

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Groupe La Centrale v. Zsolt Bikadi

Case No. D2026-0636

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Groupe La Centrale, France, represented by MIIP MADE IN IP, France.

The Respondent is Zsolt Bikadi, Hungary.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lacentrale.xyz> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 13, 2026. On February 16, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 18, 2026, 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, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 18, 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 February 20, 2026.

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 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 15, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on February 26, 2026.

The Center appointed Andrew D. S. Lothian as the sole panelist in this matter on March 4, 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

Originally registered on June 20, 1995, the Complainant is a simplified joint-stock company, most recently registered with the Paris, France, Trade and Companies Register under number 318 771 623 on April 24, 2012. The Complainant was formerly known as Car & Boat Media. The reputation of it, and its trademarks, is recognized by panels in previous cases under the Policy, such as, for example, *Groupe La Centrale v. WhoisGuard Protected, WhoisGuard, Inc. / Zen Femi*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-3368](#). The Complainant primarily operates in the field of automobile classified advertisements under the LA CENTRALE mark. The Complainant owns a variety of registered trademarks for said mark including, for example:

- French Registered Trademark Number 99832003 in respect of the word and device mark LA CENTRALE, registered on December 29, 1999 in Classes 16, 35, 36, 38, 41, 42, and 45;
- French Registered Trademark Number 3036751 in respect of the word mark LA CENTRALE, registered on June 23, 2000 in Classes 16, 35, 36, 38, 41, 42, and 45; and
- European Union Registered Trademark Number 001919182 in respect of the word mark LA CENTRALE, registered on January 23, 2003 in Classes 16, 35, 36, 38, 41, and 42.

The Complainant is also the registrant of the following domain names, which it uses to publish automotive-related information and content on the corresponding websites:

<lacentrale.fr>, which was registered on August 22, 1996; <lacentrale.com>, which was registered on January 17, 1997; <lacentrale.press>, which was registered on August 10, 2021; <lacentrale.site>, which was registered on December 19, 2024; and <lacentrale.pub>, which was registered on December 19, 2024.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 28, 2025. The Complainant's screenshot of the website associated with the disputed domain name dated February 2, 2026, shows that the disputed domain name forwards to a page on "www.expireddomains.com" on which it is offered for sale via GoDaddy at a "Buy Now" price of USD 100.

The Respondent is no stranger to the UDRP, having been the respondent in no less than 12 previous cases under the Policy. The Respondent made no response in the following nine cases:

BGC Group, Inc., and BGC Partners, L.P. v. Zsolt Bikadi, WIPO Case No. [D2026-0006](#), <bgcpartners.xyz>, transfer; *QlikTech International AB v. Zsolt Bikadi*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-1799](#), <qlick.marketing>, transfer; *H. Lundbeck A/S v. Zsolt Bikadi*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-1306](#), <lexapro.directory>, transfer; *Opice Blum Academy Treinamento e Consultoria Ltda v. Zsolt Bikadi*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-2311](#), <opiceblumacademy.com>, transfer; *FXDirectDealer, LLC v. Zsolt Bikadi*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-0531](#), <tritoncapitalmarkets.com>, transfer; *Center for Financial Training Atlantic & Central States, Inc. v. Zsolt Bikadi*, FORUM Claim No. FA2307002051938, <cftuny.com>, transfer; *Picis Clinical Solutions, Inc. v. Zsolt Bikadi*, FORUM Claim No. FA2303002036494, <harrispulsecheck.com>, transfer; *Chime Financial, Inc. v. Zsolt Bikadi*, FORUM Claim No. FA2301002027954, <chime-customerservice.net>, transfer; and *Lexington Furniture Industries, Inc. d/b/a Lexington Home Brands v. Zsolt Bikadi*, FORUM Claim No. FA2212002022754, <lexingtonfurniture.net>, transfer.

