was completed but no delivery notification was received from the destination server. The courier was unable to complete delivery of the physical copy as the address provided by the Respondent does not exist.

Bearing in mind the duty of the holder of a domain name to provide and keep up to date correct Whois details, therefore, the Panel finds that the Respondent has been given a fair opportunity to present his or its case.

When a respondent has defaulted, paragraph 14(a) of the Rules requires the Panel to proceed to a decision on the Complaint in the absence of exceptional circumstances. Accordingly, paragraph 15(a) of the Rules requires the Panel to decide the dispute on the basis of the statements and documents that have been submitted and any rules and principles of law deemed applicable.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that in order to divest the Respondent of the disputed domain name, the Complainant must demonstrate each of the following:

- (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 in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The first element that the Complainant must establish is that the disputed domain name is identical with, or confusingly similar to, the Complainant's trademark rights.

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.

According to the evidence provided by the Complainant, the Complainant is using its trademark and logo on its website. The Complaint, however, does not include details about how long this website has been operational or the volume of traffic to it. That said, the Complainant has proven ownership of the registered trademark identified in section 4 above.

The comparison of the disputed domain name to the Complainant's trademark simply requires a visual and aural comparison of the disputed domain name to the proven trademarks. This test is narrower than and thus different to the question of “likelihood of confusion” under trademark law. Therefore, questions such as the scope of the trademark rights, the geographical location of the respective parties, the date they were acquired and other considerations that may be relevant to an assessment of infringement under trademark

law are not relevant at this stage. Such matters, if relevant, may fall for consideration under the other elements of the Policy. See e.g. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

In undertaking that comparison, it is permissible in the present circumstances to disregard the country code Top-Level Domain (“ccTLD”) component as a functional aspect of the domain name system. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.

It is also usual to disregard the design elements of a trademark under the first element as such elements are generally incapable of representation in a domain name. Where the textual elements have been disclaimed in the registration or cannot fairly be described as an essential or important element of the trademark, however, different considerations may arise. See for example, [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.10. The figurative elements of the Complainant’s trademarks are not so dominating that the verbal element cannot be considered an essential or important part of the trademarks in this case. Accordingly, it is appropriate to apply the usual rule.

Disregarding the “.me” ccTLD, the disputed domain name consists of what can be understood as a four letter acronym. A string of four letters of this kind may be considered descriptive as it may represent any number of different things or organisations. In the present case, it may potentially be seen as an acronym for the primary verbal element of the Complainant’s registered trademark, bearing in mind that “LU” is a recognised abbreviation or acronym for Luxembourg.

A number of decisions under the Policy have found that a four letter sign which is an acronym for the words of a trademark is confusingly similar to the trademark. See for example *Phi Kappa Sigma Fraternity, Inc. v. Phi Kappa Sigma Foundation Fund, Inc. / Daniel Heiss, Phi Kappa Sigma Foundation* WIPO Case No [D2021-4164](#) and the decisions there cited.

As this requirement under the Policy is essentially a standing requirement, the Panel is prepared to proceed on the basis that the disputed domain name which can be seen as an acronym for the distinctive verbal part of the Complainant’s registered trademark is confusingly similar to that trademark. That is especially the case here bearing in mind that, in cases of doubt, it can be permissible to have regard to the content of the website to which the disputed domain name resolves (at least here initially) so that it appears prima facie that the Respondent is targeting the Complainant’s trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.15.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark and the requirement under the first limb of the Policy is satisfied.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The second requirement the Complainant must prove is that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides that the following circumstances can be situations in which the Respondent has rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name:

- (i) before any notice to [the Respondent] of the dispute, [the Respondent’s] use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the [disputed] domain name or a name corresponding to the [disputed] domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or
- (ii) [the Respondent] (as an individual, business, or other organization) has been commonly known by the [disputed] domain name, even if [the Respondent] has acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or
- (iii) [the Respondent] is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the [disputed] domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

These are illustrative only and are not an exhaustive listing of the situations in which a respondent can show rights or legitimate interests in a domain name.

While 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 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.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name after the Complainant registered its trademark.

The Complainant states that it has not authorised the Respondent to use the disputed domain name. Nor is the Respondent affiliated with it.

The disputed domain name is not derived from the Respondent's name. Nor is there any suggestion of some other name by which the Respondent is commonly known from which the disputed domain name could be derived. From the available record, the Respondent does not appear to hold any trademarks for the disputed domain name.

The four letters of the disputed domain name (apart from the ccTLD) do not appear to be descriptive of the services apparently being offered from the website.

As described in section 4 above, the Respondent appears to be using the disputed domain name to attract Internet users looking for the Complainant's website to what appears to be a gambling or “investment” website which invites Internet users landing on the page to deposit funds into an account with the Respondent.

It is not clear to the Panel whether or not this is a genuine gambling or “investment” site although, as it appears to the Respondent has given false contact details to the Registrar – so far as the Panel is aware, Selangor is in Malaysia (where it is famous for pewter ware) and not Afghanistan, the Panel is sceptical about this. In any event, the use of the disputed domain name to attract Internet users to a website which initially masquerades as the Complainant's website is clearly not a legitimate activity under the Policy.

These matters, taken together, are sufficient to establish a prima facie case under the Policy that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The basis on which the Respondent has adopted the disputed domain name, therefore, calls for explanation or justification. The Respondent, however, has not sought to rebut that prima facie case or advance any claimed entitlement. Accordingly, the Panel finds the Complainant has established the second requirement under the Policy also.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Under the third requirement of the Policy, the Complainant must establish that the disputed domain names have been both registered and used in bad faith by the Respondent. These are conjunctive requirements; both must be satisfied for a successful complaint: see e.g., *Group One Holdings Pte Ltd v. Steven Hafto* WIPO Case No. [D2017-0183](#).

Generally speaking, a finding that a domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith requires an inference to be drawn that the respondent in question has registered and is using the disputed domain name to take advantage of its significance as a trademark owned by (usually) the complainant.

That requirement is evidently satisfied here given the disputed domain name resolves initially (and transiently) to a landing page which appears to replicate the Complainant's website – including a replica of the Complainant's registered trademark.

In these circumstances, the Panel readily finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and subsequently used in bad faith. Given the short passage of time from the registration of the disputed domain name to its resolving to the Respondent's website, the Panel infers the Respondent registered the disputed domain name for the purpose that the Respondent has used it. As discussed in section 5B above, that use is not legitimate under the Policy and accordingly constitutes registration and use in bad faith.

Accordingly, the Complainant has established all three requirements under the Policy.

6. 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 <cclu.me> be cancelled.

/Warwick A. Rothnie/

Warwick A. Rothnie

Sole Panelist

Date: January 16, 2026