

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

ETABLISSEMENTS RICHARD PONTVERT ET CIE v. Emilie Adams Case No. D2025-1471

1. The Parties

1.1 The Complainant is ETABLISSEMENTS RICHARD PONTVERT ET CIE, France, represented by CABINET LAVOIX, France.

1.2 The Respondent is Emilie Adams, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

2.1 The disputed domain name <chaussuresparaboot.com> (the "Domain Name") is registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

3.1 The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on April 10, 2025. At that time, publicly available Whois details did not identify the underlying registrant of the Domain Name.

3.2 On April 11, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On April 13, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing underlying registrant and contact information for the Domain Name. The Center sent an email to the Complainant on April 15, 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 April 15, 2025.

3.3 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").

3.4 In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on April 16, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 6, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 13, 2025.

3.5 The Center appointed Matthew S. Harris as the sole panelist in this matter on May 21, 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

4.1 The Complainant is a French “société anonyme à conseil d’administration” (limited company with a board of directors), whose head office is located in Saint-Jean-de-Moirans, France. It has sold footwear under the name “Paraboot” since the 1920s. These products are sold and promoted from a website operating from the domain name <paraboot.com>, which the Complainant has held since December 25, 1999.

4.2 The Complainant’s sales were reported in 2023 to be EUR 24.5 million, with 35% of those sales in Asia and 60% in Europe.

4.3 The Complainant is the owner of numerous trade marks that comprise or incorporate the term “Paraboot”. These include:

(i) European Union trade mark n°001434307 with a filing date of December 21, 1999 and a registration date of February 12, 2001 for PARABOOT as a word mark in class 18.

(ii) International trade mark n°1249091 with a registration date of March 17, 2015 in classes 18 and 25, which has proceeded to registration in 14 territories (including the European Union, United States and China) and which takes the following form:



(the “Paraboot Logo”).

4.4 The Domain Name was registered on June 12, 2024. It has been used since registration for a French language website that prominently displays at the top of the page the Paraboot Logo. This website purports to sell the Complainant’s footwear at prices approximately 70% lower than the usual prices for those products. None of the copies of the pages from the website provided by the Complainant, identify any other person or entity operating that website and it is no longer active as at the date of this decision.

4.5 The registered address provided for the Domain Name, purports to be on a street in Little Rock, Arkansas, United States, but that street does not exist.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

5.1 The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Name. It contends that the Domain Name comprises its registered mark and the French word for shoes, and therefore is confusingly similar to that mark. It further contends that Internet users will believe the Domain Name to be “simply a variation” of the Complainant’s <paraboot.com> domain name, and that the website operating from the Domain Name is “fraudulent” and creates “a serious risk for the consumer”. In the circumstances, the Complainant claims that the Respondent does not have a right or legitimate interest in the Domain Name and that the Domain Name has been registered and used in bad faith.

5.2 The Complainant also relies inter alia on the fictitious registration address provided for the Domain Name as supporting its contentions as to bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

6.1 It is generally 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 trade mark and the Domain Name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 1.7.

6.2 The Panel finds the Complainant has clearly shown rights in registered trade marks that comprise or incorporate the term "Paraboot". [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

6.3 The Panel also accepts that the Domain Name can most sensibly be understood as the term "Paraboot" in combination with the word "chaussures" and the ".com" generic Top-Level Domain ("TLD").

6.4 Accordingly, the Complainant's mark is reproduced in its entirety and is recognisable within the Domain Name and the Panel accepts that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7.

6.5 Although the addition of other terms (in this case, the word "chaussures") 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 Domain Name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

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

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests and Registered and Used in Bad Faith

6.7 It is usual for panels under the Policy to consider the issues of rights or legitimate interests and registration and use in bad faith in turn. However, in this case it is more convenient to consider those issues together. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.15.

6.8 The Domain Name in this case can most sensibly be read as a combination of the Complainant's mark PARABOOT, the French word "chaussures" which describes the products sold by the Complainant under that mark, and the ".com" TLD. The form of the Domain Name is such that the Panel is also satisfied that the Respondent intended the Domain Name to be read that way, particularly given the extent of the Complainant's business at the time that the Domain Name was registered. That this was the intention of the Respondent is also clear from the website that has operated from the Domain Name, which purports to offer for sale the Complainant's products.

6.9 The Complainant contends that the website operating is "fraudulent". What exactly is meant by that claim is not clear. The Complainant's reference to the unusually low price at which the Complainant's products is perhaps intended to suggest that the products offered for sale are either counterfeit or not provided to consumers, but neither are expressly alleged by the Complainant.

6.10 However, whatever the Complainant intends by that claim, the Panel is satisfied that the way in which the Domain Name has been used, and the website operating from the Domain Name, is deceptive and deliberately so. In particular, the Panel accepts that the content of the website is deliberately designed to lead Internet users to believe that they have reached a website operated or endorsed by the Complainant when that is not the case. This includes the prominent display of the Complainant's Paraboot Logo in a manner that suggests that this is the Complainant's own website, and the fact that there is no obvious indication that this website is operated by a third party.

6.11 There is no right or legitimate interest in holding and using a domain name to deliberately mislead Internet users into believing that the domain name is held and being used by a trade mark owner when it is not ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#) section 2.13.1) and such holding and use provides positive evidence that no such rights or legitimate interest exists. The registration and use of a domain name for such a purpose is also registration and use in bad faith (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4). The Respondent's operation of the website from the Domain Name also falls within the circumstances evidencing bad faith registration and use set out at paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

6.12 Further, the fact that the Domain Name has been registered with a fictitious address also supports a finding of lack of rights or legitimate interests and bad faith registration and use (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 2.5, 3.2.1 and 3.6).

6.13 The Panel, therefore, finds the second and third elements of the Policy have been established.

7. Decision

7.1 For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the Domain Name <chaussuresparaboot.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Matthew S. Harris/

Matthew S. Harris

Sole Panelist

Date: May 28, 2025