

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

DV Dinh Van v. Stanley Pace
Case No. D2025-5361

1. The Parties

Complainant is DV Dinh Van, France, represented by Cabinet Bouchara, France.

Respondent is Stanley Pace, United States of America (“United States”), represented by John Berryhill, Ph.d., Esq., United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <vandin.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 December 22, 2025. On December 23, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 23, 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 (Domain By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on December 24, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on December 24, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on January 26, 2026. Respondent requested an automatic four-day extension of the Response due date. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 19, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on February 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Marina Perraki as the sole panelist in this matter on February 27, 2026. 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

Complainant is a French company founded in 1965 by Jean Dinh Van active in the creation and distribution of jewelry. Jean Dinh Van is considered amongst the most creative French jewelers of the 1960s.

Complainant owns various trademark registrations for DINH VAN including:

- the International trademark registration No. 419636, DINH VAN (word), registered on December 17, 1975, for goods in International classes 14 and 20;
- the French trademark registration No. 1238775, DINH VAN (word), registered on June 16, 1983, for goods in International classes 3, 14, and 20;
- the United States trademark registration No. 2420828, DINH VAN, filed on July 14, 1999 and registered on January 16, 2001, for goods in Class 14, and
- the European Union trademark registration No. 003584935, DINH VAN (word), filed on December 16, 2003 and duly registered on April 28, 2006 in classes 3, 14, and 25.

Complainant has more than 300 stores and points of sale throughout the world, as well as presence online with its main website "www.dinhvan.com" and more than 99,000 followers on Instagram.

Complainant also owns the domain name registration <dinhvan.com> since May 11, 2000.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 25, 2009 and at the time of filing of the Complaint resolved to a parking page comprising pay-per-click ("PPC") links to various websites selling jewelry. Subsequently it led to a website where it was being offered for sale and currently it leads to an inactive website.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

Respondent submitted a Response to the Center on February 19, 2026. Respondent recognized Complainant's rights in the trademark DINH VAN in connection with jewelry but alleged legitimate interests and denied bad faith. Respondent stated that he is a domain investor with history of registering both geographical terms and common names. Respondent stated that a commune in the city of Hanoi, Viet Nam is called "Van Dinh". He also stated that Van Dinh is a commonly used Vietnamese surname or personal name. Furthermore, he stated that the "Vit co Van Dinh" (small-sized duck of Van Dinh) has been well known for its special taste and featured on the menu of many restaurants.

Respondent claimed that the fact that the disputed domain name leads in 2026 to a parking page with links related to jewelry does not prove Respondent's intention at the time of registration in 2009 and he claims to be unaware of such recent use ("unaware of the recent and apparently geo-targeted search results which the Complainant alleges to have observed in France").

Respondent stated that he has registered a significant number of South American geographical place names as domain names and also that he maintains a surname/first name portfolio, part of which includes other Asian surnames such as Chun, Dien, Dong, Xiang, and Zong.

Respondent claimed that Complainant's evidence shows the nameservers for the disputed domain name to be "ns1.bodis.com" and "ns2.bodis.com"; that "Bodis.com" is a domain monetization PPC service which ceased operations on January 31, 2026; that their terms of service, and of access to their parking pages,

are still available and include information on targeting cookies, namely cookies that are used to deliver adverts more relevant to the users and their interests. From this, as Respondent claimed, follows that the advertisements seen by Complainant's counsel in France were based on the fact that Complainant's counsel is located in France, and their browser history included the fact that Complainant's counsel had visited Complainant's site. Respondent submitted that the disputed domain name has been legitimately registered consistent with Respondent's longstanding pattern of dealing in geographic and personal name domain names.

