

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LUXINNOVATION GIE v. Lesch Christiane, Innovation Lux S.a.r.l.
Case No. D2026-3288

1. The Parties

The Complainant is LUXINNOVATION GIE, Luxembourg, represented by Office Freylinger S.A., Luxembourg.

The Respondent is Lesch Christiane, Innovation Lux S.a.r.l., Luxembourg, represented by Jurisconsul, Luxembourg.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <innovation-lux.com> is registered with RegistryGate GmbH (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint in German was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 24, 2026. On July 27, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 28, 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 July 29, 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 in English on August 3, 2026.

On July 29, 2026, the Center informed the Parties in German and English that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is English. On July 31, 2026, the Respondent sent a communication to the Center insisting that the language of the proceeding be English. On August 3, 2026, the Complainant submitted the amended Complaint translated into English. The Respondent did not submit any further 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 10, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 30, 2026. On August 25, 2026, the Respondent requested an automatic four calendar day extension of the time for filing a Response under paragraph 5(b) of the Rules. On the same date, the Center confirmed the extension, establishing September 3, 2026, as the new Response due date. The Response was filed with the Center on September 1, 2026.

The Center appointed W. Scott Blackmer, Emmanuelle Ragot, and Tobias Zuberbühler as panelists in this matter on September 14, 2026. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. Each member of 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 established as a *Groupement d'Intérêt Économique* (GIE) under the laws of Luxembourg, with its headquarters in Esch-sur-Alzette, Luxembourg. As described in the Complaint and on the Complainant's website at "www.luxinnovation.lu" (available in French, German, and English), the Complainant is a public-private partnership founded in 1984 with the collaboration of government ministries including the Ministry of the Economy and the Ministry of Research and Higher Education. The Complainant serves as the "national innovation agency" to support individual companies, including startups, in developing and bringing to market innovative projects in the digital economy through access to knowledge, funding, infrastructure, and networks. The Panel notes that the Internet Archive's Wayback Machine has archived screenshots of the Complainant's website since 1998.¹

The Complainant operates a Knowledge Hub, sponsors and participates in events such as industry conferences, webinars, matchmaking activities, and joint calls with prospective investors and business partners. It hosts the Luxembourg AI Factory and Startup, and it operates other programs such as Luxembourg Trade & Invest, the Luxembourg Digital Innovation Hub, and Work in Luxembourg.

The Complainant holds numerous trademark registrations, including the word mark LUXINNOVATION, European Union trademark registration number 005968516, registered May 2, 2008, in Nice classes 16, 35, 36, 41, 42, and 45. The word mark appears online on the Complainant's website as well as in publicity and media in connection with the Complainant's programs, along with other word marks and figurative marks that also feature the textual element "luxinnovation".

The disputed domain name was created on October 25, 2024, and is registered to the Respondent "Lesch Cristiane", listing the organization "Innovation Lux S.a.r.l." The Response attaches a copy of an extract from the Luxembourg Registry of Commerce and Companies showing that Innovation Lux S.a.r.l. was formed on January 2, 2025, and registered on April 2, 2025, as a Luxembourg limited liability company headquartered in the city of Luxembourg, with the object of performing strategic consulting services. Christiane Lesch (Lesch is the family name) is identified both as partner and manager. The Response, filed on behalf of both Ms. Lesch and Innovation Lux S.a.r.l., explains that Ms. Lesch, a German national residing in Germany with more than twenty years of experience in strategic consulting, public relations, and business development, has operated a business in Germany since 2014. Her Declaration recounts her formal training and experience in the field of artificial intelligence ("AI") and her plans to establish a company in Luxembourg in 2024, with a corresponding website. She states that she is the sole shareholder of Innovation Lux S.a.r.l. Given their common interests in the disputed domain name, the Panel refers hereafter to Christiane Lesch and Innovation Lux S.a.r.l. collectively as the "Respondent" unless otherwise indicated.

¹Noting the general powers of a panel articulated in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, it is commonly accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record, as the Panel has done in these proceedings. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.8.

The Response and the attached Declaration of Roberto Lesch explain that before the incorporation of Innovation Lux S.a.r.l., Roberto Lesch, the husband of Christiane Lesch and, like her, a resident of Germany, registered the disputed domain name on October 25, 2024, on behalf of Ms. Lesch and the new consulting business that she planned to incorporate in Luxembourg. He states that he initially registered the disputed domain name and established associated web hosting and email services using accounts held by his own information technology consulting business, which trades under the name Meta-IT Consulting. This narrative is supported by copies of invoices and receipts attached to the Response. Mr. Lesch refers to a written contract that he executed with Ms. Lesch dated September 2, 2024 (attached to the Response) to provide technical services to her new company including a domain, which would belong to the Luxembourg company after its establishment. Mr. Lesch states that on June 29, 2026, he transferred the web hosting account and the disputed domain name registration to Innovation Lux S.a.r.l. “in accordance with the written contract of 2 September 2024”. He notes that the contract expressly provided that this transfer was not to be deemed a sale of the domain name.

