

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Bonduelle SA v. Biz Moov

Case No. D2026-2413

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Bonduelle SA, France, represented by IP Twins SAS, France.

The Respondent is Biz Moov, France.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <bonduelle.com> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 3, 2026. On June 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 4, 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 (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 5, 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 June 8, 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 June 9, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 29, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 1, 2026.

The Center appointed Isabelle Leroux as the sole panelist in this matter on July 10, 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 Bonduelle SA, a worldwide company in the agro-industrial sector, created in 1853 by Louis-Antoine Bonduelle in northern France. The Complainant's group is present in three continents and 100 countries, with more than 11,000 employees and working with more than 2,000 partner farmers around the world. The Complainant is also listed on the Euronext stock exchange.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademarks consisting of or containing the word "bonduelle", including, but not limited to:

- European Union trademark BONDUELLE No. 007151467, registered on March 19, 2009, duly renewed, and designating goods in International classes 29, 30, 31, and 32; and
- France trademark BONDUELLE No. 1448420, registered on February 2, 1988, duly renewed, and designating goods in International classes 29, 30, 31, 32, and 33.

In addition, the Complainant is also the owner of numerous domain names identical to or comprising the sign "bonduelle", both under generic and country-code top-level domains. For instance, <bonduelle.com> has been registered since February 21, 1997, <bonduelle.fr> since December 20, 1998, and <bonduelle.us> since April 19, 2002.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on March 18, 2026.

The Disputed Domain Name redirects towards the official website of the Complainant ("www.bonduelle.com").

According to the information communicated by the Registrar, the registrant of the Disputed Domain Name is Biz Moov, purportedly domiciled in France.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the conditions 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 its earlier well-known trademarks. The Disputed Domain Name reproduces the earlier trademark BONDUELLE in its entirety, differing only by the addition of the vowel "e", i.e. "bondueelle". This repeated vowel does not significantly affect the appearance or pronunciation of the domain name. Such intentional misspelling of the Complainant's trademark is commonly referred to as "typosquatting";
- As regards the absence of rights or legitimate interests, the Complainant searched trademark records and found no BONDUELLE or BONDUEELLE trademark owned by the Respondent, asserting that the Respondent has acquired no trademark right in the name BONDUELLE or BONDUEELLE which could have granted the Respondent rights in the Disputed Domain Name. The Respondent has never been authorised by the Complainant to use the trademark BONDUELLE in any manner, and there is no

contractual or commercial relationship between the parties which could eventually legitimize the registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name; and

- As regards bad faith, the Complainant submits that, given its solid notoriety in 100 countries and the fact that the Respondent is located in France – the historical country of implementation of the BONDUELLE trademark – it is very likely that the Respondent knew the trademark BONDUELLE at the time of registration of the Disputed Domain Name. Furthermore, given the composition and complexity of the Disputed Domain Name (10 characters), it is nearly impossible that the similarity with the trademark is a coincidence.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that the Complainant must prove each of the following three elements in order to succeed in its Complaint:

- (i) the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and are being used in bad faith.

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

Although the addition of the letter "e" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such letter does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Name and the BONDUELLE trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

The Panel further notes that the Disputed Domain Name differs from the Complainant's trademark BONDUELLE only by the addition of an extra vowel "e", which the Panel considers to be an intentional misspelling of the Complainant's trademark. Such intentional misspelling of the Complainant's trademark is commonly referred to as "typosquatting" and, per [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9, does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Name and the BONDUELLE trademarks for the purposes of the Policy as the Disputed Domain Name contains sufficiently recognizable aspects of the Complainant's mark.

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.

There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known under the Disputed Domain Name. The Respondent has not been licensed or otherwise authorised by the Complainant to use its BONDUELLE trademarks in any manner. The Complainant performed searches and found no BONDUELLE or BONDUEELLE trademark owned by the Respondent. Furthermore, the Disputed Domain Name redirects towards the official website of the Complainant (“www.bonduelle.com”), which does not support a claim to rights or legitimate interests. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.3. Moreover, there is no indication that the Respondent is using, or has made any demonstrable preparations to use, the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate non-commercial or fair use purpose.

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 given the strong reputation and long-standing use of the Complainant’s BONDUELLE trademarks in France, where the Complainant was founded and the Respondent is purportedly located, it is implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant’s trademarks at the time of registration.

The Panel observes that: (i) the Complainant’s trademark registrations predate the registration of the Disputed Domain Name by many years; (ii) the BONDUELLE trademark is distinctive and well known; (iii) the Disputed Domain Name was registered with an intentional misspelling of the Complainant’s trademark and cannot be a coincidence; (iv) the Respondent has failed to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good faith use of the Disputed Domain Name, having also failed to respond to the Complaint; and (v) the Disputed Domain Name redirects towards the official website of the Complainant (“www.bonduelle.com”) meaning that the Respondent knows the Complainant.

These circumstances strongly suggest that the Respondent was aware of and deliberately targeted the Complainant's trademarks when registering the Disputed Domain Name. The Respondent's conduct indicates an intention to take unfair advantage of the Complainant's reputation, which constitutes bad faith registration and use under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

Furthermore, by reproducing the Complainant's trademark in the Disputed Domain Name while simultaneously redirecting it towards the official website of the Complainant ("www.bonduelle.com"), the Respondent strengthens the impression that it is affiliated with the Complainant. This strategy of confusion could make Internet users wrongly believe that they are visiting an official or affiliated website of the Complainant, and is a typical example of bad faith use in cybersquatting cases.

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 <bondueelle.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Isabelle Leroux/

Isabelle Leroux

Sole Panelist

Date: July 24, 2026