

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Groupe La Centrale v. Tung Truong
Case No. D2025-2611

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Groupe La Centrale, France, represented by MIIP – MADE IN IP, France.

The Respondent is Tung Truong, Viet Nam.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lacentral.info> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in French with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 3, 2025. On July 4, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 7, 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 (Registration Private, Domains by Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 8, 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 July 11, 2025.

On July 17, 2025, the Center informed the Parties in French and English, that the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain name is English. On July 22, 2025, the Complainant submitted the amended Complaint translated into English. Following the Center’s invitation to rectify certain information in the Complaint, the Complainant filed a second amended Complaint in English on July 25, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaints 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 28, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5,

the due date for Response was August 17, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 19, 2025.

The Center appointed Edoardo Fano as the sole panelist in this matter on August 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.

The Panel has not received any requests from the Complainant or the Respondent regarding further submissions, waivers or extensions of deadlines, and the Panel has not found it necessary to request any further information from the Parties.

Having reviewed the communication records in the case file provided by the Center, the Panel finds that the Center has discharged its responsibility under the Rules, paragraph 2(a) "to employ reasonably available means calculated to achieve actual notice to [the] Respondent". Therefore, the Panel shall issue its Decision based upon the Complaint, the Policy, the Rules and the Supplemental Rules and without the benefit of a response from the Respondent.

The language of the proceeding is English, being the language of the Registration Agreement, as per paragraph 11(a) of the Rules.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is Groupe La Centrale (formerly Car & Boat Media), a French company operating in the automobile classified ads field, and owning several trademark registrations for LA CENTRALE, among which the following ones:

- French Trademark Registration No. 99832003 for LA CENTRALE and design, registered on December 29, 1999;
- French Trademark Registration No. 3036751 for LA CENTRALE, registered on June 23, 2000; and
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 001919182 for LA CENTRALE, registered on January 23, 2003.

The Complainant also operates on the Internet, its official website being "www.lacentrale.fr", and owns several domain names for LA CENTRALE and "la central", among which <lacentrale.com>, <lacentrale.info>, <la-centrale.info>, and <la-central.info>.

The Complainant has provided evidence in support of the above.

According to the Whois records, the disputed domain name was registered on March 18, 2025, and it directs to a parking page of the Registrar.

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 states that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark LA CENTRALE.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name since it has not been authorized by the Complainant to register the disputed domain name or

to use its trademark within the disputed domain name, it is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and it is not making either a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant finally submits that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in bad faith, since the Complainant's trademark LA CENTRALE is well known in the automobile classified ads field. Therefore, the Respondent targeted the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name and the Complainant contends that the passive holding of the disputed domain name qualifies as bad faith registration and use.

B. Respondent

The Respondent has made no reply to the Complainant's contentions and is in default. In reference to paragraphs 5(f) and 14 of the Rules, no exceptional circumstances explaining the default have been put forward or are apparent from the record.

A respondent is not obliged to participate in a proceeding under the Policy, but if it fails to do so, reasonable facts asserted by a complainant may be taken as true, and appropriate inferences, in accordance with paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, may be drawn. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)") section 4.3.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists three elements, which the Complainant must satisfy in order to succeed:

- (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.

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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 that the Complainant's trademark LA CENTRALE is almost entirely reproduced within the disputed domain name, since only the last letter "e" is missing. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

It is well accepted that a generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD"), in this case ".info", is typically ignored when assessing the confusing similarity between a trademark and a domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

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.

While the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, UDRP panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the often impossible 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. 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 present 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 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 that, in the circumstances of this case, noting the lack of any substantive response putting forward a legitimate non-infringing purpose and the composition of the disputed domain name nearly identical to the Complainant’s own domain names <la-central.info>, <lacentrale.info>, and <la-centrale.info>, it is reasonable to infer that, when registering the disputed domain name, the Respondent intended to take unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant as to the origin or affiliation of the website at the disputed domain name.

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.

In the present case, regarding the registration in bad faith of the disputed domain name, the reputation of the Complainant’s trademark LA CENTRALE in the field of automobile classified ads and the composition of the disputed domain name indicates that the Respondent, more likely than not, knew of the Complainant, and deliberately registered the disputed domain name in bad faith.

As regards the use of the disputed domain name, which is directing to an inactive webpage, that is to a Registrar’s parking page, 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. Having reviewed the record, the Panel notes the reputation of the Complainant’s trademark in the field of automobile classified ads, the nature of the disputed domain name (which is almost identical to the Complainant’s trademark, as well as almost identical to the Complainant’s domain names <la-central.info>, <lacentrale.info>, and <la-centrale.info>), and the failure of the Respondent to submit a response, 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.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute 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, <lacentral.info>, be transferred to the Complainant.

/Edoardo Fano/

Edoardo Fano

Sole Panelist

Date: September 5, 2025