The disputed domain name resolves to the Respondent’s multipage website (available in English, German, French, Spanish, and Italian) advertising the consulting services of “Innovation Lux”, with the tagline “Global Business Consulting for International Growth, AI Transformation and Risk Resilience”. The Respondent’s website identifies the Respondent company and its contact details. The site offers subscriptions to its newsletter and names client references, including several well-known global companies. The Panel notes that the Internet Archive’s Wayback Machine has screenshots of the Respondent’s website beginning in March 2025.

The Complainant’s representative sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent dated May 18, 2026, asking for the voluntary transfer of the disputed domain name. The Complainant says it did not receive a substantive response to its claims; the Respondent says its counsel requested evidence of the correspondent’s authority and proposed a settlement discussion but never received a reply. This proceeding followed.

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 or confusingly similar to its LUXINNOVATION mark, merely reversing the elements “lux” and “innovation” and adding a hyphen “that will not be noticed by the consumer”. The Complainant observes that the mark is a neologism. Consumers may be familiar with the dictionary word “innovation”, but this is combined with “lux”, which might refer to the country Luxembourg or to “luxury”. The Complainant argues that the order of the terms is not distinctive and the disputed domain name is “at least nearly identical” to its mark.

The Complainant states that it has no association with the Respondent and argues that the Respondent “cannot reasonably claim that it intended to develop and offer legitimate activities using the disputed domain name”, because it is “almost identical to the Complainant’s trademarks and other rights”.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent knew or should have known about the Complainant’s trademark rights, as the Complainant has existed “since the eighties” and is very active in promoting business opportunities in Luxembourg, with government support. The Complainant emphasizes that the Respondent established a consulting business advertising services in the field of AI in early 2025, just as the Complainant created the “Luxembourg AI Factory” in April 2025 as a one-stop shop for companies to maximize the potential of AI. The Complainant points out that Luxembourg is a small country, and the Respondent was launching a business focused on this field at the same time that the Complainant was promoting it.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent's choice of the disputed domain name fits the example of bad faith cited in the Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv), creating a likelihood of confusion with a mark to attract Internet users to another site for commercial gain. The Complainant contends that the Respondent seeks to "intercept" the Complainant's customers and business partners, especially for events and workshops, and points to one partner who was already confused after receiving an invitation from the Respondent, believing it came from the Complainant. The Complainant also argues that the confusingly similar disputed domain name raises the risk of phishing and is possibly suggestive of criminal activity.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied all three elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent first questions whether the descriptive elements of the Complainant's mark, "decomposed", are in fact recognizable in the disputed domain name and therefore confusingly similar for purposes of the side-by-side comparison required to establish standing under the Policy.

The Respondent then claims rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. It corresponds to the Respondent's company name by which it is "commonly known", and the Respondent was actually doing business using the disputed domain name before notice of the dispute. The Respondent shows that it made commercial proposals beginning in January 2025 and issued its first invoices for services in June and July 2025 (supporting evidence is attached to the Response), with approximately one thousand participants attending the Respondent's workshops in its first fiscal year. The Respondent has been operating since January 2025 under the name "Innovation Lux", advertising services through its website and social media accounts, with press coverage, public speaking engagements, and other marketing.

The Respondent denies any bad-faith intent to target the Complainant or its mark. The Respondent observes that its website and marketing use the Respondent's own logo and describe only the Respondent's services, with no references to the Complainant. The Respondent states that Ms. Lesch, a citizen and resident of Germany who had been consulting on AI since 2023 (as documented in attachments to the Response), was not aware of the Complainant when she sought a descriptive name for the planned Luxembourg company. As recounted in her Declaration, Ms. Lesch found no registered trademark identical to the name "Innovation Lux" and proceeded to form the company on January 2, 2025, as evidenced by a deed of incorporation, and to obtain registration in Luxembourg on April 2, 2025. The Respondent points out further that the disputed domain name was registered on behalf of the Respondent in October 2024, six months before the Complainant launched its "AI Factory" in April 2025, so that program could not have been the motivation for selecting the disputed domain name.

