# Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108652

| | |
|---|---|
| Case number | CAC-UDRP-108652 |
| Time of filing | 2026-05-14 09:06:24 |
| Domain names | thesimoneperele.shop |

## Case administrator

| | |
|---|---|
| Organization | Iveta Špiclová (Czech Arbitration Court) (Case admin) |

## Complainant

| | |
|---|---|
| Organization | SIMONE PERELE |

## Complainant representative

| | |
|---|---|
| Organization | NAMESHIELD S.A.S. |

## Respondent

| | |
|---|---|
| Name | kayleighs kayleighs |

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 several trademarks “SIMONE PERELE”, such as:

- International trademark SIMONE PERELE n° 272755, registered on August 9, 1963;
- European trademark SIMONE PERELE n° 4367512, registered on February 17, 2006;
- European trademark SP SIMONE PERELE PARIS n° 13026216 registered on December 31, 2014.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Alleged to have been created in 1948, SIMONE PERELE designs, manufactures and sells items of women’s lingerie and swimsuits in a variety of high-quality modern styles and cuts. SIMONE PERELE allegedly sells his products within traditional boutiques and department stores, and through an official e-shop in France and in several other countries in the world.

The disputed domain name <thesimoneperele.shop> was registered on March 14, 2026 and redirects to a website purporting to be an online store selling the Complainant’s SIMONE PERELE products.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain name should be transferred to it.

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 <thesimoneperele.shop> is undoubtedly confusingly similar to the Complainant's registered SIMONE PERELE trademarks. The word "the" and the domain name ".shop" are obviously irrelevant to this analysis as they add no distinctiveness.

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).

The Complainant contends that the Respondent is not affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant in any way. The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Respondent. Neither license nor authorization has been granted to the Respondent to make any use of the Complainant’s trademark SIMONE PERELE or apply for registration of the disputed domain name <thesimoneperele.shop> by the Complainant.

Furthermore, the disputed domain name redirects to a website purporting to be an online store selling the Complainant’s SIMONE PERELE products. Such use is not legitimate within the meaning of the Policy. The Complainant clearly has satisfied its burden on this element, and the Respondent has not appeared to dispute any of the Complainant's allegations. Therefore, this element is met by Complainant.

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).

The disputed domain name redirects to an online shop which makes reference to the Complainant’s trademark and products. Given the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent has registered and used the domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademark.

Furthermore, the disputed domain name redirects to online store which competes with the products offered by the Complainant. Using a domain name in order to offer competing services is disruption of the business of the owner of the relevant mark, and thus is bad faith within the meaning of the Policy. Therefore, Complainant has satisfied this element 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

Using a domain name in order to offer competing services is disruption of the business of the owner of the relevant mark, and thus is bad faith within the meaning of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **thesimoneperele.shop**: Transferred

## PANELLISTS

| Name | **Mike Rodenbaugh** |
|---|---|

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-06-17

Publish the Decision