In these nine cases, the Respondent had offered the domain name concerned for sale in a single case, namely, *BGC Group, Inc., and BGC Partners, L.P. v. Zsolt Bikadi*, supra, and in the remainder, except *H. Lundbeck A/S v. Zsolt Bikadi*, supra., where the website under the domain name concerned was not active,

the domain names concerned made use of pay-per-click ("PPC") advertisements on the corresponding websites and were found to target the complainant's rights.

The Respondent made an informal response in the following two cases:

WG Acquisition Limited v. Zsolt Bikadi, WIPO Case No. [D2024-4073](#), <wentworthhillsgolf.com>, denied; and *Young Innovations, Inc. v. Zsolt Bikadi*, FORUM Claim No. FA2505002155417, <youngdentalcorporation.com>, transfer.

In the first of these cases, the Respondent was found to have a history of registering domain names that had been allowed to lapse by trademark owners, which had also occurred in that case, and the panel found that the composition of the domain name concerned was consistent with targeting the previous registrant rather than the complainant, therefore denying the complaint. In the second case, the panel found that while the Respondent was correct that investment in descriptive and dictionary word domain names can be an acceptable business practice in appropriate cases, the domain name concerned was neither descriptive nor generic and its value to the Respondent was based upon the trademark value of said domain name. In those circumstances, the panel found that the Respondent's offer of sale of the domain name concerned was paradigmatic bad faith in terms of the Policy.

The Respondent apparently made a formal response in the following case:

PuroSystems, LLC v. Zsolt Bikadi, FORUM Claim No. FA2202001986321, <purocleanwr.com>, transfer.

In that case, the Respondent explained that it had registered the domain name concerned after it had expired, and added that it was willing to surrender it. The panel therefore ordered transfer of the said domain name.

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 contains the entirety of the Complainant's trademark LA CENTRALE identically, and that the ".xyz" suffix does not reduce the likelihood of confusion.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent has no real interest in the disputed domain name since it has put in place no concrete activity for its use other than to redirect it to a "for sale" page. The Complainant states that there are no other trademarks on the "TMView Global Brand Database" for LA CENTRALE other than those owned by the Complainant, and that the Respondent itself has no corresponding trademark rights. The Complainant notes that it has no business relationship or other connection with the Respondent and submits that the use of the disputed domain name suggests an affiliation with the Complainant despite the fact that the Respondent has no legal or commercial relationship with it. The Complainant contends that an Internet user could only believe that the disputed domain name is linked to the Complainant given its identity with the Complainant's mark.

The Complainant states that the Respondent does not appear to have a business named "La Centrale" and is not commonly known by the term, adding that public searches such as a Google search do not identify the Respondent as having any apparent connection with the term. The Complainant states that the Respondent could not have registered or intended to use the disputed domain name without knowing of the Complainant's LA CENTRALE mark, which had already been used by the Complainant for automobile-related activities for many years. The Complainant produces a Google search for "LA CENTRALE" showing that its website is the first to appear in the corresponding results, adding that it is a company widely known to

the French public, and that its website is available and accessible worldwide. The Complainant states that it has not identified any use or intention to use the disputed domain name by the Respondent in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

With regard to the issue of registration and use in bad faith, the Complainant points out that the disputed domain name has been offered for sale despite the fact that the Respondent has no right to the name, adding that this circumstance has led to a finding of bad faith in previous cases under the Policy. The Complainant asserts that its trademarks are well-known trademarks in France, for example being recognized as such in *Car&Boat Media v. Wiam Zouhair*, WIPO Case No. [D2012-2428](#), and in *Groupe La Centrale contre WhoisGuard Protected, WhoisGuard, Inc. / Zen Femi*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-3368](#). The Complainant submits that the Respondent was likely aware of the Complainant's reputation. The Complainant states that it cannot be a coincidence that the disputed domain name is identical in its Second-Level Domain to the Complainant's domain names and to its trademarks. The Complainant concludes that the Respondent knowingly registered the disputed domain name to create confusion about the origin of its website, to defraud, and to take advantage of the Complainant's efforts. The Complainant adds that no good faith use has been made of the disputed domain name, which has been passively held with intent to sell it, knowing that the Complainant could have an interest in acquiring it. The Complainant adds that the ".xyz" domain name suffix is associated with phishing attacks, submitting a study article as evidence.

