

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

VUSIONGROUP v. cicilia wijaya, 01
Case No. D2025-3000

1. The Parties

The Complainant is VUSIONGROUP, France, represented by Domgate, France.

The Respondent is cicilia wijaya, 01, Cambodia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <vusion.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 28, 2025. On July 29, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 31, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 31, 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 September 5, 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 September 8, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 28, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 6, 2025.

The Center appointed Willem J. H. Leppink as the sole panelist in this matter on October 9, 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 following facts are undisputed.

The Complainant, originally named Group SES (Store Electronic Systems), was founded in 1992 by an entrepreneur from a family of retailers in northern France. It equipped its first store with electronic shelf labels (ESLs) in 1993. It was listed on the Paris stock exchange in 2006 and expanded to Asia and Latin America in 2007. The Complainant following a strategic alliance was renamed to SES-imagotag. Among other innovations, the Complainant has developed the VUSION Retail IoT platform to help retailers transform their physical stores into high value digital assets, more automated, data-driven, and connected in real-time to suppliers and consumers. The Complainant has contracts with many large retail chains.

In 2024, the Complainant changed its name to VUSIONGROUP. Nowadays, the Complainant is involved in digital solutions for physical retail, with more than 350 large retailers in Europe, Asia, and America. There are 25 offices worldwide and 850 employees. Its 2023 turnover was EUR 802 million.

The Complainant owns various trademark registrations for the VUSION trade mark in various jurisdictions worldwide, including the European Union Trade Mark no. 017952747 for the word mark VUSION registered on January 30, 2019 for goods and services in classes 6, 9, 20, 35, 38, 42.

The Complainant's main website can be found at "www.vusion.com".

The disputed domain name was registered on June 18, 2025 and before the Complaint was submitted, resolved to a parked page with pay-per-click (PPC) links and then redirected to "goslingfan.com/career/", which resolved to a gambling site in Indonesian. At the time of rendering the Decision, the disputed domain name redirected to the domain name resolved to "aic-media.com", which resolved to an entertainment site in Indonesian.

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 the following:

- The disputed domain name was registered only one day after several communications regarding the General Meeting of the Complainant;
- The only difference between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's VUSION trademark is the addition of the vowel "i" and the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" at the end of the disputed domain name. The addition of a vowel, and in particular the vowel "i", is a usual thing to do for cyber squatters.

On June 19, 2025, the Complainant's representative sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent and to the Registrar through online contact forms. The Complainant's representative also submitted two other owner's contact forms. The first reminder was sent on June 24, 2025, and a second reminder was sent on July 3, 2025. The Respondent never replied.

Earlier panel decisions confirmed the distinctiveness of the Complainant's VUSION trademark.

The website to which the disputed domain name resolved cannot be considered as evidence of the Respondent's use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The disputed domain name resolved first to a parked page with PPC links. Such use does not qualify as a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

The Complainant further contends that the redirections to gambling sites, do not qualify as a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. The websites to which the disputed domain name redirected do not display either terms “vusion” or “viusion”.

The Complainant contends such use is evidence of bad faith registration and use.

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 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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name, which appears to be a misspelling of the mark, is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7 and 1.9.

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.

Moreover, the redirections of the disputed domain name to commercial sites which are not related to the disputed domain name itself, are insufficient alone to support a finding of rights or legitimate interests, noting also the composition of the disputed domain name and the fact that the Complainant’s trademark is a coined term without any dictionary meaning.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel refers to its consideration under 6.B.

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 disputed domain name was registered in 2025, years after the registration of the Complainant's VUSION trademark. VUSION is a coined term. Nothing on the record of this proceeding indicates that it has any meaning other than as a reference to the Complainant's company name and retail platform. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar and even nearly identical to that mark, and also almost identical to the Complainant's domain name. The mark and the Complainant's platform have un rebuttably acquired notoriety. The Respondent provides no explanation for its choice to register the disputed domain name. Based on this record, the Panel has reason to find on the balance of probabilities that the Respondent likely had the VUSION mark in mind when it registered the disputed domain name.

In these circumstances, the original redirection to a parked page with PPC would not prevent a finding of registration and use in bad faith. Moreover, the redirection to gambling and entertainment sites affirm such a finding. The Panel finds it more likely than not 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 mark.

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 <viusion.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Willem J. H. Leppink/

Willem J. H. Leppink

Sole Panelist

Date: October 14, 2025