

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Frida Kahlo Corporation v. Nicholas Van Helsen, Crown Casino
Case No. D2025-0298

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Frida Kahlo Corporation, Mexico, represented by Arochi & Lindner, Mexico.

The Respondent is Nicholas Van Helsen, Crown Casino, Cambodia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <fridakahlorestaurante.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on January 24, 2025. On January 27, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 27, 2025, 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 (Registration Private, and as indicated by reference to the annex of the Complaint, Domains by Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 29, 2025, 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 29, 2025.

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 February 5, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 25, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on February 27, 2025.

The Center appointed Federica Togo as the sole panelist in this matter on March 6, 2025. 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

It results from the Complainant's undisputed allegations that it is a business entity dedicated to manage and commercialize the intellectual property rights associated with the iconic Mexican artist "Frida Kahlo". Through strategic partnerships and branding efforts, the corporation aims to preserve and promote Frida Kahlo's legacy while ensuring that her image is represented in a way that aligns with her cultural and artistic significance.

The Complainant is the registered owner of many trademarks for Frida Kahlo, e.g., Mexican trademark registration no. 866404 Frida Kahlo (word), registered on January 28, 2005 for services in class 43.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 15, 2014. Furthermore, the undisputed evidence provided by the Complainant proves that the disputed domain name resolved to a website displaying gambling content.

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 identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark since it contains the entire Complainant's trademark. The word "RESTAURANTE," meaning "restaurant" is not a distinctive element and is precisely the type of services that the Complainant offers through its trademark registration.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant, the Complainant's trademark is well known in Mexico and globally and the Respondent is not and has never been associated with such brand. Furthermore, The Complainant has not granted any authorization to any third party to make use of its trademarks to register the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name resolved to a webpage which apparently is denominated "NENEKTOGEL4D" related to "Toto SGP & Toto HK" which is or promotes what it appears to be a betting game. The Respondent uses the Complainant's trademarks to divert customers away from the official websites and services, leading them into this suspicious site.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. According to the Complainant, by operating a website under the disputed domain name, using without authorization the Complainant's trademarks, in an intentional manner and with the purpose of attracting users, creating a scenario of imminent confusion with the Frida Kahlo brand as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or promotion of its platform, its content and the commercial activity carried out therein, the Respondent is acting in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to "decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable". Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires a complainant to prove each of the following three elements in order to obtain an order that each disputed domain name be transferred or cancelled:

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

The Panel will therefore proceed to analyze whether the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are satisfied.

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, "restaurante") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term 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.

Moreover, the Panel notes that the disputed domain names contain the Complainant's trademark FRIDA KAHLO in its entirety. The Panel finds it most likely that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name containing the Complainant's trademark, with the intention to take advantage of the Complainant's reputation and with the intent to mislead Internet users.

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.

One of these circumstances is that the Respondent by using the disputed domain name, has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website or location or of a product or service on its website or location (paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy).

In the present case, the Panel notes that it results from the Complainant's documented allegations that the disputed domain name resolved to a website displaying gambling content.

By the time the disputed domain name was registered, the panel considers it to be unlikely that the Respondent did not have knowledge of the Complainant and its marks, which are entirely included in the disputed domain name, and which have been existing by many years at the time the disputed domain name was registered. Consequently, and in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, the Panel is convinced that the Respondent also knew that the disputed domain name included the Complainant's trademark when it registered the disputed domain name.

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.

In this regard, the further circumstances surrounding the disputed domain name's registration and use confirm the Panel's findings that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith:

- (i) the nature of the disputed domain name (wholly incorporating the Complainant's trademark);
- (ii) the content of the website to which the disputed domain name directs (i.e. displaying gambling content);
- (iii) a clear absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with no response for the Respondent's choice of the disputed domain name; and
- (iv) the Respondent concealing its identity through a privacy service.

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 <fridakahlorestaurante.com> be transferred to the Complainant

/Federica Togo/

Federica Togo

Sole Panelist

Date: March 20, 2025