The Complainant argues that the content on the website associated with the disputed domain name is prejudicial to the Complainant's image as it has no activity, a page with "limp" content. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent, by using the disputed domain name, has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to the Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion as to source or affiliation.

The Complainant notes that 2,150 domain names have been registered under the Respondent's name (report produced). The Complainant shows that a number of these redirect to resale platforms. The Complainant also shows that complaints have been filed against the Respondent, in four of which the panel found that all three elements of the Policy were made out and ordered transfer. The Complainant concludes that the Respondent knew of the Complainant's trademarks, domain names and website, and that this is the reason why the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

In its Response consisting of an email to the Center, the Respondent contends that the disputed domain name consists entirely of a French dictionary term, "La Centrale", meaning "The Central" or "The Power Plant", adding that this is a common descriptive phrase used globally across multiple industries, and that it is not a coined or distinctive term. The Respondent adds that it has broad linguistic usage, including its own "Wikipedia" entry. The Respondent adds that no single party can reasonably claim exclusive rights over such term, adding that it has a legitimate interest in registering such a domain name for resale, and that it is not being used to target any specific business or trademark.

The Respondent asserts that numerous unrelated entities operate under the name "La Centrale" across various sectors and provides a single example. The Respondent asserts that the term is not uniquely associated with any single entity.

Under the heading "Non-Commercial Use", the Respondent points out that the disputed domain name resolves to a standard sales lander, adding that it is not being used to divert customers or harm any trademark.

The Respondent denies bad faith registration or use, asserting that its asking price is reasonable and nominal, not exceeding typical out of pocket costs, that it had no knowledge of the Complainant at the point of registration and selected the disputed domain name solely for its inherent value as a dictionary phrase, that there is no likelihood of confusion because the landing page does not imitate or reference the Complainant's branding, industry, or services.

The Respondent asserts that the Complaint constitutes an abusive filing, adding that the Complainant is a sophisticated party that knew or should have known that “La Centrale” is a dictionary term, and that the facts of this case cannot satisfy the standard of bad faith under the Policy. The Respondent concludes that the Complaint represents an improper attempt to obtain control of a generic domain name from a good faith registrant.

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 disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select 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 entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7. The absence of a space in the disputed domain name when compared to the Complainant’s mark is of no significance in that spaces are not permitted in domain names for technical reasons.

The applicable Top-Level Domain (“TLD”) in a domain name (e.g., “.com”, “.club”, “.nyc”, and, here, “.xyz”) is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [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 that 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 the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name based on its submissions that the disputed domain name suggests an affiliation with the Complainant despite the fact that the Respondent has no legal or commercial relationship with it, that the Respondent does not appear to have a business named “La Centrale” and is not commonly known by the term, that the Complainant’s website is widely known to the public and accessible worldwide, and that the Respondent does not appear to have any intention to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Panel therefore turns to the Respondent’s case in rebuttal.

The Panel notes as a preliminary issue that the Response does not comply with paragraph 5(c)(viii) of the Rules. This failure is “not a trivial matter” (see *MMJ Apparel IP LLC v. Krix Luther*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3031](#), referencing in turn *Audiotech Systems Ltd. v. Videotech Systems Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-0431](#)). As noted above, the Respondent is no stranger to the UDRP, having been the respondent in no less than 12 previous cases, whereby some familiarity with the Policy and Rules would reasonably be expected of it. Consequently, the Panel sees no need to provide the Respondent with a second opportunity to comply with this particular requirement of the Rules.

