

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Valorissimo v. VALORISIMO REAL ESTATE L.L.C

Case No. D2025-5417

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Valorissimo, France, represented by Cabinet Regimbeau, France.

The Respondent is VALORISIMO REAL ESTATE L.L.C, Dubai, United Arab Emirates, internally represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <valorissimo.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 29, 2025. On December 29, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 31, 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, Domains By Proxy LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 2, 2026, 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 5, 2026, and an amendment to the Complaint on January 8, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint and 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 January 9, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 29, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on February 2, 2026. Subsequent communications were submitted by the Parties on February 3, 2026 (the admissibility of the will be addressed by the Panel under section 6 below).

The Center appointed Jacques de Werra as the sole panelist in this matter on February 5, 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

The Complainant is a French company that belongs to Bouygues Immobilier group (which is one of the most prominent French companies operating in the field of real estate – see “www.bouygues-immobilier.com”). The Complainant operates an online platform that hosts a real estate marketplace and connects advisors (wealth management advisors, bankers, insurance property managers, independent wealth management advisors, etc.) and real estate developers (“www.partenaires.valorissimo.com/a-propos”).

The Complainant was incorporated as a French simplified joint-stock company on December 29, 2017.

The Complainant is the owner of a French word trademark (“the Trademark”) for VALORISSIMO No. 3052998 registered on September 21, 2000, for services in classes 36, 37, 38, and 42 (covering various services relating to the real estate industry). The Complainant became the owner of the Trademark on June 13, 2018.

The Complainant owns the domain name <valorissimo.com> and operates a website associated with this domain name for its business activities. The home page of “www.valorissimo.com” consists in a page on which users must enter their email and password to get access to the platform (or must sign in as new users).

The named Respondent in this case has not participated to the proceedings. A response was however submitted in the proceedings on behalf of a Dubai, United Arab Emirates, company named Valorisimo Real Estate L.L.C for which the documents of incorporation were submitted in the proceedings (“the Valorisimo Company”). The email address relating to the disputed domain name (which was disclosed by the Registrar and currently appears on the WhoIs record) identifies a Mr. Tahir (whose name corresponds to the email address listed in the disputed domain name registration details confirmed by the Registrar and who identified himself as the founder and the corporate representative of the Valorisimo Company). On this basis, the Panel considers that the Valorisimo Company must be treated as the Respondent in this case. As a result, reference will be made to the Valorisimo Company as the Respondent from now on in this decision.

The Respondent was incorporated on December 11, 2024. The website associated to the disputed domain name is used by the Respondent for its business activities relating to investment in real estate in Dubai and Abu Dhabi. The Respondent operates the website associated with the disputed domain name to assist investors who are interested in UAE (Dubai and Abu Dhabi) real estate opportunities by helping buyers to discover, evaluate, and compare local real estate opportunities, including through artificial intelligence (AI) assisted matching and analysis.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 3, 2024, and resolves to a website available in English and French advertising real estate investment opportunities in the United Arab Emirates.

The Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent on February 10, 2025, to which the Respondent did not react.

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 Trademark, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests on the disputed domain name that is the subject of the Complaint, since it has no identical or similar prior company name in Benelux and/or prior trademark in Benelux, France or in any countries in the European Union, including a European Union trademark. Moreover, the Respondent has no connection with the Complainant in any way. Indeed, the Respondent is not an authorized dealer, distributor or licensee of the Complainant and has not been permitted by the Complainant to make any use of its prior rights. Furthermore, the Complainant claims that the Trademark is well-known on the French real-estate market and through French consumers and it was known by the Respondent at the date of the registration of the disputed domain name. In addition, the Respondent cannot assert that it is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, without intent for commercial gain misleadingly to divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

The Complainant further claims that the Complainant is a well-known subsidiary of the worldwide group BOUYGUES (including Bouygues Immobilier), which is present in over 80 countries so that it would result that the Complainant's presence, notably on the Internet indicates that, at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name, the Respondent knew, or at least should have known, that the Complainant's prior Trademark existed. In view of the Complainant's reputation, the Respondent should clearly have been aware of its prior rights in the Trademark, company name and domain name <valorissimo.com>.

