Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108599

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108599
Time of filing	2026-04-22 08:58:51
Domain names	grevin-pass.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	MUSEE GREVIN

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Organization	fdsfsd

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

The Complainant is the owner of the EUTM no. 2207124 "GREVIN" filed on May 4, 2001, registered on March 25, 2004 and duly renewed in classes 16, 25, 28, 35, 41 and 42.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is the organisation responsible for running the Grévin Museum. Inaugurated in 1882, the Grévin Museum is one of Paris' most iconic cultural institutions. Grévin is both an institution that has welcomed over 60 million visitors, an architectural heritage site typical of early 20th-century Paris, and a witness to history with more than 2,000 wax figures created by the expert hands of Les Ateliers Grévin artists.

The disputed domain name <grevin-pass.com> was registered on April 18, 2026.

On the basis of information provided in the complaint, the disputed domain name was linked to a copy of the Complainant's official website for a certain period of time and now it is inactive.

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark "GREVIN" since the addition of the term "PASS" is not sufficient to escape the finding that the domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark "GREVIN".

Furthermore, according to the Complainant, the Respondent is not identified in the Whois database as the disputed domain name and he or she has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant insists that the Respondent is not related in any way to the Complainant and that the Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Respondent. In particular, the Complainant outlines that neither a license nor any authorization has been granted to the Respondent to make any use of the Complainant's trademark "GREVIN" or apply for registration of the disputed domain name by the Complainant. The Complainant also observes that the disputed domain name used to resolve to a page copying the Complainant's official website and that this use cannot be considered a bona fide offer of services or a legitimate use of domain names, since the website misled consumers into believing that they were accessing the Complainant's website.

In addition, in the Complainant's view, given the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent has registered the domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademark. Moreover, according to the Complainant, the domain name was used to resolve to a page copying the Complainant's official website. Therefore, by using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial purposes, internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of its website.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant´s contentions are summarized above.

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).

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).

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).

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

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that to obtain the transfer of the disputed domain name; the Complainant must prove that each of the following elements is present:

(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.

1) The disputed domain name <grevin-pass.com> combines three elements: (1) the wording "grevin" (2) the term "pass" (preceded by a simple hyphen which has no significance in the context of the comparison we are considering here) and (3) the top-level

domain name ".com". The relevant comparison to be made is with the portion of the domain name "grevin-pass". Actually, it is well established that the top-level domain name (i.e., ".com") should be disregarded for this purpose (see, between many others, Playboy Enterprises International, Inc. v. John Taxiarchos, WIPO Case No. D2006 - 0561). Furthermore, the term "PASS" does not distinguish the disputed domain name from the Complainant's "GREVIN" mark. Actually, in the Panel's view, "PASS" must be considered as a generic term, especially having regard to the Complainant's business, since this term, when used in the context of the museum sector, will unambiguously be understood to mean "admission ticket". In general, when a distinctive mark is combined with less distinctive terms, the combination will typically be found to be confusingly similar to the distinctive mark. Therefore, in the case at hand, the combination does not prevent the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark (see, between many others, Arcelormittal S.A. v. Name Francois Dumontier, CAC Case. No. 100855). Therefore, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark "GREVIN". The Complainant, therefore, succeeds on the first element of the Policy.

2) Pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, a complainant must make out a prima facie case that a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Once such a prima facie case is made, the respondent carries the burden of demonstrating its rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. If the respondent fails to do so, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy. In this case, the Panel finds that the Complainant's submitted evidence and allegations are sufficient to establish a prima facie case of the Respondent's lack of rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, also considering the fact that the Respondent had the chance to justify the registration and use of the disputed domain name, but failed to do so. According to the information provided by the Complainant and not contested, the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name nor authorised to use the Complainant's trademark "GREVIN". For these reasons, the Panel takes the view that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name for the purpose of the second element of the Policy.

3) The disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent on April 18, 2026, and thus more than 20 years after the Complainant's trademark was duly registered in the European Union. The Complainant has used the "GREVIN" trademark so intensively that it is impossible to believe that the Respondent had no knowledge of the Complainant's trademark rights at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. Therefore, in the Panel's view, the disputed domain name <grevin-pass.com> was registered in bad faith.

The Respondent used the disputed domain name to confuse internet users, by falsely associating the websites at the disputed domain name with the Complainant. In particular, the Complainant has demonstrated that the domain name <grevin-pass.com> was linked to a copy of the Complainant's official website for a certain period of time, creating the false impression that <grevin-pass.com> was authorized or endorsed by MUSEE GREVIN. The Panel observes that the pattern of behavior demonstrated by the Respondent, involving the use of the disputed domain name to create misleading impressions of legitimacy and association with the Complainant, underscores a clear intent to exploit the Complainant's trademark for fraudulent purposes. Therefore, in the Panel's view, there is no evidence that Respondent registered the disputed domain name to provide a bona fide offering of its goods and services. The disputed domain name is now inactive. This circumstance does not prevent a finding of bad faith use. Previous panels have held that the passive holding of a domain name can be considered as use in bad faith (see WIPO Case No. D2000-0003 <telstra.org> and WIPO Case No. D2011-0421<browns.com>).

As a result of the above, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant, therefore, succeeds also on the third element of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **grevin-pass.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Guido Maffei**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-05-25

Publish the Decision