As in *MMJ Apparel IP LLC v. Krix Luther*, supra, this procedural failure means that the Panel is not prepared to attach much in the way of evidential weight to the assertions of the Respondent in its submissions. Unlike said previous case, there is no documentary evidence accompanying the Respondent’s submissions here, which consist only of unsupported assertions in the said email, and there is no additional material presented by the Respondent that the Panel could take into account, albeit that any such material would likewise only be capable of bearing limited weight in the absence of compliance with paragraph 5(c)(viii) of the Rules.

In essence, the Respondent’s position as asserted in the Response is that the term in the disputed domain name is a dictionary term in the French language, which the Respondent is entitled (as a domain name investor) to register in a domain name for general sale to interested parties. The Respondent did not produce any dictionary entries or other evidence in support of its various assertions. The Panel decided that it was appropriate for it to consider two French dictionaries in order to assess whether there might be any support for the Respondent’s claim.

The Panel notes that the word “centrale” in the disputed domain name is found in the dictionary. The Larousse French dictionary provides that “centrale” is a feminine noun (whereby, the Panel notes, the combination with the correct definite article would give rise to “la centrale”, being the term in the disputed domain name).¹ Four different meanings are given, namely “Nom générique d’installations, de dispositifs dans lesquels on opère certains traitements dont les résultats sont distribués à divers postes utilisateurs”, which the Panel translates as “A generic term for facilities or systems in which certain processes are carried out, the results of which are distributed to various user stations.” This fits with the fourth meaning under the heading “Électricité” (“Electricity”) “Ensemble d’installations constituant une usine génératrice d’énergie électrique par conversion d’autres formes d’énergie”, which the Panel translates as “A set of facilities forming a power plant that generates electricity by converting other forms of energy.” This matches the Respondent’s reference to a power plant as a meaning for the term. The other two meanings given relate to the law, whereby the term may refer to “maison centrale”, i.e., a high security prison, or of “confédération de syndicats”, i.e., a confederation of trade unions.

The Dictionnaire de l’Académie française, ninth edition, lists similar meanings for the feminine noun “centrale”. The four examples which it gives are (Panel’s translation) (1) an energy production facility, (2) a place where a product is processed or stored, (3) the trade union meaning as above, and (4) a purchasing center which consolidates procurement and ordering of multiple distribution enterprises.

Despite its presence as a noun in the dictionary, however, the Panel notes that, in typical French usage, the term “la centrale” appears to be accompanied by a modifier (for example, “la centrale électrique”). The Panel did not find examples in the dictionary for uses of the term on its own. Given this fact, and noting the absence of any evidence to the contrary from the Respondent, the Panel considers that the term in the disputed domain name does not appear, of itself, to be a “dictionary term” as such, because it is presented without a modifier, and only with the definite article, in the disputed domain name. Instead, it is at best an abbreviation of a longer (modifier-containing) phrase which has more of the character of being a name, or which represents the Complainant’s LA CENTRALE trademark. In this regard, the Panel notes that the single example cited by the Respondent of an alternative use of “lacentrale” on its own in a domain name

¹ The Panel may review readily and publicly accessible dictionaries in order to assist it in reaching its decision (see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.8).

(independently of the Complainant's mark) represents the name of an art collective which itself is an abbreviated version of its fuller (modifier-containing) name "Galerie et atelier la Centrale Électrique".²

As noted above, the Respondent asserted that it selected the term because it has inherent value as a dictionary term, that it is a common descriptive phrase used globally across multiple industries, that it is not a coined or distinctive term, and that numerous unrelated entities operate under the name "La Centrale" across various sectors. However, it provided no evidence whatsoever in support of those submissions apart from the single example noted above, which in any event the Panel finds to be unsupportive of the general thrust of the Respondent's contentions. Furthermore, given the failure of the Response to comply with paragraph 5(c)(viii) of the Rules, the credibility of the Respondent's position is significantly undermined. The absence of supporting evidence, despite the Respondent's broad assertions regarding widespread descriptive use, renders its claims speculative at best. In these circumstances, the Panel is unable to place any weight on the Respondent's unsubstantiated submissions, which fall well short of what would be required to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case.

