

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Compagnie Générale des Etablissements Michelin v. chen zi meng  
Case No. D2024-3786

### 1. The Parties

The Complainant is Compagnie Générale des Etablissements Michelin, France, represented by Dreyfus & associés, France.

The Respondent is chen zi meng, China.

### 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <mrmichelin.com> is registered with Gname.com Pte. Ltd. (the “Registrar”).

### 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 17, 2024. On September 18, 2024, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 19, 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 (GUANGXI) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 20, 2024, 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 in English on the same day.

On September 20, 2024, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. On September 20, 2024, the Complainant requested English to 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 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 in English and Chinese of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 27, 2024. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 17, 2024. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 18, 2024.

The Center appointed Joseph Simone as the sole panelist in this matter on October 23, 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, Compagnie Générale des Etablissements Michelin ("Michelin"), is a leading company in the car tire industry.

The Complainant is headquartered in Clermont-Ferrand, France, with nine R&D centers around the world, 117 production sites in 26 countries, a commercial presence in 170 countries, and 124,000 employees worldwide.

The Complainant has an extensive global portfolio of trade marks including MICHELIN, including the following:

- Chinese Trade Mark Registration No. 6167649 in Class 12, registered on January 7, 2010;
- Chinese Trade Mark Registration No. 10574991 in Class 16, registered on June 7, 2013; and
- Chinese Trade Mark Registration No. 9156074 in Class 35, registered on February 14, 2013.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 1, 2021.

According to evidence provided by the Complainant, at the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website displaying pornographic content, as well as links to Chinese language content related to online gambling. At the time of issuance of this Decision, the disputed domain name continues to resolve to the same pornographic content.

#### **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 registered by the Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's MICHELIN trade marks, and that the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" does not affect the analysis as to whether the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trade marks.

Furthermore, the Complainant argues that the addition of the terms "mr" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's MICHELIN mark.

The Complainant asserts that it has not authorized the Respondent to use the MICHELIN mark, and there is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent has used, or undertaken any demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Complainant also claims there is no evidence indicating that the Respondent has any connection to the MICHELIN mark in any way, and that there is no plausible good-faith reason for the Respondent to have registered the disputed domain name. The Complainant therefore concludes that the registration and any use of the disputed domain name whatsoever must be in bad faith.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **6.1. Preliminary Issue: Language of the Proceeding**

In accordance with paragraph 11(a) of the Rules:

"[...] the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the Registration Agreement, subject to the authority of the Panel to determine otherwise, having regard to the circumstances of the administrative proceeding."

In this case, the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. Hence, the default language of the proceeding should be Chinese.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for the following reasons:

- the Registrar's website displays its registration agreements both in English and Chinese, hence the language of the Registration Agreement of the disputed domain name may thus be English or Chinese; and
- the Complainant is based in France, and requiring a translation would lead to significant additional expenses and unnecessary delays.

The Respondent was notified in both Chinese and English of the language of the proceeding and the commencement of the proceeding and did not comment on the language of the proceeding or submit any response in either Chinese or English.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel must judiciously and in the spirit of fairness take into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including 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).

Considering the circumstances of this case, the Panel determines that the language of the proceeding shall be English, and as such, the Panel has issued this decision in English. The Panel further finds that such determination should not create any prejudice to either Party and should ensure that the proceeding takes place with due expedition.

## **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 trade mark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Panel acknowledges that the Complainant has established rights in the MICHELIN trade marks in many jurisdictions around the world.

Disregarding the gTLD ".com", the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trade mark MICHELIN in its entirety. Thus, the disputed domain name should be regarded as confusingly similar to the Complainant's MICHELIN trade mark. The inclusion of the additional term "mr" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7 and 1.8.

The Panel therefore finds that the Complainant satisfies the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy in establishing its rights in the MICHELIN trade mark and in showing that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its mark.

## **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.

The Complainant asserts that it has not authorized the Respondent to use its trade marks and there is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent has used, or undertaken any demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Respondent did not file a response and has therefore failed to assert factors or put forth evidence to establish that it enjoys rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Meanwhile, no evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the Respondent, prior to the notice of the dispute, had used or demonstrated its preparation to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. At the time the Complaint was filed, the disputed domain name resolved to a website which displays pornographic content, as well as the links in Chinese, related to online gambling.

There is also no evidence adduced to show that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name or the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. As such, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has failed to rebut the Complainant's prima facie showing of the Respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and that none of the circumstances of paragraph 4(c) of the Policy is applicable in this case.

Accordingly, and based on the Panel's findings below, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

### **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 states that any of the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, shall be considered as evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith:

- (i) circumstances indicating that the respondent registered or acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant (the owner of the trade mark or service mark) or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or
- (ii) circumstances indicating that the respondent registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trade mark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) circumstances indicating that the respondent has registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) circumstances indicating that the respondent is using the domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the respondent's website or location or of a product or service on its website or location.

The examples of bad faith registration and use set forth in paragraph 4(b) of the Policy are not meant to be exhaustive of all circumstances in which bad faith may be found. Other circumstances may also 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).

For reasons discussed under this and the preceding heading, the Panel believes that the Respondent's conduct in this case constitutes bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name.

When the Respondent registered the disputed domain name, the MICHELIN trade marks were already widely known and directly associated with the Complainant's activities. UDRP panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos or incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term) to a famous or widely known trade mark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

Given the extensive prior use and fame of the Complainant's marks, in the Panel's view, the Respondent should have been aware of the Complainant's marks when registering the disputed domain name.

The Respondent has provided no evidence to justify its choice of the term "michelin" in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant's registered trade mark rights in MICHELIN for its products and services predate the registration date of the disputed domain name. A simple online search for the term "michelin" would have revealed that it is an established brand. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2.

The Panel is therefore of the view that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trade mark rights.

In light of the foregoing, there are no plausible good faith reasons for the Respondent to have registered and used the disputed domain name. The Panel finds in the circumstances that, by registering and using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trade marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website or of a product or service on its website (paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy).

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

## **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 <mrmichelin.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Joseph Simone/*

**Joseph Simone**

Sole Panelist

Date: November 6, 2024