

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Bolsius International B.V. v. Tressleras Sandra
Case No. D2025-5379

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Bolsius International B.V., Netherlands (Kingdom of the), represented by Novagraaf Nederland B.V., Netherlands (Kingdom of the).

The Respondent is Tressleras Sandra, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <bolsiuskaarsen.com> is registered with Gname.com Pte. Ltd. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 23, 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 24, 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 (Redacted for privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 26, 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 amendment to the Complaint on December 29, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 December 30, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 19, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Federica Togo as the sole panelist in this matter on January 26, 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

It results from the Complainant's undisputed allegations that since 1870 it is active in the fields of all types of candles and is amongst the largest producers of candles in Europe.

The Complainant is the registered owner of several trademarks for BOLSIUS, e.g. International trademark registration No 476419 BOLSIUS (word), registered on March 30, 1983, designating inter alia the European Union since January 18, 2005, covering amongst others "candles" in class 4 and "candlesticks" in class 21.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 16, 2025. Furthermore, the undisputed evidence provided by the Complainant proves that the disputed domain name resolves to an online shop displaying prominently and without authorization the Complainant's trademark and logo and allegedly advertising and offering for sale Complainant's products. The following indications are displayed on the website's section "over ons" ("about us" in English): "Welcome to Bolsius, your trusted partner for atmospheric and sustainable candles. With a rich history dating back to 1870, we are passionate about creating products that bring warmth and coziness to every home" (English translation).

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 the Complainant's trademark since it wholly incorporates the Complainant's trademark BOLSIUS. The element "kaarsen", is the Dutch word for "candles" and is considered to be generic. The relevant trademark is clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name. The addition of the generic element "kaarsen" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant, the Respondent has no relationship with the Complainant and/or Complainant's trademarks. The Respondent has no trademark registrations for BOLSIUS. No license is granted and no consent is given by the Complainant to the Respondent to use the Complainant's trademarks in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not an official distributor nor is the Respondent authorized in any other way by the Complainant to sell its products or to use the trademark BOLSIUS.

Furthermore, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. According to the Complainant, the Respondent should have been aware of the Complainant's trademark rights when she registered the disputed domain name. In fact, the Complainant has trademarks that go back to 1983 and has been active since 1870. The Respondent is well aware of this, because she mentions this on the disputed domain name's "about page". In addition, the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademarks and targeted the Complainant when it registered the disputed domain name, because the website shows the same device mark of the Complainant and offers the same products. The use of the disputed domain name is considered an act of bad faith, because the disputed domain name is being used to benefit from the possible raised confusion of the Complainant's BOLSIUS trademark, by leading Internet users to its domain name. Given the fact that the Complainant is a market leader in the

candle business, the average Internet user is being misled when seeing the disputed domain name. The average Internet user may think that the disputed domain name is affiliated with the Complainant, or, at least, is being used with the Complainant's consent. In fact, the Complainant already received complaints from customers, that they ordered products, but were not delivered. This conduct demonstrates that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website.

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, "kaarsen", 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 name is clearly constituted by the “BOLSIUS” registered trademark and the term “kaarsen”, the Dutch word for “candles”, which clearly refer to the Complainant’s core business, tending to suggest sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. This is also confirmed by the content of the website to which the disputed domain names resolve, allegedly advertizing and offering for sale the Complainant’s products and reproducing without authorization the Complainant’s trademark and logo and presenting itself as the Complainant.

The composition of the disputed domain name directly targeting the Complainant’s field of activity, enhances the false impression that the disputed domain name is somehow officially related to the Complainant and promoting the Complainant’s business. Such composition of the disputed domain name cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. See section 2.5.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

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 resolves to a website prominently displaying the Complainant’s trademark and logo, and purportedly advertizing and offering for sale the Complainant’s products and presenting itself as the Complainant. For the Panel, it is therefore evident that the Respondent positively knew the Complainant’s mark. 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 (incorporating the Complainant's mark plus the addition of a descriptive term within the trademark owner's field of commerce);

(ii) the content of the website to which the disputed domain name directs, prominently displaying the Complainant's trademark, logo, and purportedly advertising and offering for sale the Complainant's products, and presenting itself as the Complainant.

(iii) absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with no response for the Respondent's choice 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 disputed domain name <bolsiuskaarsen.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Federica Togo/

Federica Togo

Sole Panelist

Date: February 3, 2026