If the disputed domain name had been a dictionary term, the starting point for the Panel would have been that "[...] generally speaking, panels have accepted that aggregating and holding domain names (usually for resale) consisting e.g., of acronyms, dictionary words, common phrases, or unique/catchy or memorable terms (alone or in combination) can be bona fide and is not per se illegitimate under the UDRP where the respondent can show that the purpose of the registration was not to target a trademark". [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1. However, "[p]anel[s] have held that merely registering a domain name comprised of a dictionary word or phrase would not by itself automatically confer rights or legitimate interests on the respondent. Mere arguments that a domain name corresponds to a dictionary term/phrase or acronym, or unique/catchy or memorable term (sometimes referred to by respondents as "brandable") may not be sufficient, and panels will consider the overall facts and circumstances of the case when assessing such arguments. [...] As long as the disputed domain name is being used in a way that does not trade off the complainant's trademark (whether to host links, content, a landing or sales page, or hosting no content at all), and where there are no other indicia of cybersquatting, such use may support the respondent's claim to a right or legitimate interest". [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.10.1. In considering the overall facts and circumstances, "[p]anel[s] also tend to look at factors such as the status and fame of the relevant mark and whether the respondent has registered and legitimately used other domain names containing dictionary words or phrases in connection with the respective dictionary meaning". [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.10.1.

For completeness, therefore, the Panel will also assess the status and fame of the Complainant's mark. The Panel accepts that this is considerable, albeit that, on the evidence before the Panel, the Complainant's fame seems to emanate from the francophone world. Nevertheless, the Complainant's evidence of its "notoriety barometer" (a survey by an organization named "Ifop" conducted for the Complainant in September 2024), states that the Complainant's "La Centrale" brand is now the second most popular brand [in France], and is known "primarily through the Internet (41%), in particular via a search engine (Google) (24%, score up +5pts) and Internet advertising (12%) and TV commercials (22%)". This means that the Complainant has a strong Internet presence, available worldwide via its "lacentrale" domain names as noted in the factual background section above. It should also be noted that the Complainant's Google search for "La Centrale" returned a substantial number of entries relating to the Complainant's mark, though it must be said that these may have been geo-located to the searcher's apparently French IP address.

Nevertheless, what is important for present purposes is the fact that the Complainant does have an extremely strong Internet presence, including that it is the operator of the term "lacentrale" in the ".com" namespace as used for its official website, being the term exactly matched by the Respondent in the disputed domain name. The Respondent may not be based in a francophone country but given its choice of an alleged French dictionary term, it must be presumed to have more than a passing familiarity with the

² The Panel notes that in order to understand the usage of the cited example, the Panel visited the publicly available website of the said organization, noting that the Respondent had mentioned its domain name, whereby this was in the record before the Panel (see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.8).

francophone world. Furthermore, the Complainant's mark is in force where the Respondent is based. In any event, as the panel noted in *Fakir Elektrikli EV Aletleri Diş Ticaret Anonim Şirketi v. Development Services, Telepathy, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-0535](#), "the fact that a respondent is in a different jurisdiction than a complainant is something that some people can consider to be of greater significance than it actually is, particularly if the complainant has a significant online presence". Here, the Panel finds the significance of the Complainant's online presence to be undeniable, and there is no attempt on the Respondent's part to make any serious challenge to that aspect of the Complainant's case.

The strength of the Complainant's mark is likewise evident from its success in numerous previous cases under the Policy demonstrating the well-known nature of its LA CENTRALE trademark. In some 11 cases, previous panels recognized the strength of the Complainant's mark, namely:

