

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

L'Oréal v. 小海

Case No. D2025-1488

1. The Parties

The Complainant is L'Oréal, France, represented by Dreyfus & associés, France.

The Respondent is 小海, Thailand.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <lancomebet.info> and <lancomebet.org> are registered with Dynadot Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on April 11, 2025. On April 11, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On April 14, 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 (Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 16, 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 22, 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 April 25, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 15, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 19, 2025.

The Center appointed Reyes Campello Estebanz as the sole panelist in this matter on June 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 is a French cosmetics industrial group that operates internationally under a portfolio of 37 brands, being one of them the LANCÔME brand. The Complainant covers all lines of cosmetics, including hair care, colouring, skincare, make-up, and perfume, and employs 86,000 employees organized in various divisions that manage the different brands.

The Complainant's Lancôme division was founded in 1935, and, since then, the brand has become one of the worldwide leading beauty skincare, makeup, and perfume brands. It is commercialized internationally, including in China, where the division operates since 1997 through a subsidiary headquartered in Shanghai, and has several offices in other five cities with more than 10,000 employees.

The Complainant holds numerous trademark registrations for its LANCÔME brand, including:

- Chinese Trademark Registration No. 775926, LANCÔME, registered on January 14, 1995, in class 42;
- International Trademark Registration No. 1679731, LANCOME, registered on dated June 1, 2022, in classes 3, 9, 35, and 41;
- United States Trademark Registration No. 7453776, LANCOME, registered on July 23, 2024, in classes 3, 9, 35, and 41; and
- United States Trademark Registration No. 425129, LANCÔME, registered on November 5, 1946, in class 3; (hereinafter collectively referred as the "LANCÔME mark").

Prior decisions under the Policy have recognized the worldwide reputation and famous character of the LANCÔME mark.¹

The Complainant and its affiliates further own and operate, among other domain names reflecting its LANCÔME mark, the domain name <lancome.com> (registered on July 8, 1997), which resolves to its official website and online store.

The disputed domain names were registered on March 10, 2025, and they resolve to similar websites, in the Portuguese language, that prominently display the terms "Lancomebet" or "Lancome bet" at their headings and within their content, and purportedly offer online casino, gambling and betting services. The website linked to the disputed domain name <lancomebet.info> includes within its content references to the domain name <lancomebet.com>, requires the registration and login of the Internet users, and redirects them to a different website which access is restricted. The website linked to the disputed domain name <lancomebet.org> requires registration to access to the offered services. None of these websites includes any information about their owner or respective owners, nor do they include any information about the owner of the disputed domain names.

On March 19, 2025, the Complainant sent a blocking request to the Registrar via email and online form, requesting the deactivation the disputed domain names, with no response despite several reminders.

¹See, e.g., *Lancôme Parfums et Beauté & Cie Snc v. Value-Domain com*, Value Domain, WIPO Case No. [D2013-0518](#); *Lancôme Parfums Beauté et compagnie v. Eva Lee / YinSi BaoHu Yi KaiQi*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-0478](#); and *L'Oréal, Lancôme Parfums Et Beauté & Compagnie v. Emir Kurtovic, Agencija Raptor*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-2639](#).

On March 26, 2025, the Complainant sent another notification to the hosting company of the websites linked to the disputed domain names, asserting its trademark rights and requesting the deactivation of the Respondent's websites. The Complainant received no response despite several reminders.

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 the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its well-known trademark, as they reproduce the LANCÔME mark in its entirety with the adjunction of the term "bet". Internet users will likely be confused into believing the disputed domain names are endorsed by the Complainant. The generic Top-Level Domains ("gTLDs") here, ".info" and ".org", are irrelevant in determining confusing similarity.

The Complainant further contends the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. The Respondent is neither affiliated to the Complainant nor has it been authorized to use the LANCÔME mark, and it is not commonly known by the disputed domain names or the name "Lancôme", so no actual or contemplated bona fide or legitimate use of the disputed domain names could reasonably be claimed. The disputed domain names are not used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, but to resolve to online gambling websites that deceive users into believing there is any connection between these websites and the Complainant or its trademark.