Incidentally, the Respondent's actual knowledge of the Complainant's prior rights is indicated by the fact that the denomination "valorissimo" has been entirely reproduced in the disputed domain name (save for the second letter "s" which is virtually imperceptible to the eye and entirely inaudible phonetically). Moreover, the webpages of the disputed domain name mention activity identical to the Complainant's and therefore there is a high risk of association.

Furthermore, the 25 year gap between the filing of the Complainant's prior Trademark and the registration of the disputed domain name by the Respondent can, in certain circumstances, be an indicator of bad faith. Since the Trademark and domain name of the Complainant have been in existence for a long time, it is hard to believe that the Respondent coincidentally selected this precise domain name without any knowledge of the Complainant's prior rights on this denomination. The Respondent uses a privacy protection service, thereby preventing the Complainant from identifying its identity and coordinates. Following well established case-law, the use of such service shows that the Respondent specifically tried to block or intentionally delay the disclosure of its identity or coordinates, which is an additional indication that the registration was carried out in bad faith.

In all circumstances, it is inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's prior Trademark and rights. A simple search on the Internet on the denomination "Valorissimo" (the Respondent's company name) would have alerted the Respondent to the Complainant's presence, reputation and prior rights. Indeed, all the results are related to the Complainant and its Trademark and activity.

Therefore, there is no legitimate reason which could explain the Respondent's actions other than disrupting the business of the Complainant and diverting Internet users to its website under the false impression that they are accessing the Claimant's site, thereby creating a clear likelihood of confusion.

It is clear that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website. Such behavior corroborates the fact that the disputed domain name has been used in bad faith. The Respondent did not even bother to reply to the Complainant's formal cease-and-desist letter.

In its subsequent unsolicited submission (reacting to the Respondent's Response) of February 3, 2026, the Complainant claims that the Respondent has the same activity as the Complainant by claiming that both companies, through their respective websites, provide real estate services, and notably a platform assisting and supporting investors, in their property-purchase process and that both companies provide their services to French consumers/investors because the Respondent's website is also available in French language. The Complainant further claims that the Respondent directs its services toward French consumers.

In light of the near-identity between the respective domain names—and, consequently, between the corresponding Internet addresses—a French consumer could readily be misled and, at the very least, may reasonably assume that an association or other form of commercial relationship exists between the two entities. In addition, the Respondent provides on the website associated with the disputed domain name a tax guide intended for French consumers/clients, entitled “Convention fiscale France-United Arab Emirates: everything you need to know to optimise your taxation” / “Convention fiscale France Émirats arabes unis : tout comprendre pour optimiser sa fiscalité”.

Moreover, a search made by the Complainant on the search engine Google for the term “valorissimo” (which constitutes the Complainant's Trademark) reveals that it is the Respondent's website which is first listed with the slogan “Experts Français UAE - Valorissimo - Investir à Dubai en 2025” (“French experts UAE - Valorissimo - To invest in Dubai in 2025”).

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied the last two elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent has rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, including under paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, for the following reasons:

- The Respondent is a duly incorporated company in Dubai, and is commonly known by the name “Valorissimo”;
- The disputed domain name corresponds to the Respondent's company name and brand;
- The Respondent has used (and continues to use) the disputed domain name for a bona fide offering of services related to United Arab Emirates real estate investment support for investors;
- The Respondent does not claim any association with the Complainant and does not seek to pass itself off as the Complainant; and
- The Respondent started the internal branding and design discussions for the now Valorissimo platform in October 2024 and selected the name “Valorissimo” in November 2024.

