

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

BENDA BILI v. Hierro Mela, Huang Bao Chuan, Harold McConnell,
asd asfasf, asgfasgasgas, jottsoldes jottsoldes, jottsoldes, John John,
Wei Lin, and Xu Zheng
Case No. D2026-1120

1. The Parties

The Complainant is BENDA BILI, France, represented by Nameshield, France.

The Respondents are Hierro Mela, United States of America, Huang Bao Chuan, China, Harold McConnell, United States of America, asd asfasf, asgfasgasgas, Italy, jottsoldes jottsoldes, jottsoldes, France, John John, Germany, Wei Lin, China, and Xu Zheng, Hong Kong, China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <outlet-sezane.com> is registered with CloudFlare, Inc.

The disputed domain name <sezanechic.com> is registered with TuringSign Inc. d/b/a Cosmotown.

The disputed domain name <sezaneclothing.com> is registered with Dominet (HK) Limited.

The disputed domain name <sezanejapans.com> is registered with Bizcn.com, Inc.

The disputed domain name <sezaneofficiel.shop> is registered with Alibaba.com Singapore E-Commerce Private Limited.

The disputed domain names <sezane-schweiz.com>, <sezanesireland.com>, and <sezanesuk.com> are registered with Dynadot Inc.

The disputed domain name <vip-sezane.com> is registered with Dnsgulf Pte. Ltd.

The disputed domain name <vip-sezaneshop.com> is registered with EU Technology (HK) Limited.

(collectively, the “Registrars”)

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 16, 2026. On March 16, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars requests for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On March 17, March 18, March 19, March 20, and March 24, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by emails to the Center their verification responses, disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (“Anonymous / Redacted for Privacy”) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 26, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint in English on March 27, 2026.

On March 26, 2026, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain names <vip-sezaneshop.com> and <sezanejapans.com> is Chinese. On March 27, 2026, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceedings. The Respondents did not submit any comment on the Complainant’s submission.

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 Respondents in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 31, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 20, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents’ default on April 21, 2026.

The Center appointed Deanna Wong Wai Man as the sole panelist in this matter on May 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

The Complainant is a French company active in the field of ready-to-wear fashion collections and accessories for women, operating under the trademark and commercial identifier SEZANE. The Complainant conducts its business primarily through online retail channels. According to the evidence submitted with the Complaint, the Complainant markets and sells clothing, handbags, footwear, and related fashion accessories through its official website and has developed a significant online presence under the SEZANE mark.

The Complainant is the owner of an international trademark portfolio for SEZANE, which includes, inter alia:

- International Trademark Registration No. 1170876 for SÉZANE, registered on June 3, 2013.

The Complainant also operates the official domain name <sezane.com>.

The disputed domain names were all registered between October 14, 2025 and February 27, 2026. According to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the disputed domain names all resolved to online shop templates offering clothing and accessories under the SEZANE brand. These websites prominently reproduced the Complainant’s SEZANE trademark and logo and displayed layouts resembling official online

retail stores associated with the Complainant. On the date of this Decision some of the disputed domain names remain fully active, while others direct to error or warning pages.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's SEZANE trademark since each of the disputed domain names incorporates the SEZANE mark in its entirety together with descriptive or geographical terms such as "chic", "shop", "outlet", "vip", "clothing", "officiel", "schweiz", "ireland", "uk", and "japans". The Complainant submits that the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity and does not dispel the impression that the disputed domain names are associated with the Complainant. The Complainant further submits that the generic Top-Level Domains ("gTLDs") ".com" and ".shop" are standard registration requirements which should be disregarded for the purpose of the first element under the Policy. The Complainant also relies upon previous UDRP decisions recognizing the Complainant's rights in the SEZANE trademark.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. In particular, the Complainant submits that the Respondents are not affiliated with or authorized by the Complainant in any way and have not been licensed or otherwise permitted to use the SEZANE trademark or to register domain names incorporating that mark. The Complainant argues that the Respondents are not commonly known by the disputed domain names and that the Whois information associated with the disputed domain names does not correspond to the disputed domain names. The Complainant further asserts that the disputed domain names were used for websites impersonating the Complainant by reproducing the SEZANE trademark and logo and purporting to offer SEZANE-branded products for sale, which, according to the Complainant, cannot confer rights or legitimate interests under the Policy.

