

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Paris Hilton v. Lan Pham
Case No. D2025-2754

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Paris Hilton, United States of America (“USA”), represented by Tucker & Latifi, LLP, USA.

The Respondent is Lan Pham, Viet Nam.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <parishiltonpride.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 11, 2025. On July 14, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 14, 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 (Namecheap Inc.) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 15, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on July 15, 2025. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on July 21, 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 July 22, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 11, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any formal response. Accordingly, the Center notified the commencement of panel appointment process on August 12, 2025.

The Center appointed Mladen Vukmir as the sole panelist in this matter on August 18, 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 Paris Hilton, a USA individual, globally recognized actress, model, designer, influencer, author, disc jockey (“DJ”), and businesswoman.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous PARIS HILTON trademarks registered in various jurisdictions, including PARIS HILTON trademark registered in USA on February 14, 2006, under the registration number 3,059,587 for goods in class 3, PARIS HILTON trademark registered in USA on October 9, 2007, under the registration number 3,309,679 for goods in class 25, and PARIS HILTON trademark registered in the European Union on July 14, 2006, under the registration number 004059631 for goods in classes 3, 14 and 25 (the “PARIS HILTON trademark”).

The Complainant operates a website under the domain name <parishilton.com> as her primary retail source on the Internet.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 28, 2025. According to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the disputed domain name resolves to a website where the Complainant’s PARIS HILTON trademark and image have been displayed, and the purported products under the Complainant’s PARIS HILTON trademark have been offered 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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that:

(i) she has appeared on multiple reality television shows and magazine covers and is the author of a New York Times Best Seller. Recently, she starred in two Netflix cooking shows and hosts two podcasts. The Complainant states that is one of the highest-paid female DJs in the world. In 2013, she was awarded Best Breakthrough DJ at the NRJ DJ Awards (Nouvelle Radio des Jeunes DJ Awards), and in 2014, she was awarded Best Female DJ at the NRJ DJ Awards. The Complainant is internationally known and has performed worldwide, including in Europe, Asia, Central and South America, and North America. The Complainant holds a certified gold record from the Recording Industry Association of America. Separate and apart from her career as a DJ, the Complainant has achieved significant entrepreneurial success. Most notably, the Complainant, is the licensor of a successful perfume line and other consumer products sold worldwide.

(ii) the disputed domain name is confusingly similar and effectively identical to the PARIS HILTON trademark, as it incorporates PARIS HILTON trademark mark in its entirety. The disputed domain name simply combines the Complainant’s PARIS HILTON trademark with the term “pride” which does not change PARIS HILTON trademark so significantly that the average consumer would believe the goods sold at the disputed domain name are from a different source.

(iii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant has not authorized nor licensed the Respondent to use her PARIS HILTON trademarks. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. There can be no legitimate business reason for the

Respondent to register or use a domain name incorporating the Complainant's famous PARIS HILTON trademark. The Complainant further argues that the Respondent operates the website created under the disputed domain name only to sell PARIS HILTON-branded goods, believed to be counterfeit, and in any event without disclosure of the absence of any relationship with the Complainant. The Respondent prominently displays the Complainant's PARIS HILTON trademark, brand name, and images of the Complainant to reinforce a false impression of association.

(iv) the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The disputed domain name is an online store that is deceptively and confusingly similar to the Complainant's genuine online retail store and seeks to hold itself out as a retailer of genuine PARIS HILTON-branded goods and apparel, which is not the case. By incorporating the PARIS HILTON trademark in its entirety and using it in connection with an online retail website, the Respondent is intentionally attempting to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to source, affiliation, or endorsement. According to the Complainant, Internet users searching for her legitimate website may be diverted to the Respondent's site, where they are misled into believing that the goods offered are genuine or authorized, to her detriment. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has deliberately combined her famous mark with the descriptive word "pride" to mislead the public, exploit her reputation, and capitalize on consumer confusion, which constitutes bad faith registration and use under the Policy.

B. Respondent

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

However, the Respondent sent an informal email communication to the Center on July 15, 2025, stating: "Thanks for your feedback. We have removed this website." The Respondent has not submitted any substantial information nor response 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.

The entirety of the PARIS HILTON trademark is reproduced 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.

The disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's PARIS HILTON trademark followed by the term "pride". Where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, adding other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, meaningless, or otherwise), would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Although the addition of other term "pride" 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 trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The addition of the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.com” is irrelevant in assessing confusing similarity. As confirmed in section 1.11 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), gTLDs are typically disregarded under the first element of the Policy.

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 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 considers that the composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1. The Respondent is not authorized by the Complainant to use the PARIS HILTON trademark, and there is no indication that the Respondent is known under the disputed domain name. There is no apparent relation from the records between the Respondent and Complainant, neither does it arise that the Complainant has ever licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the PARIS HILTON trademark, or to apply for or use any domain name incorporating the same trademark.

There is no evidence in the case file or otherwise apparent to the Panel that the Respondent has been using the disputed domain name in connection with bona fide offering of goods or services or making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is using the disputed domain name to resolve to a website displaying the Complainant’s mark and image and to offer what purports to be the Complainant’s products. There was no disclaimer on the website clarifying the (lack of) relationship between the Parties. The Respondent has not provided explanation or evidence demonstrating any rights or legitimate interests, nor has submitted evidence of a bona fide offering of goods or services, or of any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. In its email communication to the Center, the Respondent just stated that they have removed the website created under the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

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 which 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name incorporates the PARIS HILTON trademark in its entirety, and was used to resolve to an online store displaying the Complainant's mark and image. The products on the website to which the disputed domain name resolves to are the same as the Complainant's have been offered, creating the impression as being a website operated by the Complainant.

The available evidence shows that registration and use of the Complainant's PARIS HILTON trademark predate the registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant is a well-known celebrity and a public figure. Registering the disputed domain name, which is confusingly similar to her trademark, and then using the disputed domain name for an online store that is similar to the Complainant's genuine online retail, show that the Respondent knew of the Complainant and the PARIS HILTON trademark. The Panel finds that the Respondent's awareness of the Complainant's PARIS HILTON trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name suggests bad faith.

The Panel is of opinion that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website or location or of a product on the Respondent's website or location.

Taking into account the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name that incorporates the Complainant's PARIS HILTON trademark entirely, the lack of a plausible legitimate use as described under section 6.B of the Decision, the Respondent's failure to respond to the Complaint, and the Respondent's apparent use of the disputed domain name to promote the purported products of the Complainant, the Panel finds that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in 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 <parishiltonpride.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mladen Vukmir/

Mladen Vukmir

Sole Panelist

Date: September 1, 2025