The Respondent further claims that it has neither registered nor used the disputed domain name in bad faith for the following reasons:

- Different geography and different target audience (no intent to target the Complainant's customers): the Respondent's activity is exclusively focused on the United Arab Emirates market and is directed to individuals seeking United Arab Emirates properties. The Complainant's services are described as France-focused, B2B business, and directed to the French real estate sales ecosystem. The Parties do not compete for the same customers and the Respondent has not targeted the Complainant's customers;
- No intent to create confusion; no affiliation; no geographic confusion: the Respondent does not present itself as a French company, does not reference the Complainant, and does not use the Complainant's branding or content. The Respondent's website and messaging are centered on Dubai/United Arab Emirates. Any French-language content is intended to serve French-speaking investors interested in Dubai/United Arab Emirates, not to target the Complainant's French market;
- Independent selection of the name; no knowledge of the Complainant at registration: “Valorissimo” was chosen independently as a coined brand inspired by the idea of valuing/optimizing real estate. The Respondent was not aware of the Complainant at the time of registration and did not register the disputed domain name to take advantage of the Complainant's reputation. Moreover, the Complainant

- does not benefit from a strong brand recognition so there is no incentive for the Respondent;
- No classic bad-faith indicia under Policy 4(b): the Respondent has not offered the disputed domain name for sale to the Complainant, has not engaged in a pattern of abusive registrations, and has not used the domain to impersonate the Complainant or divert users to a competitor. The disputed domain name is used for the Respondent's own bona fide business; and
- Privacy service is not bad faith: the use of a privacy service is a common registration option for security and spam prevention and, without evidence of targeting, is not determinative of bad faith.

Without admitting any likelihood of confusion, the Respondent has implemented a clear non-affiliation disclaimer on its website to further reduce any possible confusion, consistent with good-faith operation ("www.valorisimo.com/terms-of-service").

In its subsequent unsolicited submission of February 3, 2026 (reacting to the Complainant's unsolicited submission of February 3, 2026), the Respondent claims that:

- The Parties do not have the "same activity" or the "same customers" because the Respondent operates a United Arab Emirates-focused real estate platform centered on Dubai and Abu Dhabi, offering information and tools to help individual buyers and investors worldwide (B2C) identify and purchase United Arab Emirates properties. Its offering is built around United Arab Emirates projects and the retail purchase/investment journey. The Complainant, by contrast, describes a B2B platform focused on France, connecting real estate developers/promoters and professional intermediaries (including CGPs) to optimize performance across the sales process. This has no overlap with the Respondent's United Arab Emirates retail buyer model, no overlap with the Respondent's United Arab Emirates market, and no meaningful geographic overlap;
- The Complainant's website appears to operate as a closed, professional platform (akin to an extranet) for industry participants who already know and use the service, rather than as a public-facing retail site. Accordingly, the parties are not providing the same services;
- The Respondent's website does not target the same French clients. The Respondent's clients are international individual buyers and investors seeking to purchase property in the United Arab Emirates (Dubai/Abu Dhabi). French is simply one of the languages offered to serve francophone international clients; it does not transform the Respondent into a France-focused real estate marketplace. A French-language interface does not mean the Respondent targets the Complainant's B2B customer base, nor does it create any overlap in the Parties' respective target markets;
- French-language content (including tax guidance) is consistent with United Arab Emirates-focused investing. The Complainant highlights a France – United Arab Emirates tax treaty page as purported evidence of targeting French clients. In fact, such guidance is standard educational content for francophone investors purchasing in the United Arab Emirates and is consistent with the Respondent's United Arab Emirates-only investment focus. It does not indicate that the Respondent offers French real estate programs or targets the Complainant's B2B market;
- The Complainant's counsel relies on a Google search snippet allegedly displaying "Valorissimo." Search snippets are generated dynamically by third-party algorithms and vary by user and time; they are not reliable evidence of the Respondent's intent at registration. In any event, the Respondent's business model, website content, and evidence show a bona fide United Arab Emirates-focused offering under the Valorisimo brand and no intent to target the Complainant; and
- Without admitting any likelihood of confusion, the Respondent has implemented and will maintain a clear non-affiliation disclaimer on the website as a further good-faith measure to minimize any potential confusion.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Procedural Issue – Admissibility of Late Response and Additional Unsolicited Submissions

The due date for the Respondent's Response was January 29, 2026. The Respondent has filed its response on February 2, 2026. The Respondent stated in this context that the Notice of Complaint was routed to a sales inbox and was mistakenly treated as spam and that the Respondent acted promptly upon becoming aware of the proceedings and filed the Response to assist the Panel on a complete record.

