

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

BAI BRETAGNE ANGLETERRE IRLANDE v. Domain Admin

Case No. D2025-1964

1. The Parties

Complainant is BAI Bretagne Angleterre Irlande, France, represented by Selarl Avoxa Rennes, France.

Respondent is Domain Admin, Panama.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <britannyferries.com> (the “Domain Name”) 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 May 16, 2025. On May 16, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On the same day, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name, which differed from named Respondent (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on May 20, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on the same day.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 21, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 10, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on June 11, 2025.

The Center appointed Clive L. Elliott K.C., as the sole panelist in this matter on June 17, 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

Complainant is a registered public limited company with a management board and supervisory board, whose head office is located in Roscoff, France.

Complainant is the registered owner of the mark BRITTANY FERRIES (“Complainant’s Mark”) as follows:

Mark	Jurisdiction	Registration No.	Registration Date	Classes
	France	96620313	September 20, 1996	36, 39, 43

Complainant is also the owner of several domain names comprising Complainant’s Mark, and these domain names are active in the field of passengers and freight transport and are regularly consulted by Internet users.

According to the publicly available WhoIs, the Domain Name was registered on October 20, 2001, and at the date of the Complaint, the Domain Name resolved to a parking page showing links related to Complainant’s area of businesses including some of the links, when clicked, referred to competitors’ sites.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Name.

Notably, Complainant contends that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to Complainant’s Mark as it reproduces Complainant’s Mark phonetically, with spelling errors, for example, it has a doubling of the consonant “n” in the Domain Name instead of the doubling of the consonant “t” (“Britanny” instead of “Brittany”). When searched online for the word “Britanny” it does not exist and instead “Brittany” is proposed. This, Complainant asserts, is a case of typosquatting and creates a likelihood of confusion.

Complainant points out that the website attached to the Domain Name is a parking page with links to travel by ferries to France cruises, including a link to Complainant’s own website for Brittany Ferries. Complainant submits that Respondent is cybersquatting and has knowingly chosen the Domain Name in order to deceive Internet users and to benefit from Complainant’s notoriety.

Complainant goes on to contend that the Domain Name allows access to a website with dynamic content that changes depending on the IP address and the client’s browser. For example, by consulting the site at other times, it is possible to access dubious content, gift scams, X sites, fake virus scams, etc. Complainant claims that it obtained a bailiff’s report, where it is reported having gained access to a fraudulent website when trying to gain access to the Domain Name.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

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 Complainant's Mark and the Domain Name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

Complainant has used and registered Complainant's Mark and shown rights in respect of a trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

Complainant's Mark is, for all intents and purposes, incorporated within the Domain Name. The Domain Name differs only to the extent of two subtle spelling errors, a doubling of the consonant "n" instead of the doubling of the consonant "t". Complainant submits that, notwithstanding this change, the Domain Name is confusingly similar to Complainant's Mark. The Panel accepts the merit of this argument and finds that this is a case of typosquatting and the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7. and 1.9.

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 Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a 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 respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name (although the burden of proof always remains on complainant). If respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

The Panel finds Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Respondent has not challenged Complainant's prima facie showing and has not provided an argument or relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name, such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

In the present case, it is evidenced that the website attached to the Domain Name is a parking page with links to travel by ferries to France cruises, including a link to Complainant's own website for Brittany Ferries. This indicates that there is no bona fide offering of goods or services. In addition, it carries a risk that the Domain Name may be used to impersonate Complainant. In this regard, the composition of the Domain Name, incorporating Complainant's Mark but with small typographical changes and Internet users may not notice the subtle difference between the Domain Name and Complainant's Mark, gives rise to a risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

Additionally, there is no evidence that Respondent is commonly known by the Domain Name.

Accordingly, 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.

The Panel notes that the composition of the Domain Name, incorporating Complainant's Mark, but with insignificant typographical changes, suggests Respondent knew of and sought to take advantage of Complainant's Mark when deliberately modifying Complainant's Mark and registering the Domain Name.

As noted above, Respondent has not put forward any credible explanation for the choice of the Domain Name. Absent such explanation, the Panel considers that there is a significant risk that communications originating from or associated with the Domain Name would be misleading or deceptive, falsely suggesting a connection with Complainant noting the difference between the Domain Name and Complainant's Mark is very subtle.

In addition, the use of the Domain Name for a website with pay-per-click links which capitalize on the reputation of Complainant's Mark constitutes bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel finds that 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 Domain Name <britannyferries.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Clive L. Elliott K.C./

Clive L. Elliott K.C.

Sole Panelist

Date: July 2, 2025