

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Showroomprive.com v. Sophie Rochat, Showdress
Case No. D2025-2281

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Showroomprive.com, France, represented by STRATO-IP, France.

The Respondent is Sophie Rochat, Showdress, United Arab Emirates.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <showdressprive.com> is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 11, 2025. On June 12, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 17, 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 (Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0174447351) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 17, 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 June 18, 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 June 20, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 10, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 11, 2025.

The Center appointed Wilson Pinheiro Jabur as the sole panelist in this matter on July 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

The Complainant is a French e-commerce company that specializes in online flash sales of fashion, beauty, home and travel brands through its official website available at <showroomprive.com>, currently using the following logo:



The Complainant is the owner of the European Union trademark registration No. 005761374 for the word mark SHOWROOMPRIVE.COM, filed on March 5, 2007, registered on January 23, 2008, subsequently renewed, in classes 25, 35 and 38 (Annex 9 to the Complaint).

The disputed domain name was registered on March 22, 2025, and presently resolves to an active online shop purportedly offering goods from famous brands at discounted prices and displaying a similar logo to that of the Complainant:



Prior to this dispute, the Complainant sent on May 28, 2025, a formal notice to the Respondent, which remains unanswered (Annex 8 to the Complaint).

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 asserts to operate a very successful e-commerce platform that presently counts with over 3000 partnerships with brands, having achieved an annual turnover of EUR 677 million in 2023. In addition to that, the Complainant affirms that its trademark SHOWROOMPRIVE.COM is an extremely reputed trademark, having achieved an 85% reputation rate in France in 2021.

The Complainant contends it became aware of the disputed domain name, which is being used in connection with a website that reproduces the visual markers of the official showroomprive.com website, imitating its trademarks and offering handbags bearing famous brands at significantly discounted prices.

In the Complainant's view, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's rights in SHOWROOMPRIVE.COM, the only difference lying in the replacement of the term "room" for the term "dress" which is highly suggestive of the products sold by the Complainant and therefore is not sufficient to distinguish the disputed domain name from the Complainant's earlier trademark.

As to the lack of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, the Complainant asserts that:

- i. the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant in any way, nor has it been granted a license or otherwise been authorized by the Complainant to use its SHOWROOMPRIVE.COM trademark or any similar signs, including in a domain name registration, email address, trademarked content publishing or trademarked goods sales offers;
- ii. the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, as shown by the information listed in the Whois extract related to the disputed domain name;
- iii. the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, given that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to operate a website which imitates the Complainant's trademark and logo without its authorization, in addition to reproducing the most relevant visual markers of the Complainant's official website, operating in the exact same activity as that of the Complainant; and
- iv. Internet users who ordered at the Respondent's website complained online about never having received any products (<https://fr.trustpilot.com/review/showdressprive.com>).

The Complainant further asserts that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith and continues to use it in bad faith, given that the website available at the disputed domain name: (i) imitates the Complainant's SHOWROOMPRIVE.COM trademark and logo; (ii) imitates the look and feel of the Complainant's official website; and (iii) operates the exact same activity as that of the Complainant. The Respondent has therefore intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's SHOWROOMPRIVE.COM trademark and associated products, leading Internet users to believe that the disputed domain name is in some way affiliated to the Complainant when it is not.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy sets forth three requirements, which have to be met for this Panel to order the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant must prove in this administrative proceeding that each of the aforesaid three elements is present in order to obtain the transfer of the disputed domain name.

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. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the SHOWROOMPRIVE.COM mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. Although the addition of other terms (“dress” instead of “room”) 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 mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The content of the website associated with the disputed domain name confirms the confusing similarity as it appears prima facie that the Respondent seeks to target the Complainant’s trademark through the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.15.

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.

In that sense, and according to the evidence submitted, the Complainant has made a prima facie case against the Respondent who is not affiliated with the Complainant in any way, nor has it been granted a license or otherwise been authorized by the Complainant to use its SHOWROOMPRIVE.COM trademark or any similar signs, including in a domain name registration, email address, trademarked content publishing or trademarked goods sales offers.

Also, the lack of evidence as to any trademarks registered by the Respondent corresponding to the disputed domain name corroborates the indication of an absence of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity such as impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1. The Panel notes the use of the disputed domain name and particularly the similarity between the logo displayed on the Respondent’s website compared to the Complainant’s logo. In these circumstances, Panel considers that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name to take an unfair advantage of the similarities with the Complainant’s trademark.

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.

This case presents the following circumstances which indicate on the balance of probabilities bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name:

- a) the Respondent has been using the disputed domain name in connection with a website purportedly offering goods from famous brands at discounted prices displaying a similar logo to that of the Complainant in addition to a similar look-and-feel to that of the Complainant's official website, thus creating a high degree of likelihood of confusion;
- b) the Respondent has not responded to this procedure;
- c) the Respondent did not reply to the formal notice sent prior to this dispute; and
- d) the use of what appears to be a false address for the registration of the disputed domain name, preventing the Center from being able to deliver the Written Notice to the Respondent.

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 <showdressprive.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Wilson Pinheiro Jabur/

Wilson Pinheiro Jabur

Sole Panelist

Date: July 28, 2025