

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Talisman Brands Inc. (d/b/a Established) v. ali hashem, Agent Egypt  
Case No. D2025-0760

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Talisman Brands Inc. (d/b/a Established), United States of America, represented by Plasseraud IP, France.

The Respondent is ali hashem, Agent Egypt, Egypt.

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

The disputed domain name <thomson-egypt.com> is registered with Launchpad.com Inc. (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 24, 2025. On February 25, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 25, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 27, 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 28, 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 March 4, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 24, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 28, 2025.

The Center appointed George R. F. Souter as the sole panelist in this matter on April 3, 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's THOMSON trademark has been in use for over 130 years, and has acquired a considerable reputation worldwide in connection with the sale of consumer electronics such as radios and record players, and household appliances, such as refrigerators.

In Egypt in particular, THOMSON-trademarked products have been sold for over 40 years.

The Complainant has protected its THOMSON trademark widely through trademark registrations, including International Registration No. 286629, registered on July 18, 1964, and International Registration No. 793989, registered on October 8, 2002. Both of these cited registrations include Egypt in the geographical scope of protection.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 26, 2018, and directs users to a website in which the Respondent falsely pretends to be the official service center/repairer of THOMSON products in Egypt, and falsely claims to be the Complainant's official agent in Egypt.

#### **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 Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and that the Complainant has never granted permission to the Respondent to use its THOMSON trademark in connection with the registration of a domain name, or otherwise. The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

##### **B. Respondent**

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

#### **6. Discussion and Findings**

##### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 1.2.1.

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 3.0](#), section 1.7. The mere addition of a hyphen and the geographical indicator "Egypt" in the disputed domain name does not prevent this finding.

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

## **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

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. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

In particular, the Panel considers that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name for a website prominently displaying the Complainant's mark, using the Complainant's product images, and purportedly offering repair and maintenance services for the Complainant's products cannot fulfill the requirements in the Oki Data test, as the Respondent falsely indicates that it is "the only maintenance of Thomson in Egypt officially approved by Thomson International". [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.8, and *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#).

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

## **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

The Panel is convinced that the disputed domain name was deliberately chosen to invoke affiliation with the Complainant, which renders a finding of registration in bad faith inevitable, and the Panel so finds.

It is well-established in prior decisions under the Policy that the use of a domain name found to be confusingly similar to the trademark of a complainant to invoke affiliation with the business of the complainant constitutes use of the disputed domain name in bad faith. The similar circumstances of the present case clearly, therefore, justify a finding of use of the disputed domain name in bad faith under the paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, and the Panel so finds.

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 <thomson-egypt.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/George R. F. Souter/*

**George R. F. Souter**

Sole Panelist

Date: April 17, 2025