

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Groupe Lactalis v. Jose Roberto Contreras
Case No. D2025-2914

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Groupe Lactalis, France, represented by Nameshield, France.

The Respondent is Jose Roberto Contreras, Colombia

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <co-lactalis.com> is registered with Name SRS AB (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 23, 2025. On July 23, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 24, 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 (Shield Whois) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 24, 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 24, 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 29, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 18, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 27, 2025.

The Center appointed Emre Kerim Yardimci as the sole panelist in this matter on September 1, 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 multi-national company founded in France, engaged in the dairy sector.

The Complainant has traded under the name “Lactalis” since 1999. The Complainant is one of the largest dairy products group in the world, with over 85,500 employees, 266 production sites and a presence in over 51 different countries.

The Complainant is the holder of the following trademarks:

- The European Union trademark LACTALIS No. 1529833 registered on November 7, 2002;
- The International trademark LACTALIS No. 900154 registered on July 27, 2006;
- The International trademark LACTALIS No. 1135514 registered on September 20, 2012;
- The European Union trademark LACTALIS No. 017959526 registered on May 22, 2019; and
- The Colombian trademark LACTALIS No. 484725 registered on December 24, 2013.

The disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent on July 11, 2025.

The Complainant is also owner of several domain names including <lactalis.com> registered on January 9, 1999, and <lactaliscolumbia.com.co> registered on December 14, 2023.

The disputed domain name resolves to an inactive page.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to, and at the same time, incorporating the Complainant's well-known trademark LACTALIS and that the addition of the descriptive term “co” does not lessen the association between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark.

The Complainant considers that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, mainly because the Complainant has neither licensed nor otherwise authorized the Respondent to use its marks or to apply for or use any domain name incorporating the trademark LACTALIS.

The Complainant further asserts that although the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name, any future use cannot be considered for a bona fide offering of goods and services. Finally, in addressing the question of registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith, the Complainant observes that the Respondent is well aware of the Complainant's trademark considering their trademark is so widely well-known that it is inconceivable that the Respondent was not aware the Complainant or its earlier rights.

Finally, the Complainant further submits that Mail Exchange (“MX”) servers are activated in relation with the disputed domain name emails, suggesting that the Respondent has the intention to use the disputed domain name to support an email account.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that;

- (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 interest in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) The disputed domain name has been registered in bad faith and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name wholly incorporates the Complainant's trademark and the abbreviation "co" does not prevent a finding of the confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

As regards the generic Top-Level Domain, it is typically disregarded under the confusing similarity test.

For the reasons mentioned above, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's LACTALIS trademark.

The Complainant has thus fulfilled paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The onus is upon the Complainant to make out a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and it is then for the Respondent to rebut this case.

The Panel accepts the Complainant's submissions that the Respondent does not appear to have been known by the disputed domain name, has not made demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name, and the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial use of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent has not filed a Response. It has no consent from the Complainant to register any domain name incorporating the Complainant's trademark, it has not used the disputed domain names for a bona fide offering of goods or services, and the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor is it making noncommercial fair use of the disputed domain name.

The current passive holding of the disputed domain name does not give rise to any rights or legitimate interests under the circumstances of this case. In addition, the Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name, incorporating the Complainant's trademark in its entirety with the addition of the abbreviation "co" carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant.

In the Panel's view, the Complainant has made out their prima facie case under this element of the Policy and the Respondent, who is in default, has failed to rebut this case. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

In the circumstances of this case, and in view of the Panel's discussion below, the Panel finds that the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel accepts the Complainant's assertions that the trademark LACTALIS is a well-known trademark.

The Complainant's trademark was registered for not less than 20 years at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name.

The incorporation of a well-known trademark into a domain name by a registrant having no plausible explanation for doing so may be, in and of itself, an indication of bad faith (*Veuve Clicquot Ponsardin, Maison Fondée en 1772 v. The Polygenix Group Co.*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0163](#); *General Electric Company v. CPIC NET and Hussain Syed*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0087](#); and *Microsoft Corporation v. Montrose Corporation*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-1568](#)).

The Panel accepts the Complainant claim that the Respondent has activated the MX servers in relation with the disputed domain name emails, suggesting that the Respondent has the intention to likely use the disputed domain name to support email account.

Lastly, the Panel observed that the Respondent used a privacy shield. While the Respondent's use of a privacy service will not in itself constitute bad faith under the Policy, the Panel may still take it into account and draw adverse inferences under certain circumstances. The use of the privacy shield in this case together with other elements gives rise to the suspicion that the privacy shield was used to mask the identity of the underlying registrant, to give impression that the Complainant is behind the disputed domain name.

Given the reputation or the distinctiveness of the Complainant's mark, the composition of the disputed domain name, the Respondent's lack of participation in this proceeding, the lack of any credible good faith use to which the confusingly similar disputed domain name could be put, and the Respondent's use of privacy service, the totality of circumstances surrounding the non-use of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Therefore, in the view of cumulative circumstances, the Panel finds that the requirement of registration and use in bad faith is satisfied, according to the Policy, paragraph 4(a)(iii).

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 <co-lactalis.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Emre Kerim Yardimci/

Emre Kerim Yardimci

Sole Panelist

Date: September 15, 2025