

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

MILAN PRESSE v. Rishikesh Jha

Case No. D2025-1016

1. The Parties

The Complainant is MILAN PRESSE, France, represented by Grant Thornton, France.

The Respondent is Rishikesh Jha, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <milanjournal.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 12, 2025. On March 13, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 13, 2025, 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 (Registration Private, Domains by Proxy LLC, DomainsByProxy.com) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 14, 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 March 17, 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 18, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 7, 2025. The Response was filed with the Center on April 1, 2025.


The Center appointed Assen Alexiev as the sole panelist in this matter on April 10, 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 publishing house and press group created in 1980. It publishes various printed books and magazines for children, which are being distributed in France, Belgium, Luxembourg, Switzerland, Morocco, Tunisia, New Caledonia, France, Martinique, France, Guadeloupe, France and French Polynesia under the brand MILAN, displayed in the top left corner of each publication. The Complainant also offers online games and activities, written contents and articles for parents and adults, competitions and other events through the domain names <milanpresse.com>, registered on April 21, 1996, and <milanjeunesse.com>, registered on November 10, 2010, both of which resolve to its official website at “www.milan-jeunesse.com”, which also displays the brand MILAN at its top left corner. Since 2004, the Complainant is owned by the press and publishing group BAYARD, which is present in 16 countries.

The Complainant is the owner of the following trademark registrations:

– the French trademark  with registration No. 3457451, registered on October 18, 2006 for goods and services in International Classes 9, 16 (including for newspapers, periodicals, magazines, journals, books, printed matter, etc.), 35, 38 (including for telecommunications, press and information services) and 41 (the “MILAN JEUNESSE trademark”); and

– the French trademark  with registration No. 3457442, registered on October 18, 2006 for goods and services in International Classes 9, 16 (including newspapers, periodicals, magazines, journals, books, printed matter, etc.), 35, 38 (including telecommunications, press and information services) and 41 (the “MILAN PRESSE trademark”).

The disputed domain name was registered on June 17, 2024. It resolves to an English language website with the heading “MILAN JOURNAL”, which contains diverse articles about various personalities and topics related to fashion, film, music and other industries.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademarks, because it reproduces entirely their distinctive and dominant element “MILAN” in combination with the dictionary word “journal”, which is closely related to the business of the Complainant and is a synonym of the term “press” (the English equivalent of the French word “presse”) that is part of the Complainant’s trademark MILAN PRESSE. The Complainant adds that the disputed domain name is also confusingly similar to its domain names <milanjeunesse.com> and <milanpresse.com>.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, because the Complainant has not authorized it to use its trademarks or to register any domain name with the element “MILAN” for the publication of online content and there is no relationship between the Parties. According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name is not being used for bona fide activities but was chosen to take advantage of the Complainant’s goodwill. It points out that the disputed domain name resolves to a website with articles and written publications and contents, which activity is identical to the activity of the Complainant and may mislead Internet users to believe that the content on the Respondent’s website originates from the Complainant.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. It maintains that its trademarks have an indisputable reputation because of their longstanding use, the importance of their exploitation and the extent of the advertising and promotional effort made for their communication, and notes that they long predate the registration of the disputed domain name.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademarks when it registered the disputed domain name, which is evident from the fact that the disputed domain name includes the term "journal" that directly refers to the Complainant's business activity, and intentionally attempts to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the website at the disputed domain name by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks. The Complainant points out that the website at the disputed domain name directly targets the Complainant's field of activity and enhances the false impression that the disputed domain name is related to the Complainant. According to the Complainant, Internet users are likely to believe that the disputed domain name and the associated website originate from the Complainant and adds that the top results of a Google search of the terms "milan journal" are directly related to the Complainant.

The Complainant adds that it sent a cease-and-desist letter on November 18, 2024 to the Respondent, but never received any response.

B. Respondent

The Respondent states that it is the owner of Milan Journal - a fashion blog focused on providing fashion-related content and articles. The Respondent maintains that the disputed domain name was registered in good faith to reflect the fashion-related content of the associated website, and that it is being used solely for the purpose of offering a platform for fashion enthusiasts, without intent to infringe on the Complainant's brand, to deceive consumers, or to cause confusion.