The Respondent requests a finding of attempted Reverse Domain Name Hijacking ("RDNH") by the Complainant. The Respondent notes that the Complainant states that it recently discovered the Respondent's website but fails to mention that its own "Fit 4 Scale" program team approached the Respondent in March and April 2026 and solicited the Respondent's proposal (which it ultimately did not accept) for the Respondent to act as a coach in the program, raising no objection to the Respondent's name at that time. Moreover, the Complainant claimed that the Respondent did not reply substantively to the Complainant's demand letter but failed to mention that the Complainant did not reply to the Respondent's suggestion that the Parties discuss settlement. Finally, the Complainant also neglected to mention that it attempted to have the Respondent's hosting provider deactivate the Respondent's website, without copying the Respondent. When the hosting provider declined following the Respondent's counter-notice, the Complainant's counsel wrote to the Respondent's counsel that there was "no urgency" in this matter and then filed the present Complaint, which the Respondent characterizes as a "Plan B" use of the Policy.

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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark (the registered LUXINNOVATION word 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, as the inversion of the two textual elements and their separation by a hyphen does not prevent recognition. See, for example, *Editions Terre Mars v. Editions Larivière*, WIPO Case No. [D2011-2024](#) (inversion of a mark in 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.

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

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Panel finds that, before notice to the Respondent of the dispute, the Respondent used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.2. The Response demonstrates with declarations and supporting documents that the Respondent's website has been used for an active consulting business since January 2025.

The Panel finds further that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name or a name correspondent to the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.3. The Response and attached declarations and supporting documents demonstrate that the Respondent has a company registration with a corresponding name used in proposals, invoices, media references, social media sites, and speaking appearances.

The Panel finds accordingly that the Respondent has made a strong showing of rights or legitimate interests. This is, however, subject to the assessment of the Complainant's claim that the Respondent chose the disputed domain name and, by implication, its company and business name, not for their descriptive value but as a pretense to exploit the Complainant's mark and cannot, therefore, be deemed to be making a bona fide commercial offering and to have legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. That analysis is most efficiently conducted in the following section on the issue of bad faith.

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 Complainant points to the example of bad faith articulated in paragraph 4(b)(iv), intentionally creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark to attract Internet users for commercial gain.

The Complainant infers such intent based on its long-established mark in "a small country" and the circumstances that the Respondent selected a "nearly identical" company name and a corresponding disputed domain name for use in the field of AI consulting at about the same time that the Complainant launched its "Luxembourg AI Factory" in April 2025.

The Respondent, who was residing and operating a business in Germany not Luxembourg, denies prior awareness of the Complainant and its mark and claims that the disputed domain name (which is not identical to the mark) was not selected to exploit any trademark but for its descriptive value in referring to the country

where the Respondent planned to establish a more “international” business and to “innovation” in its dictionary sense. This is at least plausible. The Complainant’s supposition about the Respondent’s motivation for choosing its company name and the disputed domain name to take advantage of publicity surrounding the Complainant’s “Luxembourg AI Factory” launch in April 2025 is not persuasive, since the disputed domain name was registered six months earlier, and the Respondent’s preparations for and establishment of its business predated the Complainant launched its AI Factory. The Respondent’s website is not imitative of the Complainant’s and makes no reference to the Complainant. If there has been confusion on the part of an unnamed business partner of the Complainant, it does not appear to have been perpetrated deliberately by the Respondent.

The Complainant has the burden of proof to establish the probability of bad faith in both the registration and use of the disputed domain name. The Panel does not find on this record that the Complainant has met this burden in the limited evidentiary context of a UDRP proceeding.

The Panel finds the third element of the Policy has not been established.

Based on this analysis of the facts, the Panel also confirms its finding above that the second element has not 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 Panel does not find on this record that the Complaint has been brought in bad faith and constitutes an attempt at Reverse Domain Name Hijacking. The Complainant had standing and a well-established mark and did not know the details of the disputed domain name registration or the Respondent’s legitimate business activities until this proceeding. It is unsurprising that a business team of the Complainant’s organization had earlier contact with the Respondent without the legal department’s knowledge, and the Panel is not prepared to impute bad faith for RDNH purposes on the basis of the Complainant’s correspondence relating to its notice to the Respondent’s web hosting provider.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/W. Scott Blackmer/
W. Scott Blackmer
Presiding Panelist

/Emmanuelle Ragot/
Emmanuelle Ragot
Panelist

/Tobias Zuberbühler/
Tobias Zuberbühler
Panelist
Date: September 28, 2026