

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Louis Vuitton Malletier v. Yael Yahav, Whois Secure Ltd.  
Case No. D2025-2445

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Louis Vuitton Malletier, France, represented by Studio Barbero S.p.A., Italy.

The Respondent is Yael Yahav, Whois Secure Ltd., Israel.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <lousvuitton.com> is registered with Key-Systems GmbH (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 20, 2025. On June 20, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 25, 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 (On behalf of lousvuitton.com OWNER c/o whoisproxy.com / SPM Brand Protection LTD) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 27, 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 amendment to the Complaint on July 1, 2025.

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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 3, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 23, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 24, 2025.

The Center appointed Tobias Zuberbühler as the sole panelist in this matter on July 29, 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 in the present proceeding is Louis Vuitton Malletier, a French fashion house part of the multinational luxury goods conglomerate LVMH Moët Hennessy Louis Vuitton.

The Complainant owns trademark registrations in various jurisdictions, including the International trademark LOUIS VUITTON (Reg. No. 416052, registered on June 19, 1975).

The disputed domain name was registered on January 8, 2010, and has been redirected since its registration to parking pages featuring sponsored links and/or offering the disputed domain name for sale.

#### **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.

##### **B. Respondent**

The Respondent has not submitted any 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. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

A domain name is "identical or confusingly similar" to a trademark for the purposes of the Policy when the domain name includes the trademark, or a confusingly similar approximation, regardless of other terms in the domain name (*Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Richard MacLeod d/b/a For Sale*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0662](#)). This includes the omission of the first letter "i" in the Complainant's LOUIS VUITTON trademark, which is considered as a misspelling of a trademark (i.e., "typosquatting"). [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9.

The Panel finds that 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 that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant’s prima facie showing and has not come forward with any evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise. The Panel also notes that the disputed domain name is a misspelling of the Complainant’s LOUIS VUITTON trademark by omitting the first letter “i” in and that there is a risk that Internet users will not notice the subtle misspelling. In the present case, the Panel therefore finds that the composition of the disputed domain name creates a risk of user confusion.

The Panel finds that 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 disputed domain name constitutes a misspelling of the Complainant’s prior registered LOUIS VUITTON trademark by omitting the first letter “i.” The difference between the two is rather subtle. Therefore, under the circumstances of this case, it is more likely than not that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant’s trademark when registering the disputed domain name and was engaged in an attempt to mislead Internet users into believing that the disputed domain name may be associated with the Complainant.

The disputed domain name has been redirected since its registration to parking pages featuring sponsored links and/or offering the disputed domain name for sale. Considering the reputation of the Complainant’s trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name and the lack of the Response from the Respondent, the Panel finds that the current use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith registration and use 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 <lousvuitton.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Tobias Zuberbühler/*

**Tobias Zuberbühler**

Sole Panelist

Date: August 12, 2025