

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Région Ile-de-France v. Marion Douchard
Case No. D2025-2986

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Marion Douchard, France.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <mon-lycees.net> is 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 25, 2025. On July 28, 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 providing the contact details.

The Center verified that the 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 the same date.

The Center appointed Vincent Denoyelle as the sole panelist in this matter on August 26, 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 public local authority administering the Paris region (Ile-de-France).

The Complainant has developed a portal dedicated to high schools within the Paris region and available at the domain name <monlycee.net>.

The Complainant is the registered owner of the following MONLYCÉE.NET trade marks:

French MONLYCÉE.NET trade mark number 4317870 registered on May 26, 2017; and
French MONLYCÉE.NET trade mark number 4317888 registered on March 24, 2017.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 23, 2025.

The only information known about the Respondent is as disclosed by 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.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the MONLYCÉE.NET trade mark of the Complainant.

The Complainant represents that it has made searches in trade mark databases for the name of the Respondent and it did not generate any results. The Complainant declares that it has not granted any license or authorization to the Respondent to make any use of its trade mark. The Complainant highlights the fact that the disputed domain name is highly similar to the domain name operated by the Complainant for its services and that the disputed domain name is thus an attempt on the Respondent's part to target the Complainant and create confusion in the mind of Internet users. Finally, the Complainant points to other domain names which are used for illegitimate purposes and which the Complainant thinks are under common control with the disputed domain name.

Turning to bad faith, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name is highly similar to the Complainant's trade mark and the domain name operated by the Complainant for its services. The Complainant also refers to other domain names which are used for illegitimate purposes and which the Complainant thinks are under common control with the disputed domain name. Finally, the Complainant contends that the registration data for the disputed domain name, including the registrant's address, are clearly false.

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 that the MONLYCÉE.NET trade mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the MONLYCÉE.NET trade mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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 notes the fact that trade mark searches have been carried out by the Complainant on the Respondent and that the Respondent has received no authorization or license from the Complainant to use its MONLYCÉE.NET trade mark. In light of the circumstances of the case, the Panel considers that on the balance of probabilities, the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name as (i) the registration details used by the Respondent are clearly fabricated and incorrect, (ii) the disputed domain name is not subject to any visible use and (iii) the Respondent who has been put on notice has not submitted any response whatsoever to the Complainant's contentions.

Whilst this is not affecting the Panel's finding under the second element, the Panel is not able to take into account the argument related to other domain names which the Complainant considers to be used for illegitimate purposes and which the Complainant thinks are under common control with the disputed domain name, given that the Complainant somehow chose not to request a consolidation but instead filed separate complaints. The Panel will thus address the disputed domain name individually.

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.

As part of a panel's general powers articulated in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, the Panel has undertaken limited factual research into matters of public record as the Panel considered such information useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision under the third element. Whilst the Complainant has referred to a Google search on "monlycee.net" which is the exact trade mark and domain name of the Complainant and thus was likely to generate results relating to the Complainant, the Panel performed a Google search for the terms "mon-lycees" or "mon-lycees.net" as they correspond to the disputed domain name. The results of the searches carried out by the Panel are unequivocal in that they all refer to the Complainant which makes it very likely that the Respondent wanted to target the Complainant when it registered the disputed domain name.

In addition, the Panel finds that the registration address and telephone number provided by the Respondent for the disputed domain name are clearly false which reveals an effort on the Respondent's part to hinder the Complainant's actions to enforce its rights.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name 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 reputation of the Complainant's trade mark 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 does not prevent a finding of 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 <mon-lycees.net> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Vincent Denoyelle/

Vincent Denoyelle

Sole Panelist

Date: September 9, 2025