

## Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-105446

Case number CAC-UDRP-105446

Time of filing 2023-05-24 09:30:18

Domain names leparisien.ltd

### Case administrator

Name Olga Dvořáková (Case admin)

### Complainant

Organization LE PARISIEN LIBERE

### Complainant representative

Organization NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

### Respondent

Name Iakov Shultz

#### OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The Panel is not aware of any other legal proceedings which are pending or decided and which relate to the disputed domain name.

#### IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

In these proceedings, the Complainant mainly relies on the following trademarks:

- LE PARISIEN (logo), French Registration No. 98732441, registered as of May 14, 1998, in the name of LE PARISIEN LIBERE (SAS) (the Complainant) and duly renewed.

- LE PARISIEN (word), French Registration No. 98732442, registered as of May 14, 1998, in the name of LE PARISIEN LIBERE (SAS) (the Complainant) and duly renewed.

It is worth noting that, the Complainant owns a couple of other similar trademarks in France, which have not been cited in these proceedings.

#### FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a French daily newspaper, based in Paris, which is active locally, nationally and internationally. It was founded in 1944, towards the end of the Second World War. Ever since, the Complainant has acquired important commercial presence in France, in Europe and abroad.

The Complainant owns a fair-sized portfolio of trademarks in France, including the wording "LE PARISIEN", among which two national registrations dating back to 1985. It also owns a multitude of related domain names, like <leparisien.com> and <leparisien.fr> (its official website) since February 3, 1997 and February 9, 2009, respectively.

The disputed domain name <leparisien.ltd> was registered on February 2, 2023 by the Respondent.

---

#### PARTIES CONTENTIONS

##### COMPLAINANT:

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its LE PARISIEN trademark, as it wholly incorporates this trademark. This last element is sufficient to support the finding that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. As to the gTLD ".ltd", the Complainant suggests that it should be disregarded, as per the usual practice.

The Complainant maintains that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because the Respondent is not known by the disputed domain name, the Complainant is not affiliated with nor has it ever authorised the Respondent to register its trademark as a domain name and the Complainant has no business with the Respondent.

According to the Complainant, given the distinctiveness and reputation of the LE PARISIEN trademark, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademark in an intentionally designed way with the aim to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks and domain names, for commercial gain, and this is evidence of the fact that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

With respect to use in bad faith, the Complainant points out that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name as a page copying the Complainant's website, a fact that -in combination with the incorporation of a reputable trademark in a domain name- proves use in bad faith.

For all these reasons, the Complainant concludes that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

##### RESPONDENT:

NO ADMINISTRATIVELY COMPLIANT RESPONSE HAS BEEN FILED

---

#### RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy).

The disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's whole trademark (LE PARISIEN).

As far as the gTLD ".ltd" is concerned, it is generally recognized that top level domains do not have any bearing in the assessment of identity or confusing similarity, according to paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

Hence, the Panel is satisfied that the first requirement under the Policy is met.

---

#### NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the Respondent to have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy).

Since proving a negative fact is almost impossible, panelists in UDRP proceedings have generally agreed that it is sufficient for the Complainant to establish a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name to shift the burden of proof to the Respondent.

In the case at issue, the Complainant argued that it had never authorised the Respondent to register the LE PARISIEN trademark in a domain name, and that it had never licensed its trademark to the Respondent.

Furthermore, the Respondent has not demonstrated any use of the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services or a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Finally, there is no other evidence in the case file that could demonstrate that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

In view of the foregoing, the Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. In order to rebut the Complainant's arguments, the Respondent had the possibility to make his own defense. However, the Respondent has chosen not to file a Response.

Therefore, the Panel is satisfied that also the second requirement under the Policy is met.

---

#### BAD FAITH

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy).

As far as registration in bad faith is concerned, given the reputation of the Complainant's trademark (in France, but also in the rest of Europe, where the Respondent is located) and the fact that the disputed domain name fully incorporates this trademark (plus, that the disputed domain name has been used as a page copying the official website of the Complainant), it is quite evident that, at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name, the Respondent was well aware of the Complainant's trademark. The registration as domain name of a third party's well-known trademark with full knowledge of the fact that the rights over this trademark belong to a third party amounts to registration in bad faith.

With respect to use in bad faith, the disputed domain name resolves to a page copying the Complainant's official website. This fact is to be combined with the full incorporation of the Complainant's reputable trademark in the disputed domain name. For this Panel, same as for many previous panels, such misleading behaviour clearly amounts to use in bad faith. Therefore, it is impossible to conceive any plausible active use of the disputed domain name that would be legitimate.

Therefore, the Panel finds it clear that the disputed domain name was used in bad faith.

For all circumstances mentioned above, the Panel is satisfied that also the third requirement under the Policy is satisfied.

---

#### PROCEDURAL FACTORS

The Panel is satisfied that all procedural requirements under UDRP were met and there is no other reason why it would be inappropriate to provide a decision.

---

#### PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

The disputed domain name wholly incorporates the Complainant's trademark. The disputed domain name is therefore confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark.

The Respondent was not authorised to include the Complainant's trademark in the disputed domain name, and the Complainant never licensed its trademarks to the Respondent. The Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, or a legitimate non-commercial or fair use.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's reputable trademark. His use of the disputed domain name is in bad faith as there is no conceivable use of the disputed domain name that could amount to a legitimate use.

---

#### FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

**Accepted**

---

#### AND THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME(S) IS (ARE) TO BE

1. **leparisien.ltd**: Transferred

---

#### PANELLISTS

Name	<b>Sozos-Christos Theodoulou</b>
------	----------------------------------

---

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2023-06-25

Publish the Decision

---