

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

R PORT SA v. mourad salmi

Case No. D2026-0655

1. The Parties

The Complainant is R PORT SA, Luxembourg, represented by Gevers, Belgium.

The Respondent is mourad salmi, Morocco.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <gevers.site> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 16, 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 the same day, 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 Purposes / Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) 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 19, 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 Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Rebecca Slater as the sole panelist in this matter on March 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

The Complainant is a company incorporated under Luxembourg law. It operates through sister companies forming part of the GEVERS Group, an intellectual property firm founded in 1898 and active internationally.

The Complainant holds various trade mark registrations for GEVERS word mark, including Benelux Trade Mark Registration No. 155431 (registered on July 1, 1988), European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 000175323 (registered on November 5, 1998), and United Kingdom Trade Mark Registration No. UK00900175323, (registered on November 5, 1998) (the “Trade Mark”). The Complainant also holds registered logo marks for GEVERS.

The Complainant also uses GEVERS as a trade name in connection with its business and website at “www.gevers.eu”.

The Respondent is an individual, apparently located in Morocco. The Respondent did not submit a response, and, consequently, little information is known about the Respondent.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 30, 2025. The disputed domain name currently redirects to the Complainant’s official website at “www.gevers.eu”.

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 identical to the Trade Mark.
- The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant has not authorised the Respondent’s use of the Trade Mark, the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and the disputed domain name redirects to the Complainant’s official website, which does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.
- The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant’s trade mark rights long predate the registration of the disputed domain name, the disputed domain name redirects to the Complainant’s website, and the Respondent’s continued control of the disputed domain name creates a risk of confusion and deceptive use, including the ability to issue fraudulent communications or payment requests purporting to originate from the Complainant.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant’s contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all the elements enumerated in paragraph 4(a) of the

Policy have been satisfied, namely:

- the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trade mark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The onus of proving these elements is on the Complainant.

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 trade mark 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 trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Trade Mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the Trade Mark 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

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. 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.

The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use the Trade Mark and there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. Furthermore, the use of the disputed domain name cannot be considered a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Respondent is merely redirecting the disputed domain name to the Complainant's website at "www.gevers.eu". Such use cannot be considered bona fide use in the circumstances of this case.

The evidence provided by the Complainant indicates that the disputed domain name has been used to either: (a) impersonate the Complainant and its business; or (b) to create the incorrect impression that the Respondent is affiliated with the Complainant. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, possibly impersonation or passing off) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

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 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

The disputed domain name was clearly acquired with knowledge of the Complainant and the Trade Mark, given the composition of the disputed domain name (which is entirely comprised of the Trade Mark) and its redirection to the Complainant's website. Redirecting the disputed domain name to the Complainant's website supports a finding that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Trade Mark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

In the circumstances, the use of a privacy service when registering the disputed domain name further supports an inference of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 3.2.1 and 3.6.

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 <gevers.site> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Rebecca Slater/

Rebecca Slater

Sole Panelist

Date: March 27, 2026