Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108999

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108999
Time of filing	2026-09-16 10:32:53
Domain names	lactalis593.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	Groupe Lactalis

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Organization	World Wide Telecom LLC

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 owns the following trademarks:

- European Union reg. no. 1529833 for LACTALIS registered on November 7, 2002;
- International trademark reg. no. 900154 for LACTALIS (device) registered on July 27, 2006;
- International trademark reg. no. 1135514 for LACTALIS (device) registered on September 20, 2012;
- European Union reg. no. 017959526 for LACTALIS (device) registered on May 22, 2019;
- US trademark reg. no. 6824877 for LACTALIS registered on August 23, 2022;
- US trademark reg. no. 6933510 for LACTALIS (device) registered on December 27, 2022.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

I - The Complainant

The Complainant is active in the production of dairy products.

II - The Respondent

The disputed domain name <lactalis593.com> was registered on August 25, 2026 and resolves to a login page displaying the words “Milk World”.

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).

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

A. The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights.

The disputed domain name entirely contains the LACTALIS trademark. The addition of the number "593" does not exclude the confusing similarity between the trademark and the domain name since LACTALIS is clearly visible.

The addition of the ".org" domain name extension does not prevent the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademarks.

For the above-mentioned reasons, the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's trademark for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

B. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name

Under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, a complainant has the burden of establishing that a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of a domain name, but this burden is light. It is sufficient in the first instance for the Complainant to allege a prima facie case, and if the evidence presented is persuasive or yields a positive inference that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden shifts to the Respondent to rebut the allegations.

In this case, the Panel finds that the Complainant’s submitted evidence and allegations, to which the Respondent did not reply, are sufficient to establish a prima facie case of lack of rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

In particular, the Complainant denies that the Respondent has ever been authorized to use the LACTALIS trademark in the disputed domain name. Moreover, the WHOIS information excludes that the Respondent is known by the sign LACTALIS.

The Panel agrees that the current use of the disputed domain name is not a legitimate and fair use according to the Policy. In

particular, the evidence shows that the disputed domain name resolves to a login page displaying the term “Milk World”. This page could be used to collect personal information of the Complainant’s clients, as the terms “Milk World” directly refer to the Complainant’s activities.

C. The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith

As far as registration in bad faith is concerned, the Panel finds particularly relevant the following circumstances:

i) the Complainant's trademarks were filed long before the registration of the disputed domain name;

ii) LACTALIS, according to the information provided by the Complainant, is a well-known trademark.

These circumstances, in the absence of a reasonable justification by the Respondent, suggest that the Respondent was perfectly aware of the Complainant's trademarks and business at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name and that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

Also, the use of the disputed domain name is in bad faith. <lactalis593.com> redirects to a login page displaying the terms “Milk World”. Since "milk world" are words connected with the Complainant's business it is possible that Internet users may think that the disputed domain name is part of the Complainant's official network. Moreover, it is also possible that the Respondent uses the disputed domain name to collect personal information through the website.

All above considered the Panel takes the view that the disputed domain name is used and registered in bad faith.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **lactalis593.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Andrea Mascetti**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-10-20

Publish the Decision