As regards bad faith, Respondent produced screenshots from dates in the years 2010-2021 of the corresponding to the disputed domain name website, depicting parking pages with PPC links unconnected to jewelry. Respondent claimed that he acquired the disputed domain name because it was readily recognizable to him as a geographic name and surname.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists three elements, which Complainant must satisfy with respect to the disputed domain name:

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

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 Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. The latter fully incorporates the former's two words DINH VAN in inversion. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is disregarded, as gTLDs typically do not form part of the comparison on the grounds that they are required for technical reasons (*Rexel Developpements SAS v. Zhan Yequn*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-0275](#); *Hay & Robertson International Licensing AG v. C. J. Lovik*, WIPO Case No. [D2002-0122](#)). [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

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 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds Complainant has not established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent may establish rights or legitimate interests by demonstrating any of the following:

- (i) before any notice to it of the dispute, Respondent's use of, or demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name or a name corresponding to the disputed domain name was in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or
- (ii) Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name, even if it has acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or
- (iii) 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.

Per Complainant's evidence the disputed domain name resolved at the time of filing of the Complaint to a parked page with PPC links related to jewelry.

The evidence provided by Respondent consisting of screenshots from dates in the years 2010-2021, which is not exhaustive, also shows use of the disputed domain name for parked pages with PPC links on specific dates, none of which however targets Complainant and none related to jewelry. Respondent argues that the disputed domain name has been legitimately registered consistent with Respondent's longstanding pattern of dealing in geographic and personal name domain names.

The single screenshot targeting Complainant is a recent one and does not prove targeting of Complainant at the date of registration of the disputed domain name in 2009 and throughout up to the screenshot of December 2025.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has not 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.

The DINH VAN mark had been used and registered before the disputed domain name registration, and enjoyed worldwide recognition in its field of business (*SAS Dinh Van v Aurelien Michel*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-3927](#)). Furthermore, domainers or domain name investors are generally held to a higher standard of due diligence when acquiring domain name ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.3). Last, in his Response, Respondent did not explicitly deny such knowledge. However, the Panel finds it more likely than not that at the time of registration of the disputed domain name Respondent was unaware of Complainant.

This also in view of the allegations of Respondent that "Van Dinh" is a common Vietnamese name and a commune in the city of Hanoi, Viet Nam, and this is the reason why he chose the disputed domain name. Respondent does not allege that the name or commune are known or used by persons in the United States and elsewhere, affording for this reason to the disputed domain name an intrinsic value. And contrary to common Asiatic names, such as those in Respondent's portfolio Dong, Xiang, Zong which are more widely known, Van Dinh is not. However the Panel finds unlikely that Respondent based in the United States when registering the disputed domain name in 2009 was aware of Complainant, a jewelry business in France. This is reinforced by the absence of targeting of Complainant from that date, namely the date of registration and up to end of December 2025.

As regards bad faith use, the disputed domain name directed Internet users to a website displaying links to third-party sites. Complainant provided a screenshot of the website dated December 2025 showing PPC

links on jewelry. The evidence provided by Respondent consisting of screenshots from dates in the years 2010-2021, shows use of the disputed domain name for parked pages with PPC links on specific dates, none of which however targets Complainant and none related to jewelry. In view of the above the Panel finds that Complainant has not proved that at the time of registration of the disputed domain name Respondent acted in bad faith or that the use of the disputed domain name since then targeted Complainant.

In relation to the allegations of Respondent, that the PPC links targeting Complainant were inadvertent to Respondent and the result of targeted advertising due to cookies, these do not change the above. The “automatically” generated PPC links or website content do not disclaim respondents from responsibility for content appearing on the website associated with their domain name (nor would such links ipso facto vest the respondent with rights or legitimate interests). The fact that such links or content may be generated by a third party such as a registrar would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.5). However in the case at hand, given the long and systematic activity of Respondent in the field of geographical and personal name domain names as well as the absence of targeting at the time of registration and up to end of 2025 the Panel finds no bad faith of Respondent.

The Panel finds that Complainant has not established the third element of the Policy.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Marina Perraki/

Marina Perraki

Sole Panelist

Date: March 14, 2026