Paragraph 10 of the Rules vests the panel with the authority to determine the admissibility, relevance, materiality and weight of the evidence, and also to conduct the proceedings with due expedition.

In this case, the Panel considers that the submissions made by the Parties outside of the procedural framework (i.e. the late Response of the Respondent on February 2, 2026, and the respective subsequent submissions made by each of the Parties on February 3, 2026) are admissible because they contribute to the clarification of the relevant circumstances of this case.

6.2. Substantive Issues

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 ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

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

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name because the disputed domain name incorporates the entirety of the Trademark with only one letter "s" which distinguishes the Trademark from the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Panel notes that the Complainant relies on the reputation and multi-territorial activities of its parent company (Bouyges Immobilier) and of the Bouyges group (that operates in 80 countries) to justify the claim that the Trademark would be well-known and that the Respondent knew or should have known about it at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. However, the Panel notes that the Complainant has failed to submit evidence supporting the proposition that the Trademark itself (and not the Bouyges group/brand) would be well-known so that the Respondent would have known about it at the time of registration of the disputed domain name.

The Panel notes in this respect that the Trademark is derived from the French word "valeur" (as indicated by the Complainant itself), which means "value" which is a quite common investment term, to which the suffix "issimo" was added which is a widespread descriptive term coming from the Italian language which refers to a superlative form evidencing superior features. From this perspective, in the Panel's view, the Complainant has not established that the Trademark is intrinsically distinctive and that it would be well-established.

The Panel also notes that the Trademark is registered only in France, that the activities of the Complainant are limited to the French domestic market and that they are limited to business-to-business activities. As noted above, the homepage of the website associated with the domain name <valorissimo.com> of the Complainant does not present publicly the activities of the Complainant but rather consists in a page on

which users must enter their email and password to get access to the platform (or must sign in as new users).

The Panel notes with respect to the Respondent that the Respondent has established in the proceedings that it has created a corporate entity in Dubai containing the term “valorisimo” that was incorporated on December 11, 2024 (before the date on which the Complaint was submitted by the Complainant which was done on December 29, 2025) and has developed its real estate investment services focusing on the Dubai and Abu Dhabi real estate markets since then under this term (as evidenced by documents submitted by the Respondent in the proceedings).

In this respect, the fact that the Respondent (whose founder is a French national and consequently speaks French) may target French-speaking investors and the fact that the website associated with the disputed domain name has a version in French language (in addition to an English version) and contains certain tax information for French citizens is not sufficient for the panel to hold that the Respondent would not have used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of services under the terms of the Policy.

Similarly, the unsolicited late submission of the Complainant showing that a Google search (that was made by the Complainant after the initiation of the proceedings) for the term “Valorissimo” corresponding to the Trademark lists the Respondent and the Respondent’s disputed domain name as the first sponsored hit at the top of the ranking does not change that finding.

The Panel also notes that the fact that the Respondent has used privacy service for the disputed domain name does not affect either this finding because the Respondent could have legitimate reasons for doing so. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), paragraph 3.6 (stating that “[t]here are recognized legitimate uses of privacy and proxy registration services”).

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Given that the Panel has found that the second element of the Policy has not been established, it would not be necessary to assess thoroughly whether the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

However, the Panel notes that the Complainant has not established in the case file as presented that the Respondent’s aim in registering the disputed domain name was to profit from or exploit the Complainant’s Trademark. The Panel notes that the Complainant might have potential claims under trademark law, but those claims would be for a court to assess. As noted above, the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name for legitimate business reasons because the disputed domain name corresponds to the corporate name of the company that was incorporated in Dubai shortly after the registration of the disputed domain name that the Respondent has since then used actively for its real estate investment activities in Dubai and Abu Dhabi.

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

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Jacques de Werra/

Jacques de Werra

Sole Panelist

Date: February 22, 2026