The Complainant finally contends that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. The Complainant submits that the SEZANE trademark is distinctive and well known in connection with the Complainant's fashion business and that the Respondents therefore could not reasonably have been unaware of the Complainant and its trademark rights when registering the disputed domain names. The Complainant further argues that the Respondents intentionally used the disputed domain names to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's SEZANE trademark for commercial gain by operating websites that falsely suggested an affiliation with the Complainant. The Complainant additionally contends that the Respondents' conduct disrupts the Complainant's business and constitutes bad faith registration and use within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. First Preliminary Issue – Language of the Proceedings

The language of the Registration Agreement for some of the disputed domain names is Chinese and for others it is English. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint and amended Complaint were filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceedings be English for several reasons, including the fact that English is widely used in international relations and that the disputed domain names are composed of Latin characters rather than Chinese script, and that requiring translation into Chinese would impose an undue burden on the Complainant in terms of cost and delay.

The Respondents did not comment on the Complainant's request for the language of the proceedings and did not submit any Response.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.5.1).

Having considered all the matters above, and giving particular weight to the fact that the websites associated with the disputed domain names displayed English content targeting an international audience, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceedings shall be English.

6.2. Second Preliminary Issue – Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the disputes against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that the disputed domain names all incorporate the Complainant's SEZANE trademark together with descriptive or geographic terms, thereby exposing a pattern in the composition of the disputed domain names. The Panel further notes that the disputed domain names were registered within a relatively short period of time between October 14, 2025 and February 27, 2026, which supports the inference of coordinated conduct by the Respondents. The Panel also notes the Complainant's submission that the associated websites resolved to substantially similar online shop templates displaying the Complainant's SEZANE trademark and logo and purporting to offer SEZANE-branded products for sale. In addition, the Whois information associated with some of the disputed domain names appears to contain incomplete or implausible registrant details (which, in some instances, prevented the delivery of the Center's communications) and reflects a pattern of multiple aliases and differing identities. Having regard to the similarities in the composition of the disputed domain names, the proximity of their registration dates, the nature of the associated websites, and the overall pattern of registration and use as present in the record, the Panel finds, on balance of probabilities, that the disputed domain names are subject to common control.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as “the Respondent”) in a single proceeding.

6.3 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 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.

Although the addition of other terms such as “shop”, “outlet”, “chic”, “vip”, “clothing”, “officiel”, “schweiz”, “ireland”, “uk”, and “japans” may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the Complainant’s SEZANE mark for the purposes of the Policy.. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Based on the evidence provided, the Panel notes that the Respondent was neither affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant to use the SEZANE mark, and there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain names. The Panel further finds that there are no elements in the record indicating that the Respondent has made any bona fide or demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Instead, the record indicates that the disputed domain names were used for websites purporting to offer the Complainant’s SEZANE-branded products for sale, without disclosing its lack of relationship with the Complainant.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain names which are confusingly similar to the Complainant's SEZANE trademark. The Panel further notes that previous panels applying the Policy have recognized the Complainant's SEZANE trademark as a well-known trademark in prior UDRP proceedings, and the Panel agrees with this assessment. See, for instance, *Benda Bili v. Lu Ni La*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-0394](#). The Panel infers from these circumstances that, by registering the disputed domain names, the Respondent deliberately and consciously targeted the Complainant's well-known trademark, which creates a presumption of bad faith. The Panel further notes that the Complainant's trademark registrations predate the registration dates of the disputed domain names by several years and considers that the Respondent knew, or at least should have known, of the Complainant's trademark rights at the time of registration. This is further confirmed by the fact that, according to the record, the disputed domain names resolved to websites purporting to offer the Complainant's SEZANE-branded products for sale, which demonstrates the Respondent's awareness of the Complainant, its trademark, and its products at the time of registration. In the Panel's view, these circumstances support a finding that the disputed domain names were registered 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 Panel further finds that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's SEZANE trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the websites associated with the disputed domain names and the products purportedly offered on them. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names 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 names <outlet-sezane.com>, <sezanechic.com>, <sezaneclothing.com>, <sezanejapans.com>, <sezaneofficiel.shop>, <sezane-schweiz.com>, <sezanesireland.com>, <sezanesuk.com>, <vip-sezane.com> and <vip-sezaneshop.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Deanna Wong Wai Man/

Deanna Wong Wai Man

Sole Panelist

Date: May 18, 2026