

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Chanel v. Marko Pajic, CocoFashion  
Case No. D2024-3499

### 1. The Parties

The Complainant is Chanel, France, represented by Zivko Mijatović & Partners d.o.o. Beograd, Serbia.

The Respondent is Marko Pajic, CocoFashion, Croatia.

### 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <cocofashionluxury.com> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the "Registrar").

### 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 28, 2024. On August 28, 2024, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 29, 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 (Domain Admin) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 2, 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 September 3, 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 September 4, 2024. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 24, 2024. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 25, 2024.

The Center appointed Nayiri Boghossian as the sole panelist in this matter on September 30, 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 was founded in 1910 by Coco Chanel and is a leading luxury fashion company. The Complainant owns many trademark registrations for COCO such as the following:

- International Trademark Registration No. 363419, registered on November 13, 1969;
- International Trademark Registration No. 1301393, registered on April 7, 2016;
- International Trademark Registration No. 175733, registered on March 20, 1954.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 15, 2024, and does not resolve to an active website.

#### **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 a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights. The trademark and name COCO is associated with the Complainant's luxury product and reputation in fashion. The disputed domain name directs to Instagram accounts, which sell counterfeit goods. COCO is a personal name.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not licensed nor authorized by the Complainant to use its trademark. The Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is offering counterfeit fashion products confirmed by the Complainant via a test purchase of the goods being offered through the Instagram accounts directed to by the disputed domain name.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The disputed domain name is being used to sell various counterfeit branded garments and is linked to Instagram pages that also sell counterfeit items. The website of the Respondent contains photos of the Complainant's trademarks and products.

##### **B. Respondent**

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

#### **6. Discussion and Findings**

##### **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.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, “fashion” and “luxury”, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms 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.

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. 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. Rather, the evidence presented in the case file reflects the fact that the disputed domain name previously redirected Internet users to an Instagram account offering discounted goods bearing the Complainant’s trademark. Such redirection for commercial purposes does not vest in the Respondent rights or legitimate interests and given that the Complainant has confirmed that the goods being offered are counterfeit, the Panel finds that the use of the disputed domain name for illegal activity can never confer rights or legitimate interests upon the Respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 2.5.3 and 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant’s trademark as the disputed domain name was registered 70 years after the registration of the Complainant’s trademark, the Complainant is a leading fashion company, and the composition of the disputed domain name reflects the business activity of the Complainant.

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 here, sale of counterfeit of goods, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

While the disputed domain name no longer resolves to an active website, such non-use does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy. Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

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 <cocofashionluxury.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Nayiri Boghossian/*

**Nayiri Boghossian**

Sole Panelist

Date: October 7, 2024