The Respondent states that its branding, website content, and logo are completely independent of the Complainant's, and notes that the Complainant operates in the children's publishing industry, focusing primarily on educational content, children's books, and magazines, while the Respondent operates in the fashion blogging sector, offering content related to fashion, style, and lifestyle. The Respondent notes that target audiences for both businesses are entirely separated and not overlapping, making it unlikely that a user would confuse the two brands. The Respondent adds that the Complainant has failed to provide any evidence of actual confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademarks.

The Respondent submits that "Milan" and "journal" are common terms, as "Milan" is widely associated with fashion due to the city's international reputation as a fashion capital, while "journal" is a general term used for blogs, articles, and publications, and describes the type of content provided by the Respondent. It adds that many businesses, blogs, and brands and fashion events, including the Milan Fashion Week, use "Milan" in their branding to denote style, elegance, and fashion-forward thinking, and that "Milan" is a generic term in the fashion industry that cannot be exclusively claimed by the Complainant. The Respondent adds that the term "journal" is commonly used to denote any regularly recurring content, and in the case of the Respondent's website, its use aligns with its focus on fashion blogging, which is a distinct industry from the Complainant's publishing business for children. The Respondent also submits that "journal" is an English word, while "presse" and "jeunesse" are French words that are not its synonyms. According to the Respondent, this linguistic difference shows that there is no intentional infringement or attempt to mislead the target audience.

The Respondent denies having received any cease-and-desist letter from the Complainant.

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 MILAN PRESSE and MILAN JEUNESSE trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the distinctive “MILAN” element of the MILAN PRESSE and MILAN JEUNESSE trademarks is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the MILAN PRESSE and MILAN JEUNESSE trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, “journal”) may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the MILAN PRESSE and MILAN JEUNESSE trademarks 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

Since the Complainant has failed to establish that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, it is not necessary to address this element.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s MILAN PRESSE and MILAN JEUNESSE trademarks, as it includes the distinctive element “MILAN” of these trademarks in combination with the dictionary word “journal” which is connected to the word “presse” included in the Complainant’s MILAN PRESSE trademark and which is itself included in the scope of protection of the same trademark. The Respondent uses the disputed domain name for a website that publishes various articles about diverse topics and personalities, and this activity is also included in the scope of protection of the Complainant’s trademarks.

The “Milan” element of the disputed domain name however also coincides with the name of the Italian city of Milan, and its combination with the “journal” element can be understood as meaning a “journal related to the city of Milan”. The Respondent explains that its website is a blog with fashion-related content and that it has included “Milan” in the disputed domain name because the city of Milan has reputation as a fashion capital. It also refers to its Instagram profile with the name “giornaledimilano” (Italian for “journal of Milan”) which contains the following description of its website:

*“Milan Journal - Arren Publications
News & media website
Milan’s Heartbeat | Your daily dose of city life, culture, and luxury.
milanjournal.com”*

At the same time, it seems reasonable to regard the Complainant’s trademarks as being composed of a geographical term and a dictionary term, and the Complainant uses them to designate its activity as an editor of French speaker children’s books and magazines, while the Respondent uses the disputed domain name for a website that contains online articles about fashion, personalities, home decoration, culture, and these articles appear to be intended for an English speaking adult audience. The Parties’ respective websites have very different layouts, styles and colors, and the Respondent’s website does not reproduce the Complainant’s logo or anyhow refer to the Complainant.

Considering the above, there is no evidence to contradict the Respondent’s assertion that it has chosen to include “Milan” in the disputed domain name as it may evoke fashion due to the connection between Milan and the fashion industry, and not as a reference to the Complainant or its trademarks.

It therefore does not appear as more likely than not that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name with an intent to target the Complainant's trademarks. Since intent is a necessary element of cybersquatting, this means that a finding of bad faith under the Policy cannot be made. It may be speculated that there may be grounds for a finding of trademark infringement (which may take place even without intent), but the Panel's mission is not to take decisions on this issue, which should be left to the courts of competent jurisdiction.

The Panel therefore finds that the Complainant has not established the third element of the Policy.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Assen Alexiev/

Assen Alexiev

Sole Panelist

Date: April 25, 2025