The Complainant finally contends the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. Due to the worldwide well-known character of the LANCÔME mark and the composition of the disputed domain names, it is implausible the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant and its trademark when it registered the disputed domain names. It was the Respondent's duty to verify that the registration of the disputed domain names would not infringe the rights of any third party, and any trademark search or any search over the Internet would have revealed the Complainant and its trademark. The Respondent's primary motive in registering and using the disputed domain names is to capitalize on or otherwise take advantage of the LANCÔME mark. The disputed domain names direct users to fraudulent websites displaying the Complainant's trademark and featuring a login page where users are prompted to log into their accounts for online gaming, which demonstrates the Respondent's intention to benefit from the Complainant's reputation with opportunistic bad faith, and, potentially, collect user's sensitive data for phishing purposes.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

The Complainant has made the relevant assertions as required by the Policy and the dispute is properly within the scope of the Policy. The Panel has authority to decide the dispute examining the three elements in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, taking into consideration all of the relevant evidence, annexed materials and allegations, and performing some limited independent research under the general powers of the Panel articulated, inter alia, in paragraph 10 of the Rules.

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 names. 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 a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy, namely the LANCÔME mark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark (without the circumflex accent over the letter “o”, “ô”) is reproduced within the disputed domain names with the addition of the term “bet”. Accordingly, the Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names, and the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other term here, the word “bet”, 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 names and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Therefore, 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.

The Panel notes the Respondent’s name does not share any similarity with the disputed domain names or the terms “Lancôme” or “Lancome”.

The Panel further notes the term “Lancôme” (and “Lancome”) is a distinctive name with no particular meaning in French, Chinese, Thai or any language. The Panel under its general powers has consulted the origin of the LANCÔME mark, which, according to various sources, was inspired by the name of Le Château and the forest of Lancosme in the Indre valley, region of Brenne, France.²

The Panel further finds the fact that the Respondent’s websites do not provide any information about their owner creates a risk that Internet users may think the websites at the disputed domain names are somehow related to the Complainant, which supports a potential intention on the Respondent to deceive Internet users, which cannot confer rights or legitimate interests under the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel finds nothing in the record indicates the Respondent may have any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names, and thus the second element of the Policy has been established.

²See, e.g., an article in Vogue India, at <https://www.vogue.in/content/exclusive-80-years-lancome-film>; or the Wikipedia page related to the history of the LANCÔME mark at <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lanc%C3%B4me#:~:text=The%20name%20%22Lanc%C3%B4me%22%20was%20inspired,of%20the%20single%20golden%20rose>.

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 names in bad faith.

In the present case, the Panel notes LANCÔME mark is worldwide famous and it has been continually used over decades (since 1935). The Panel further notes this reputed trademark is used in Thailand where the Respondent is located according to the Registrar's verification. The Panel, under its general powers, has conducted a search over the Internet for the terms "Lancome" and "Thailand" revealing numerous platforms and online shop websites selling the Complainant's LANCÔME cosmetics in this country.³

The Panel finds the circumstances of this case point to the Respondent's bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain names, its knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark, and a targeting to the LANCÔME mark in bad faith, with the intention to profit from its success and international recognition. The Panel finds the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain names with opportunistic bad faith, with the intention to increase the traffic to its websites and probably to perform any type of phishing or other type of fraud.

The fact the Complainant's LANCÔME trademark is inherently distinctive and well known, and the identical reproduction of this mark (without the circumflex accent, which it is not possible to be reproduced within a domain name), together with all other circumstances of this case, point to the Respondent's bad faith under the Policy. These circumstances include: (i) the fact that the disputed domain names resolve to websites that prominently include "Lancome" and do not share any information about their owner; (ii) the Respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names; (ii) the fact that the initial registration of the disputed domain names through a privacy service; and (v) the fact that it has not come forward to refute the Complainant's allegations of bad faith.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names with opportunistic bad faith to increase the traffic to its websites for unfair commercial gain.

The Panel further considers, according to the Complainant's allegations, the restricted access and login registration requirements on the Respondent's websites together with the type of purportedly offered services, which imply the use of credit cards and other methods of payment, implies obtaining sensitive financial information from users that could easily be used in any type of phishing or other fraud. Such conduct, if it were true, constitutes bad faith under the Policy ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4). The Panel finds, however, there is not sufficient evidence in the record to consider the Respondent is involved in any fraud.

The mere registration and use of the disputed domain names targeting the Complainant and its trademark to increase the traffic to the Respondent's websites for commercial gain is sufficient to consider the Respondent has acted in bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. Accordingly, having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under the Policy, and the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

³Noting in particular the general powers of a panel articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the UDRP Rules, it has been accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record if it would consider such information useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.8.

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 <lancomebet.info> and <lancomebet.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Reyes Campello Estebaranz/

Reyes Campello Estebaranz

Sole Panelist

Date: June 17, 2025