Groupe La Centrale v. Tung Truong, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2611](#), <lacentral.info>, transfer; *Groupe La Centrale v. Maged*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-0821](#), <lacentrale.live>, transfer; *Groupe La Centrale v. Klaus Hertz*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-4925](#), <lacentraleinfo.com>, transfer; *Groupe La Centrale v. Whois Privacy Protection Foundation, Hosting Concepts BV d/b/a Registrar.eu*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-0356](#), <lacentrale-info.com>, transfer; *Groupe la Centrale v. duchen nuo*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-1406](#), <lacentraletrading.com>, transfer; *Groupe La Centrale contre WhoisGuard Protected, WhoisGuard, Inc. / Zen Femi*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-3368](#), <lacentrale-vh.com>, transfer; *Groupe La Centrale v. WhoisGuard Protected, WhoisGuard, Inc. / Arnaud BID*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-2289](#), <lacentralexpress.com>, transfer; *Car&Boat Media v. Qingxia Weng (翁青霞)*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-1318](#), <lacentraledescircuits.com>, transfer; *Car&Boat Media v. Identity Protection Service, Identity Protect Limited / Domain Management, Criteria Internet Services Limited*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-1571](#), <lacentralesexe.com>, transfer; *Car&Boat Media contre Jean-François Rouault*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-1777](#), <lacentraleimmobiliereDuparticulier.com> and <lacentraleimmobiliereDuparticulier.com>, cancellation; and *Car&Boat Media v. Wiam Zouhair*, WIPO Case No. [D2012-2428](#), <lacentraledesvoitures.com>, transfer.

Turning to the question of the Respondent's other domain names, the Panel notes that these do contain a large number of dictionary terms and phrases, several using so-called "new gTLDs" like that employed in the disputed domain name, such as <broccoli.recipes>, <ingatlan.xyz> ("ingatlan" appears to be the Hungarian word for "real estate"), <domain.tips>, and <wedding.tips>. Looking more widely in the list of domain names registered under the name of the Respondent (the list submitted by the Complainant in the case file) does not reveal any obvious targeting of trademarks, and it should be noted that while the Complainant gave examples of four other domain names that the Respondent is offering for sale, none of these, at least to the Panel's eyes, related to well-known or obvious trademarks and the Complainant did not draw out any examples from the list which could be regarded as objectionable on that basis. Nevertheless, it is clear from an analysis of the Respondent's history in connection with the Policy that, rather than confining itself to investing in such terms, it has in fact "crossed the line" into cybersquatting on multiple occasions.

Looking at the totality of the decisions involving the Respondent, it must be said that the bulk of these are no response cases, where the Respondent did not engage with the proceeding in order to contest the complainant's contentions. The majority of the cases relate to the Respondent's acquisition of a previously registered domain name which it then placed on PPC advertising. However, in one of the most recent cases the Respondent made a similar argument to that which it is making here, i.e., that the domain name concerned is descriptive or generic, namely, *Young Innovations, Inc. v. Zsolt Bikadi*, supra. The panel in that case found that the domain name, <youngdentalcorporation.com>, was not generic or descriptive but referred to and derived its value from the Complainant's trademark. Given the Panel's analysis above, the same could be said of the disputed domain name here, in that the Respondent's assertion of inherent value as a dictionary phrase (incorporating the definite article) is lacking in any degree of evidential weight, and indeed the French usage identified by the Panel appears to point to the phrase having the flavor of a name or mark rather than the asserted dictionary meaning, due to the absence of any modifier.

In these circumstances, the Panel considers that the Respondent has failed to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case. The Respondent's asserted reliance on an alleged dictionary meaning is unpersuasive, not only because such meaning appears to be linguistically incomplete when the term is used without a modifier, and

more importantly the Respondent produced no evidence whatsoever to substantiate its assertions on this topic, nor did it comply with paragraph 5(c)(viii) of the Rules. The credibility of its position is further weakened by its history under the Policy, including a comparatively recent prior case in which a similar “dictionary term” argument was advanced and rejected, namely, *Young Innovations, Inc. v. Zsolt Bikadi, supra*. Moreover, even if the disputed domain name had been a true dictionary expression, which the Panel has found is not the case, the substantial strength of the Complainant’s LA CENTRALE mark and the breadth of its online presence, when placed in the context of the Respondent’s demonstrated propensity on previous occasions to cross the line into cybersquatting, would still point away from any finding of rights or legitimate interests under the Policy.

