

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Ardian Holding and Ardian France v. RICHARD BOURET
Case No. D2023-5293

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Ardian Holding, France, and Ardian France, France, represented by Deprez Guignot & Associés, France.

The Respondent is RICHARD BOURET, France.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ardian-france.com> is registered with Name SRS AB (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 20, 2023. On December 20, 2023, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 2, 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 and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 3, 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 on January 5, 2024.

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 of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on January 9, 2024. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 29, 2024. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 31, 2024.

The Center appointed William Lobelson as the sole panelist in this matter on February 7, 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 is ARDIAN, a France-based private equity investment company (which includes the two entities ARDIAN HOLDING and ARDIAN FRANCE). It owns trademark rights in the name ARDIAN:

International trademark ARDIAN, n°1175512 registered on June 6, 2013 and duly renewed until June 6, 2033, designating inter alia the European Union, the United States of America, Sweden and Japan, in relation with services of classes 35; 36 and 38;

French trademark ARDIAN, n°3991299, registered on July 12, 2013 and duly renewed until March 19, 2033, in relation with services of class 35; 36 and 38.

The disputed domain name is <ardian-france.com>. It was registered on December 5, 2023 and directs to an error page. Mail Exchanges ("MX") servers have been set up, and the disputed domain name is used as an email address to send messages to Internet users, impersonating the Complainant, in order to offer financial investment services.

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 is confusingly similar to its earlier trademarks, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Notwithstanding the default of the Respondent, it remains incumbent on the Complainant to make out its case in all respects under the Rules set out in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy. Namely, the Complainant must prove that:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights (paragraph 4(a)(i));

(ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name (paragraph 4(a)(ii)); and

(iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith (paragraph 4(a)(iii)).

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 trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

Although the addition of other elements (here, “france” and a hyphen) may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such elements does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

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.

- (i) before any notice of the dispute, the Respondent’s use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name or a name corresponding to the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services;
- (ii) the Respondent (as an individual, business or other organization) has been commonly known by the disputed domain name, even if the Respondent has acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or
- (iii) the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

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.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, particularly by asserting that the Respondent is not affiliated with it in any way and that it never authorized the Respondent to use its trademark as part of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant’s prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent does not make any bona fide use - neither commercial nor noncommercial, of the disputed domain name.

In addition, the disputed domain name is used in connection with a fraudulent email scheme that impersonates the Complainant.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity such as sale of counterfeit goods or illegal pharmaceuticals, phishing, distributing malware, unauthorized account access/hacking, impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

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 sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (sale of counterfeit goods or illegal pharmaceuticals, phishing, distributing malware, unauthorized account access/hacking, impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent has used of the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant, which is a clear indication that the Respondent knew about the Complainant and sought to take a financial advantage through such fraudulent activities.

For this Panel, the above is a clear indication that the Respondent necessarily had the Complainant's trademark in mind when it registered the disputed domain name.

Further, the information provided to the Panel in support of the Complainant's contentions shows that the Respondent is making use of the disputed domain name as a fraudulent email address, for funds extortion and phishing purposes.

This is a fraudulent impersonation of the Complainant that clearly demonstrates a use in bad faith of the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name currently directing to an error page does not alter the finding that the disputed domain name was registered and used in bad faith.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

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 <ardian-france.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/William Lobelson/

William Lobelson

Sole Panelist

Date: February 16, 2024