

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Societe De Producteurs de Mailly Champagne v. Fang Lei,

www.datacanvas.com

Case No. DCO2026-0036

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Societe De Producteurs de Mailly Champagne, France, represented by CASALONGA, France.

The Respondent is Fang Lei, www.datacanvas.com, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <champagne-mailly.co> is registered with Amazon Registrar, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on April 21, 2026. On April 21, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 21, 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 (anonymous third party) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 22, 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 April 27, 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 April 28, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 18, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 24, 2026.

The Center appointed Taras Kyslyy as the sole panelist in this matter on June 1, 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 was established in 1929 and is Champagne vineyard. The Complainant has been operating its official website located at “www.champagne-mailly.com” for more than 25 years, displaying historical information about the company and a description of its cuvées.

The Complainant owns several trademark registrations for its MAILLY trademark, including for instance French trademark registration No. 1455010, registered on August 19, 1988, and Chinese trademark registration No. 9798728 registered on September 28, 2012.

The Complainant owns the following domain names:

- <champagne-mailly.com> registered on October 29, 1998;
- <champagne-mailly.fr> registered on September 11, 2003.

The Complainant is also operating its online store through the address “www.boutique.champagnemailly.com”.

The Complainant actively uses the MAILLY / CHAMPAGNE MAILLY sign online, including on social media. In particular, it operates the Instagram account “@champagne_mailly” and the LinkedIn company page “Champagne Mailly Grand Cru”. These accounts form part of the Complainant’s official digital presence and further demonstrate public use and recognition of the MAILLY name in connection with the Complainant’s champagne business.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 24, 2025, and does not resolve to any active website. MX records are active for the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name has been used to send phishing emails in which the Respondent impersonated the Complainant by reproducing its exact signature block and logo, with the aim of misleading customers and business partners into opening malicious attachments.

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 the Complainant’s trademark. The Complainant’s trademark is entirely reproduced in the disputed domain name. The inclusion of the Top-Level Domain extension does not give any distinctiveness to the domain name. The mere addition of a hyphen between the terms “champagne” and “mailly” does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, as the Complainant’s trademark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name. To the extent that some of the Complainant’s trademarks include minor figurative elements, such as a stylized letter “m”, it is well established that the assessment of confusing similarity under the Policy is based on the textual elements of the mark, as domain names cannot reproduce figurative features.

The Complainant also contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. No license, permission or authorization to use the denomination CHAMPAGNE MAILLY was ever granted to the Respondent by the Complainant. The Complainant has never consented to Respondent's use and reservation of its trademark in any manner, including in connection with the disputed domain name, which reproduces the Complainant's trademark. The disputed domain name is exclusively composed of the Complainant's trademark and bears no resemblance to the Respondent's name or company, or to any name by which the Respondent could be commonly known. There is no evidence that the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name without intent for commercial gain. Therefore, the Respondent could not have been in any way known under the disputed domain name and has no legitimate interest in respect of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name has been used in connection with phishing emails in which the Respondent impersonated the Complainant by reproducing its signature block and logo with the aim of misleading customers and business partners into opening malicious attachments. Such illegitimate use can never confer rights or legitimate interests in the Respondent. The Respondent has not disclosed its identity, as the Whois records do not disclose the registrant's details and only provide a contact mechanism through the registrar, which further supports the absence of rights or legitimate interests. The Respondent's choice to register a domain name entirely incorporating the Complainant's well-known trademarks cannot be considered coincidental and clearly aims at creating a misleading impression of association or affiliation with the Complainant, especially as the Complainant owns and uses the domain name <champagne-mailly.com>.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. In light of the reputation of the Complainant's trademarks and the Respondent's conduct, there is no doubt that the Respondent had prior knowledge of the Complainant's rights at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. In particular, the Respondent used the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant in phishing emails, thereby intentionally creating a likelihood. The use of the ".co" Top-Level Domain in the disputed domain name closely resembles the Complainant's registered domain name registered in ".com", reinforcing the confusing similarity and the false impression of affiliation (<champagne-mailly.com> v. <champagne-mailly.co>) and leading the recipients of phishing emails to believe they provide from the Complainant. In addition, the Respondent concealed its identity through a privacy/proxy service. Following registrar disclosure, the registrant information appears inconsistent. Namely, the disclosed name, contact and company details appear to correspond to a third party identified in publicly available sources but the postal address does neither correspond to the company's actual address as available on its website, nor to the location where the "true" company' CEO would be living in the United States(. Also, the postal address indicated by the Respondent is incomplete and does not make possible to identify a precise address. These circumstances suggest that the Respondent provided false or misleading registrant information, and may have misappropriated the identity of a third party, in order to conceal its true identity and avoid accountability. Such conduct constitutes a further indication of bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

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 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 applicable generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) in a domain name (e.g., “.com”, “.club”, “.nyc”) is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. Thus, the Panel disregards ccTLD “.co” for the purposes of the confusing similarity test.

[WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced 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 other terms here, “champagne” and a hyphen, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms 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.

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 available evidence does not confirm that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, which could demonstrate its rights or legitimate interests (see, e.g., *World Natural Bodybuilding Federation, Inc. v. Daniel Jones, TheDotCafe*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-0642](#)).

The Complainant did not license or otherwise agree to use of its prior registered trademarks by the Respondent, thus no actual or contemplated bona fide or legitimate use of the disputed domain name could be reasonably claimed (see e.g., *Sportswear Company S.P.A. v. Tang Hong*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-1875](#)).

Furthermore, the composition of the disputed domain name consisting of the Complainant’s trademark plus the additional term “champagne” (which refers to the Complainant’s core product) effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship by the Complainant.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed phishing/identity theft, 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name incorporating distinctive Complainant's trademark and used it to send phishing emails impersonating the Complainant. The Panel finds this confirms the Respondent was aware and targeted the Complainant and its trademark when registering the disputed domain name, which confirms the bad faith.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed, phishing/identity theft, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. 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 <champagne-mailly.co> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Taras Kyslyy/

Taras Kyslyy

Sole Panelist

Date: June 6, 2026