

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Tencent Holdings Limited v. Carolina Rodrigues,
Fundacion Comercio Electronico
Case No. D2023-4855

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Tencent Holdings Limited, Cayman Islands, United Kingdom, represented by Kolster Oy Ab, Finland.

The Respondent is Carolina Rodrigues, Fundacion Comercio Electronico, Panama.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <tencent.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on November 22, 2023. On November 23, 2023, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 23, 2024, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 8, 2023, 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 on December 11, 2023.

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 of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on December 12, 2023. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 1, 2024. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on January 3, 2024.

The Center appointed Kaya Köklü as the sole panelist in this matter on January 19, 2024. 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 globally active Internet and technology company established in 1998. The Complainant provides Internet, mobile and telecommunication products and services, including entertainment, and artificial intelligence. Some of the Complainant's widely known products and services include the QQ instant messenger, social media application WeChat, Tencent Games, Tencent Video, Tencent News, and Tencent Sports.

The Complainant is the registered owner of the TENCENT trademark, which is registered in a large number of jurisdictions. Among others, the Complainant is the registered owner of the European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 006033773, registered on November 18, 2008, and the United States of America Trademark Registration No. 5980417, registered on February 11, 2020, both for TENCENT and providing protection for various goods and services inter alia protected in classes 9, 38, 41, and 42.

Further, the Complainant owns and operates its official website at "www.tencent.com" since 1998.

The Respondent is reportedly located in Panama.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 2, 2023.

At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to an inactive website. At the time of this decision, it remains inactive.

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.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraphs 14 and 15(a) of the Rules, the Panel shall decide the Complaint in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable and on the basis of the Complaint where no substantive response has been submitted.

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the three following elements is satisfied:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (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.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy states that the Complainant bears the burden of proving that all these requirements are fulfilled, even if the Respondent has not substantively replied to the Complainant's contentions. *Stanworth Development Limited v. E Net Marketing Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-1228](#).

However, concerning the uncontested information provided by the Complainant, the Panel may, where relevant, accept the provided reasonable factual allegations in the Complaint as true. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)") section 4.3.

It is further noted that the Panel has taken note of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) and, where appropriate, will decide consistent with the consensus views captured therein.

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 the TENCENT trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the TENCENT mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms or letters, here the letters "e" and "s", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds these additions do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the TENCENT mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

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.

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.

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 the present case, considering the well-known nature of the Complainant's prior registered TENCENT trademark, and the lack of explanation from the Respondent regarding its choice of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that it is more likely than not that the Respondent had the Complainant and its TENCENT trademark in mind when registering the disputed domain name, and that the Respondent has most likely chosen the disputed domain name to target the Complainant and mislead Internet users. Consequently, the Panel is convinced that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in bad faith.

With respect to the use of the disputed domain names in bad faith, panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or landing page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the non-use of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith in the circumstances of this proceeding. Although panelists will look at the totality of the circumstances in each case, factors that have been considered relevant in applying the passive holding doctrine include: (i) the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant's mark, (ii) the failure of the respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, and (iii) the respondent's concealing its identity or use of false contact details (noted to be in breach of its registration agreement). [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the notoriety or distinctiveness of the Complainant's TENCENT trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, which is confusingly similar to the Complainant's TENCENT trademark, and finds that in the circumstances of this case, the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of 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 <tencent.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Kaya Köklü/

Kaya Köklü

Sole Panelist

Date: February 2, 2024