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.

The third element assessment here largely follows the terms of the second element assessment. Although the Respondent claims that it registered the disputed domain name and offered it for sale because it is a common descriptive phrase, it provided no evidence in support of this, made sweeping unsupported assertions, and notably did not accompany the Response with the declaration required by paragraph 5(c)(viii) of the Rules. Rather than being a dictionary phrase with inherent value, the weight of evidence on the present record suggests that the value of the term in the disputed domain name predominantly arises from the (Complainant’s) trademark, bearing in mind that the actual linguistic usage points against the Respondent’s unsupported contentions.

While the list of the Respondent’s domain names produced by the Complainant did not show any particular pattern of abuse, it is undeniable that the Respondent has been found to be a cybersquatter in the past, and notably in *Young Innovations, Inc. v. Zsolt Bikadi, supra* has made an unsuccessful argument of dictionary phrase value in a term relatively recently which the panel found to be predominantly the trademark of the complainant. In addition to the weight of evidence pointing away from the Respondent’s alleged dictionary phrase here, the record strongly supports the strength and reach of the Complainant’s mark and consequently reinforces the trademark value in the disputed domain name. While the Complainant’s mark might be said to have a francophone focus, it is in force where the Respondent is based, and, in any case, the Respondent must be presumed to have an interest or understanding of matters francophone given its claimed interest in an alleged word and definite article in the French language.

To conclude this section, the Panel can do no better than to quote the concluding comments of the panel in *Young Innovations, Inc. v. Zsolt Bikadi, supra*, where the Respondent made broadly the same argument: “Respondent concedes that he is attempting to sell the Disputed Domain Name. Whether his conduct is transparent or not, and whether the price is reasonable or not, are irrelevant—he clearly is trying to profit by selling the Disputed Domain Name for a price that exceeds the name’s acquisition cost. That is paradigmatic bad faith under the Policy because the domain name is being sold for its trademark value and not because of its value as a dictionary or descriptive term or phrase [...] Respondent nevertheless defends his conduct because, he states, he “registered the domain name [...] without knowledge of the Complainant’s trademark or any intent to target their business.” But, as noted above, turning a blind eye to a third party’s trademark rights is not a defense under the Policy. Nor does it matter, as Respondent argues, that Respondent did not “contact the Complainant or attempt to solicit an offer from them,” and that “[i]nstead, it has been passively held and listed for sale in a manner consistent with standard domain investment practices.” Whether a respondent expressly reaches out to a trademark owner to try to sell the domain name or passively lists the domain name for sale with the hope and expectation that the trademark owner will come seek to acquire the domain name is irrelevant. Both methods of seeking to sell a domain name can equally constitute bad faith when the purpose is to sell the domain name whose value comes from its incorporation of a trademark to the trademark owner for a profit.”

In all of these circumstances, the Panel finds on the balance of probabilities that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the Complainant and its rights in mind, and with intent to target these along the lines of paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy.

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

D. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking

Paragraph 15(e) of the Rules provides that, if after considering the submissions, the Panel finds that the Complaint was brought in bad faith, for example in an attempt at Reverse Domain Name Hijacking or to harass the domain-name holder, the Panel shall declare in its decision that the Complaint was brought in bad faith and constitutes an abuse of the administrative proceeding. The mere lack of success of the complaint is not, on its own, sufficient to constitute reverse domain name hijacking. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.16.

The Respondent requested a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking on the basis that the Complainant is a sophisticated party that knew or should have known that “La Centrale” is a dictionary term, and that the facts of this case cannot satisfy the standard of bad faith under the Policy. Given that the Panel has found in the Complainant’s favor, it does not require to address itself to such request.

The Panel therefore rejects the Respondent’s contentions on this topic and finds that the Complaint has not been brought in bad faith.

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 <lacentrale.xyz> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrew D. S. Lothian/

Andrew D. S. Lothian

Sole Panelist

Date: March 23, 2026