

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

GROUPE LA CENTRALE v. M.O., radiant chic beauty
Case No. D2025-2936

1. The Parties

The Complainant is GROUPE LA CENTRALE, France, represented by MIIP – MADE IN IP, France.

The Respondent is M.O., radiant chic beauty, Belgium.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <car-adisiac.com> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 23, 2025. On July 24, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On July 25, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response, disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Information unavailable / Redacted for Privacy, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 25, 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 July 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 July 30, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 19, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 21, 2025.

The Center appointed Nicholas Smith as the sole panelist in this matter on August 26, 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

The Complainant is a French company that specializes in the display of classified ads for automobiles and related services. In particular the Complainant owns the “Caradisiac” website at “www.caradisiac.com” which since 2000 has offered automobile news and classified advertisements to consumers in France.

The Complainant has held a trademark registration for CARADISIAC (the “CARADISIAC Mark”) in France since 2000, including French trademark number 3046447, registered August 11, 2000, for goods and services in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 38, 39, 41 and 42.

The Domain Name was registered on May 8, 2025. The Domain Name resolves to a website maintained by the Registrar displaying pay-per-click (“PPC”) links. The Complaint contains evidence that the Respondent has sent a series of emails from email accounts in the address format “[...]@car-adisiac.com” where the Respondent impersonates the Complainant (indeed a named employee of the Complainant) and contacts third party companies for illegitimate purposes.

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 Domain Name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that:

- a) It is the owner of the CARADISIAC Mark, having registered the CARADISIAC Mark in France. The Domain Name is confusingly similar to the CARADISIAC Mark as it reproduces the CARADISIAC Mark in its entirety and adds a hyphen between the “car” and “adisac” portions of the mark.
- b) There are no rights or legitimate interests held by the Respondent in respect of the Domain Name. The Complainant has not granted any license or authorization for the Respondent to use the CARADISIAC Mark. The Respondent is not commonly known by the CARADISIAC Mark, nor does it use the Domain Name for a bona fide purpose or legitimate noncommercial purpose. Rather, the Domain Name is used for emails impersonating the Complainant, which does not provide the Respondent with rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name.
- c) The Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Domain Name is being used for emails that impersonate the Complainant in order to perpetuate fraud.

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 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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the Domain Name. Accordingly, the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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 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 Domain Name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel considers that the record of this case reflects that:

- Before any notice to the Respondent of the dispute, the Respondent did not use, nor has it made demonstrable preparations to use, the Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.2.
- The Respondent (as an individual, business, or other organization) has not been commonly known by the Domain Name. Paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.3.
- The Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue. Paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.4.
- The record contains no other factors demonstrating rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in the Domain Name.

Furthermore, the Respondent's use of the Domain Name is in connection with a scheme where it sends emails passing itself off as the Complainant to third parties, seeking to acquire information it is otherwise not entitled to have. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here claimed to be phishing and impersonation/passing off) 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here claimed to be phishing and impersonation/passing off) 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 Domain Name constitutes bad faith under the Policy. The Domain Name has been used to create an email account where the Respondent sends emails purporting to be emails from the Complainant (indeed a named employee of the Complainant) in order to improperly obtain information and potentially engage in other illegitimate conduct, including damaging the reputation of the Complainant. The current hosting of sponsored PPC links on the website at the disputed domain name in the circumstances of this case further reinforces the notion that there was no good faith explanation for the registration and use of the disputed domain name.

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 Domain Name <car-adisiac.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nicholas Smith/

Nicholas Smith

Sole Panelist

Date: September 1, 2025