

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

TELEVISION FRANCAISE 1 v. Cristina Aparecida de Faria Mazzini Case No. D2025-1791

1. The Parties

The Complainant is TELEVISION FRANCAISE 1, France, represented by AARPI Scan Avocats, France.

The Respondent is Cristina Aparecida de Faria Mazzini, Brazil.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <tf1info.shop> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 5, 2025. On May 5, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 6, 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 (Domain Admin / Privacy Protect, LLC (PrivacyProtect.org)) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 6, 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 May 13, 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 May 13, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 2, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 3, 2025.

The Center appointed Jacques de Werra as the sole panelist in this matter on June 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 company operating in the field of production and broadcasting of TV programs which was founded in 1974 and operates the first and oldest television channel in France under the brand TF1. TF1 is the most watched television channel in Europe.

The Complainant is the registered owner of multiple trademarks for TF1 that have been registered in France and in other jurisdictions since the early 1980s, including the following trademarks:

- International semi-figurative trademark including the verbal term TF1 registered on July 30, 1990, under No. 556537 (duly renewed) in classes 9, 16, 25, 28, 35, 38 and 41;
- French word trademark TF1 registered on November 22, 1984 under No. 1290436 (duly renewed) in classes 1 – 42;
- International semi-figurative trademark including the two verbal terms TF1 INFO registered on April 22, 2022, under No. 1676495 in classes 9, 35, 38, 41 and 42.

The Complainant owns and operates various domain names including the following ones: <tf1.com> (registered on April 2, 1998) and <tf1info.com> (registered on August 27, 2009).

The disputed domain name was registered on February 28, 2025. It resolves to a webpage featuring the term “tf1info.shop” (which corresponds to the disputed domain name) at the top of the page followed by the following text: *“Blog Hello world! Welcome to WordPress. This is your first post. Edit or delete it, then start writing!”*.

The Complainant sent a formal notice email to the contact details of the initially identified registrant (i.e., the privacy service provider that was initially identified as the owner of the disputed domain name) on March 11, 2025, with a reminder on April 4, 2025. No response was received.

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 it is the owner of numerous well-known TF1 trademarks and domain names registered prior to the date of registration of the disputed domain name, that the disputed domain name is identical or at least confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark as it wholly incorporates it with the sole addition of the descriptive word “info”, the gTLD being disregarded due to its purely technical function.

The Complainant further contends that it has never given any authorization or permission to the Respondent to register or to use the Trademark, that the Respondent is not in any way related to the Complainant’s business, is not one of its distributors and does not carry out any activity for or has any business with it and that the Respondent is not currently known under the name and/or brand TF1 and does not own any

trademark right corresponding to that name. In addition, the disputed domain name is not used for a bona fide offering of goods and services by the Respondent.

The Complainant further alleges that the TF1 trademarks were registered and used in France and abroad many years before the disputed domain name was registered, that such domain name is identical or at least confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark and that the Respondent does not own any right on the name TF1 and is not authorized to use the Complainant's trademark. The Respondent furthermore could not ignore the Complainant's prior rights in view of its reputation and the distinctive character of the TF1 trademarks, especially considering the addition of the word "info" within the disputed domain name. The mere absence of any right or legitimate interest of the Respondent in the disputed domain name demonstrates that the disputed domain name has not been registered or used in good faith. The initially identified registrant of the disputed domain name furthermore never answered the Complainant's formal notice. Consequently, the Complainant claims that the disputed domain name was registered and is used in bad faith by the Respondent.

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 a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy (i.e., the Trademark). [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the International semi-figurative TFI INFO Trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. The Panel notes in this respect that the disputed domain name replicates the two verbal elements TF1 and INFO contained in this International semi-figurative trademark so that the disputed domain name is quasi-identical to this trademark owned by the Complainant.

Considering the other TF1 trademarks, although the addition of a term, here "info", 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 TF1 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

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 name. The Respondent - who has not participated in the proceedings - 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.

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.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3.

In this case, the Panel notes that the Respondent has not actively used the disputed domain name. However, having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's trademarks, and the composition of the disputed domain name which prominently features the Trademarks, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

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 <tf1info.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Jacques de Werra/

Jacques de Werra

Sole Panelist

Date: June 26, 2025