

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

PRL USA Holdings, Inc. and The Polo/Lauren Company L.P. v. Domain Admin, Whois Privacy Corp.
Case No. D2025-2945

1. The Parties

The Complainant is PRL USA Holdings, Inc. and The Polo/Lauren Company L.P., United States of America ("United States" or "U.S."), represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Domain Admin, Whois Privacy Corp., Bahamas.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ralphlauren.org> is registered with Internet Domain Service BS Corp (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 24, 2025. On July 24, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 29, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and provided the contact details. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 30, 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 30, 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 August 4, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 24, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 26, 2025.

The Center appointed Eva Fiammenghi 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 a leading global fashion and lifestyle company founded in 1967 in New York City, United States. The Complainant designs, markets, and distributes premium lifestyle products, including apparel, footwear, accessories, fragrances, and home furnishings. The Complainant's trademark is world-famous and has been continuously used for decades.

The Complainant owns multiple registrations for the RALPH LAUREN trademark in numerous jurisdictions worldwide, including but not limited to the following:

- International Trademark RALPH LAUREN, Reg. No. 1199485, registered on November 20, 2013, in classes 9, 11, 14, 18, 20, 21, 24, 25, 27, 35, and 43.
- Canadian Trademark RALPH LAUREN, Reg. No. TMA454070, registered on February 16, 1996, in class 28.
- United Kingdom Trademark RALPH LAUREN, Reg. No. UK00002130404, registered on November 14, 1997, in class 25.

The Complainant operates their principal website at <ralphlauren.com>, used worldwide to promote their products and services.

The disputed domain name <ralphlauren.org> was created on April 11, 2003. At the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain resolved to a website displaying pay-per-click ("PPC") links to products of third parties, some of which directly compete with those offered by the Complainant.

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 the disputed domain name is identical to its well-known RALPH LAUREN trademark, reproducing the mark in its entirety with the mere addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ".org," which is irrelevant for purposes of comparison.

The Complainant further asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant has never authorized the Respondent to use its trademark, nor is there any evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark.

The Complainant therefore requests the transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed 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 interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

These elements are discussed in turn below. In considering these elements, paragraph 15(a) of the Rules provides that the Panel shall decide the Complaint on the basis of statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any other rules or principles of law that the Panel deems applicable.

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.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Complainant's trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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 a respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a domain name.

The Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. The burden of production therefore shifts to the Respondent, which has failed to file any Response.

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 Respondent is not an authorized distributor of the Complainant and has no connection or affiliation with the Complainant that would justify its registration or use of the disputed domain name. Nor has the Respondent been commonly known by the disputed domain name or demonstrated any bona fide offering of goods or services.

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.

In the present case, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The disputed domain name is identical to the Complainants' famous RALPH LAUREN trademark. The Respondent used it to resolve to a PPC parking page displaying links to competing products and has simultaneously listed the domain for sale at USD 6,254 on the webpage of a different Registrar. Such conduct clearly demonstrates bad faith registration and use.

The Respondent's failure to reply to the Complaint further supports the finding of bad faith.

The Panel therefore 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 <ralphlauren.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Eva Fiammenghi/

Eva Fiammenghi

Sole Panelist

Date: September 15, 2025