

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Louis Vuitton Malletier v. Viktoras Berniunas  
Case No. D2026-0969

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Louis Vuitton Malletier, France, represented by Studio Barbero S.p.A., Italy.

The Respondent is Viktoras Berniunas, France.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <louisvuittonpresse.com> is registered with IONOS SE (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 6, 2026. On March 6, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 11, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 11, 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 amendment to the Complaint on March 13, 2026.

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 March 16, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 5, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 7, 2026.

The Center appointed Louis-Bernard Buchman as the sole panelist in this matter on April 15, 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's business was founded in 1854 by Louis Vuitton in Paris, France. Originally a trunk maker catering to wealthy travelers, the Complainant steadily enlarged its scope of business by offering other luxury goods and accessories, and further to its merger in 1987 with the champagne and cognac company Moët Hennessy, it grew to become the multinational luxury goods conglomerate LVMH, listed on the Paris Stock Exchange, which is one of the world leaders in luxury products, with a turnover of EUR 80.8 billion in 2025.

The Complainant, which is part of the LVMH group, owns a large portfolio of LOUIS VUITTON trademarks, including inter alia the International Trademark No. 416052, registered on June 19, 1975, and the European Union Trademark No. 000015610 registered on March 16, 1998 (together hereinafter referred to as: "the Mark").

According to InterBrand Best Global Brands, the LOUIS VUITTON trademark was ranked in 2025 as the 12th most valuable brand in the world.

The Complainant is also the registrant of many domain names, including in particular <louisvuitton.com>, registered on February 18, 1997.

The disputed domain name <louisvuittonpresse.com> was registered on January 14, 2026.

The Complainant has submitted evidence that the disputed domain name was resolving to a parking page and that mail exchange ("MX") servers were configured under it. At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name does not resolve to any active website.

#### **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:

- (i) the disputed domain name reproduces the Mark, in which the Complainant has rights, and is confusingly similar to the Mark insofar as the disputed domain name contains the Mark, which remains recognizable in the disputed domain name;
- (ii) it never authorized the Respondent to use the Mark in any manner and it never had any affiliation with the Respondent, who has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name;
- (iii) the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith; in particular, the Respondent had knowledge of the Mark when registering the disputed domain name, and by passively holding it, the Respondent is creating confusion with the Mark and using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to the Complainant.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **6.1. Procedural Aspects - Failure to Respond**

Under the Rules, paragraphs 5(f) and 14(a), the effect of a failure to submit a formal response by the Respondent is that, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel shall proceed to a decision on the basis of the Complaint.

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, it is the Complainant's burden to establish that all three of the required criteria for a transfer of the disputed domain name have been met, even in the absence of a formal response.

Under paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, the Panel is empowered to draw such inferences from the Respondent's failure to file a formal response as it considers appropriate under the circumstances.

In this case, the Panel finds that the Respondent has failed to rebut any of the reasonable factual assertions that are made and supported by evidence submitted by the Complainant.

In particular, by failing to respond, the Respondent has failed to offer the Panel any of the types of evidence set forth in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy or otherwise, from which the Panel might conclude that the Respondent has any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, such as making legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Moreover, as discussed below, the Respondent has failed to provide any exculpatory information or reasoning that might have led the Panel to question the Complainant's arguments that the Respondent has acted in bad faith.

### **6.2. Three Elements under Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy**

#### **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 Panel notes that, as aforesaid, the Respondent did not rebut these assertions and finds that despite the addition of the word "presse" (meaning "press" in French) after the Mark, the Mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name.

Although such addition may bear on the assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that it does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Regarding the generic Top-Level-Domain (“gTLD”) “.com” in the disputed domain name, it is well established that a gTLD does not generally affect the assessment for the purpose of determining identity or confusing similarity. [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 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.

Furthermore, the Panel considers that the composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

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

## **C. Registered and Used 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.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or “coming soon” page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Mark, which several prior UDRP panels have recognized to be well-known (see for instance *Louis Vuitton v. Net-Promotion*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0430](#); *Louis Vuitton Malletier SAS v. Jamey, Wakeen Industries LLC*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-1201](#); *Louis Vuitton Malletier v. Whois Privacy, Private by Design, LLC / Julien Colinet*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-3000](#); and *Louis Vuitton Malletier v. Jester Freak, Jest Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-2531](#)).

Considering in addition the size and duration of the Complainant’s operations and the apparent location of the Respondent in France where the Complainant is headquartered, the Panel finds that the Respondent was necessarily aware of the Mark when it registered the disputed domain name.

Regarding the implausibility of any good faith use, the Panel notes that the Complainant’s activity takes place in the luxury goods industry, and that the Respondent used the disputed domain name to configure MX servers, thus creating for the Complainant a present and ongoing risk of phishing or fraudulent use.

The Panel finds that in the circumstances of this case (considering the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name), the current passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Finally, some UDRP panels have held that in certain circumstances, registrants of domain names would have a duty to abstain from registering and using a domain name, which is either identical or confusingly similar to a prior trademark held by others and which would infringe upon or otherwise violate the rights of a third party. See Policy, paragraph 4(b); *Nike, Inc. v. B. B. de Boer*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-1397](#); *Nuplex Industries Limited v. Nuplex*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-0078](#); *Mobile Communication Service Inc. v. WebReg, RN*, WIPO Case No. [D2005-1304](#); *BOUYGUES v. Chengzhang, Lu Ciagao*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-1325](#); *Media General Communications, Inc. v. Rarenames, WebReg*, WIPO Case No. [D2006-0964](#); and *mVisible Technologies, Inc. v. Navigation Catalyst Systems, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-1141](#).

The Panel finds that the Respondent has clearly not abided by such duty.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 <louisvuittonpresse.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Louis-Bernard Buchman/*  
**Louis-Bernard Buchman**  
Sole Panelist  
Date: April 22, 2026