

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

ALGECO v. Weijie Xu, Weijie Xu

Case No. DME2026-0007

1. The Parties

The Complainant is ALGECO, France, represented by Nameshield, France.

The Respondent is Weijie Xu, Weijie Xu, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <algeco.me> is registered with Dominet (HK) Limited (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 1, 2026. On July 1, 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 and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 2, 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 2, 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 2, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 22, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 23, 2026.

The Center appointed William A. Van Caenegem as the sole panelist in this matter on July 27, 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 a French corporation which commenced operation in the 1950's and provides modular space and secure storage solutions for businesses and public sector agencies.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademarks for the term ALGECO including international registration n° 386452 registered on January 27, 1972; and international registration n° 1099894 registered on October 21, 2011.

The Complainant has registered domain names, including <algeco.com> which was registered on August 11, 1997.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 25, 2026, and resolves to a GoDaddy page where the disputed domain name is offered for sale for USD 1,450.

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 asserts that the disputed domain name is identical to its registered trademark ALGECO. Further, the Complainant points out that past panels have held that a Respondent was not commonly known by a disputed domain name if the Whois information was not similar to the disputed domain name. Hence, the Complainant says, the Respondent is not known by the disputed domain name. The Complainant adds that it is not related in any way to the Respondent, and does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Respondent. The latter has neither been licensed nor authorized to make any use of the Complainant's trademark ALGECO or apply for registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent's general offer to sell the disputed domain name evidences the Respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests.

The Complainant asserts that given the distinctiveness of its ALGECO trademark and reputation, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademark, which is further confirmed by the fact that an internet search for the term "algeco" redirects to the Complainant. Additionally, the Complainant points out, the disputed domain name resolves to a webpage displaying a general offer to sell the domain name for USD 1,450, which indicates that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name only in order to sell it back for more than out-of-pocket costs, which evinces bad faith registration and use. The Respondent fails to make any active use of the disputed domain name, which has often been held to be evidence of bad faith, the Complainant concludes.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name, without additions or variations. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 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.

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.

The Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name, which incorporates the Complainant's trademark in its entirety, creates a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant.

The Respondent has not been authorized by the Complainant to incorporate its distinctive ALGECO trademark in any domain name. There is nothing to indicate that the Respondent had any prior rights or entitlement to the term "algeco" prior to registering the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not known by the term "algeco" or the disputed domain name. The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name for sale does not, on the record of this case, constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

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 has registered a domain name that is identical to a distinctive and long established registered trademark with which it has no connection. A simple search would in any case have revealed to the Respondent, that at the time of registration the Complainant held trademark rights in the mark ALGECO.

In this case, the registration of the disputed domain name by the Respondent has been followed by an attempt to sell the disputed domain name online, without the disputed domain name being put to any other use. The Panel notes that, given the distinctiveness of the Complainant's ALGECO trademark and in the circumstances of this case, including the fact that the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's ALGECO trademark and is offered for sale, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in 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 <algeco.me> be transferred to the Complainant.

/William A. Van Caenegem/

William A. Van Caenegem

Sole Panelist

Date: August 9, 2026.