

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Louvre Hotels Group v. Domain Admin  
Case No. D2025-0639

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Louvre Hotels Group, France, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Domain Admin, United States of America.

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

The disputed domain names <campanilenature.com> and <campanileprime.com> are registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 18, 2025. On February 18, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On February 19, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 19, 2025, 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 February 21, 2025.

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 February 24, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 16, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 17, 2025.

The Center appointed Catherine Slater as the sole panelist in this matter on March 24, 2025. 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 established in 1976 and which operates 11 hotel brands with a total of over 1,700 locations in 70 countries around the world. One of the brands operated by the Complainant, from its inception, is CAMPANILE which is utilized for its chain of 3-star hotels comprising around 400 hotels operating in more than 13 countries.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations including:

- European Union ("EU") Registration No. 019056040 for CAMPANILE NATURE (word mark), applied for on July 17, 2024 and registered on November 15, 2024;
- EU Registration No. 019056008 for CAMPANILE PRIME (word mark), applied for on July 17, 2024 and registered on November 15, 2024;
- International Registration No. 500632 for CAMPANILE (word mark), registered on February 28, 1986.

The Complainant registered the domain name <campanile.com> on May 15, 2000.

The disputed domain names were both registered on July 17, 2024.

At the date of filing this Complaint, and at the date of this Decision, the disputed domain names both linked to identical webpages upon which they were each offered for sale for USD 2,850.

The Complainant sent cease and desist letters to the Respondent from September 23, 2024 to October 11, 2024. There was no response.

#### **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 its CAMPANILE trademark. Further, CAMPANILE NATURE and CAMPANILE PRIME are sub-branches of the Complainant's hotels which increases the confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the CAMPANILE trademark.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names because the Respondent is not sponsored by or affiliated with the Complainant. In any way, the Complainant has not given the Respondent permission to use its trademarks, the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent used a privacy service which equates to a lack of legitimate interests and the offers to sell the disputed domain names for amounts which must exceed the Respondent's out-of-pocket expenses is further evidence of a lack of rights and legitimate interests.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith because the Respondent's actions indicate that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's internationally well-known CAMPANILE trademark and only registered the disputed domain names in response to the Complainant's intention to extend its rights through the filing of new trademark applications.

In this regard, the Complainant contends that the Respondent was likely preying on the Complainant by monitoring newly filed trademark applications and the filing of corresponding domain names is a well-known practice among cybersquatters and further the offering for sale of the disputed domain names for valuable consideration in excess of the Respondent's out-of-pocket expenses is further evidence 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 Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the trademarks CAMPANILE, CAMPANILE NATURE and CAMPANILE PRIME for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the marks CAMPANILE NATURE and CAMPANILE PRIME are identically reproduced within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are identical to these marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Furthermore, the Panel finds the entirety of the mark CAMPANILE is reproduced within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are also confusingly similar to this mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. Although the addition of other terms here, "prime" and "nature", 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 names and this mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), 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 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 3.0](#), 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.

Also, the Panel considers that the composition of the disputed domain names carries a high risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

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 has registered the disputed domain names on the same day that the Complainant filed trademark applications for identical marks. The Respondent has then used the disputed domain names to point to websites upon which they are offered for sale for an amount that is clearly in excess of the Respondent's out-of-pocket expenses.

The overwhelming inference to be drawn from these facts is that the Respondent has monitored the EU trademark applications and, likely because of the well-known nature of the Complainant's CAMPANILE trademark, decided to target the Complainant with the intention of taking advantage of and profiting from the Complainant's CAMPANILE, CAMPANILE NATURE and/or CAMPANILE PRIME trademarks through the sale of the disputed domain names. These circumstances indicate that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain names primarily for the purpose of selling the disputed domain name registrations to the Complainant or to a competitor for valuable consideration in excess of the Respondent's out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain names and as such the Respondent's actions fall foul of paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy.

The Panel notes that at the time of registration of the disputed domain names, while the CAMPANILE NATURE and CAMPANILE PRIME trademarks were obviously not registered, the Complainant did already have trademark rights in CAMPANILE. The Panel further notes that the disputed domain names were both registered on the same day as the filing of the CAMPANILE NATURE and CAMPANILE PRIME trademark applications. In the circumstances, it is clear that the Respondent's intent was to target and capitalize on the Complainant's future trademark rights as well ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.8.2). Such conduct reinforces the Panel's finding of the Respondent's bad faith in registration and use of the disputed domain names.

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 <campanilenature.com> and <campanileprime.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Catherine Slater/*

**Catherine Slater**

Sole Panelist

Date: April 7, 2025