

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Région Ile-de-France v. joan carlsen  
Case No. D2025-2790

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Région Ile-de-France, France, represented by Lexing, France.

The Respondent is joan carlsen, France.

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

The disputed domain names <monlycees.net> and <support-monlycee.net> are registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 15, 2025. On July 16, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On July 17, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response, disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (“GDPR Masked”) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 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 July 25, 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 31, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 20, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 21, 2025. The Response due date was then extended to August 30, 2025, but no response was received.

The Center appointed Benjamin Fontaine as the sole panelist in this matter on September 8, 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 the French local authority, Région Ile-de-France which was created on November 28, 1956. Région Ile-de-France manages 470 public high schools, including 650,000 users (students, teachers and administrative staff), with an annual investment of EUR 130 million for digital education.

As part of this digital transformation, the Complainant has set up a service platform called “Monlycée.net”, which includes the digital workspace for Ile-de-France high schools, accessible from the domain name <monlycee.net>, registered on June 3, 2016.

The Complainant is the owner of several trade marks including “MONLYCÉE.NET” among which:

- the French trade mark MONLYCÉE.NET registered under No. 4317870 on November 28, 2016;
- the French trade mark MON LYCEE.NET (and design) registered under No. 4317888 on November 28, 2016.

The Complainant is also the owner of the domain name <monlycee.net> registered on June 3, 2016, which resolves to its digital workspace of the “Monlycee.net” service.

The two disputed domain names <monlycees.net> and <support-monlycee.net> were registered on May 23, 2025.

The disputed domain name <monlycees.net> used to resolve to a false login page which was a reproduction of the official login page of the Complainant’s website at <monlycee.net>. At the time of the present Decision, it is no longer active.

The disputed domain name <support-monlycee.net> is not active.

#### **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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends first that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its earlier trade marks MON LYCEE.NET and MONLYCÉE.NET.

Indeed, the Complainant contends that:

- the disputed domain name <monlycees.net> is composed of:
  - an identical or at least highly similar reproduction of the earlier trade mark MONLYCÉE.NET; and
  - the addition of the letter “s”, which may not eliminate the likelihood of confusion resulting from the incorporation of the earlier Complainant's trade mark.

- the disputed domain name <support-monlycee.net> is composed of:
  - an identical or at least highly similar reproduction of the earlier trade marks MON LYCEE.NET and MONLYCÉE.NET; and
  - the addition of the descriptive and generic word “support”, with identical meaning in French and in English and a dash.

Then, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. The Complainant claims that according to searches conducted trade mark databases, “Joan Carlsen” is not identified as holder of rights in France or abroad. The Complainant contends that it has not granted a license or otherwise authorization to use its earlier MON LYCEE.NET and MONLYCÉE.NET trade marks. The Complainant asserts that the contested domain names are/will be used for illegal activities.

Third, the Complainant claims that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

- Registered in bad faith:

The Complainant contends that the similarity between the disputed domain names and its earlier trade marks MON LYCEE.NET and MONLYCÉE.NET intentionally creates an undeniable association with the Complainant and its services, and proves that the Complainant was specifically targeted, especially given the fact that the domain names were registered on the same day, with the same Registrar, just a few hours apart, by the same person. In addition, the Complainant asserts that the contact details given by the Respondent are clearly false.

- Used in bad faith:

- <monlycees.net>

The Complainant claims that the domain name <monlycees.net> is used to provide access to a false login page perfectly identical to that of its own website. It also reproduces other trade marks of the Complainant.

Then, the Complainant contends that the source code of the fake login page shows the use of a tool to extract the official login page of the authentication test pattern, SingleFile. According to the Complainant, the source code also shows that the fake login page redirects to the Complainant's Packet-switched Network (“PSN”) after recovering the users IDs. The Respondent inserted a “no-referrer” directive in the fake login page, telling the target browser not to send to the PSN the referrer indicating that the browser had been redirected from the Respondent's fake page.

The Complainant concludes that it demonstrates that the goal of the Respondent is to unlawfully collect the users IDs for illegal purpose, while avoiding detection by the Complainant, which proves his bad faith.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name <monlycees.net> recently redirected to a page giving a warning about a possible risk of phishing, which is another evidence of the Respondent's bad faith.

- <support-monlycee.net>:

This disputed domain name is inactive, but, according to the Complainant, the simultaneity of the registration of the two domain names <monlycees.net> and <support-monlycee.net> suggests that the inactive domain name is intended for the same illegal use as the active one.

The Complainant relies on the doctrine of bad faith passive holding.

Finally, the Complainant claims that the mere addition of “support” to a prior trade mark automatically suggests that it can only be the contact address for the Region's ENT support service, which creates confusion in order to intentionally make the link with the Complainant and its services.

## **B. Respondent**

The Respondent did not 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 trade mark 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 trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other letters or terms, here the letter “s” (in the disputed domain name <monlycees.net>) and the term “support” (in the disputed domain name <support-monlycee.net>), may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such letter or term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Also, UDRP panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed for the disputed domain name <monlycees.net> unauthorized account access/hacking or phishing, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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.

The Respondent undoubtedly had the Complainant's trade marks MON LYCEE.NET and MONLYCÉE.NET in mind when he registered the disputed domain names. Indeed, the disputed domain name <monlycees.net> is nearly identical to the trade mark MON LYCEE.NET, as the adjunction of the letter "s" produces a limited visual impact. Also, the second disputed domain name <support-monlycee.net> combines the trade mark MON LYCEE.NET with the word "support", which directly refers to IT or technical support.

Regarding the disputed domain name <monlycees.net>, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed unauthorized account access/hacking and/or phishing constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes clear bad faith under the Policy. Indeed, the webpage hosted under the disputed domain name is strictly identical to the Complainant's official login page: even another prior Complainant's trade mark RÉGION ÎLE DE FRANCE has been reproduced. This is part of a phishing scam, to collect the data and access codes of the Complainant's clients.

Regarding the disputed domain name <support-monlycee.net>, 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 available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's trade marks in France where the Respondent is also located, the failure of the Respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name <support-monlycee.net> does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy. Besides, as shown above, the other disputed domain name, <monlycees.net>, which was registered simultaneously and shares a similar composition, has already been used to impersonate the Complainant for fraudulent purposes. This further confirms that a finding of bad faith passive holding is fully justified.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names were registered and used in bad faith.

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 names <monlycees.net> and <support-monlycee.net> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Benjamin Fontaine/*

**Benjamin Fontaine**

Sole Panelist

Date: September 22, 2025