

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Aubelia v. 明小

Case No. D2025-3257

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is 明小, Thailand

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

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

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 14, 2025. On August 14, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On August 17, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain name which differed from the named Respondent (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY (DT), Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 18, 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 August 18, 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 22, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 11, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 12, 2025.

The Center appointed Mathias Lilleengen as the sole panelist in this matter on September 16, 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

For almost 200 years, the URIAGE Thermal Centre has used its water for rehabilitation treatments. The Complainant's subsidiary, URIAGE Dermatological Laboratories, has created cosmetic products sold under the trademark URIAGE since 1992. The trademark is recognized in over 70 countries. The Complainant contends that "[i]n 2023 the URIAGE group revenue was \$178 million". The Complainant and its products have a widespread following on social networks.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations around the world for the mark URIAGE, for example International registration No. 603480 (registered on May 19, 1993), designating inter alia Thailand and China. The Complainant also owns numerous domain name registrations, such as <uriage.com> and <uriage.fr>. The website at "www.uriage.com" has subdomains in Chinese language.

The Domain Name was registered on July 27, 2025. The Respondent has used the Domain Name for a pornographic webpage in Chinese language.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant provides evidence of trademark registrations and contends that the Domain Name is confusingly similar, almost identical, to the Complainant's trademark as the Domain Name is an intentional misspelling of the Complainant's famous trademark.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name. The Complainant has never licensed or otherwise authorized the Respondent to use the URIAGE trademarks in a domain name or in any other manner. The Respondent's use of the Domain Name does not constitute a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. The Domain Name has resolved to pornographic websites in Chinese language. The Domain Name is used with intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers and/or to tarnish the Complainant's trademark.

The Complainant believes that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant's well-known trademark when the Respondent registered the Domain Name. The Respondent's awareness of the Complainant's trademark is further confirmed by the deliberate misspelling of the Complainant's trademark in the Domain Name. Moreover, the Respondent's use of the Domain Name for pornographic websites constitutes bad faith evidence as it tarnishes the Complainant and its trademark. Finally, the Respondent has listed a non-existing address in the registrant details.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

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 Domain Name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has established that it has rights in the trademark URIAGE. In this case, the Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's trademark save the letter "e" at the end. The deletion does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the trademark. For the purpose of assessing under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Panel may ignore the generic Top-Level Domain, see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

The Panel finds that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

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 disputed domain name.

While 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 often impossible 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. 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.

Based on the evidence, the Respondent is not affiliated or related to the Complainant in any way. There is no evidence that the Respondent has registered the Domain Name as a trademark or acquired trademark rights. There is no evidence of the Respondent's use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. On the contrary, the use of the Domain Name is evidence of bad faith, as discussed below.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

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.

The Panel notes that the Respondent most likely knew of the Complainant when it registered the Domain Name. It follows from the fame of the Complainant and the composition of the Domain Name. The Panel further notes that the Complainant has trademark rights in Thailand where the Respondent has listed address, and webpages in Chinese, the same language used at the Respondent's webpages.

The fact that the Complainant's trademark also is a part of the geographical location of the French spa town Uriage-les-Bains does not change the fact that the Respondent appears to be acting in bad faith in this case. Moreover, the Panel notes that the Complainant has provided evidence of the strong reputation of the

URIAGE trademark and the Complainant's worldwide operations. The Respondent has not offered any explanation as to why it registered a domain name confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark, nor provided any evidence of actual or contemplated good faith use of the Domain Name. On the contrary, the Respondent's use is evidence of bad faith use in this case. Moreover, as additional evidence of bad faith, the Respondent has left false registrant details.

Based on the available record, 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 the Domain Name <uriag.com> transferred to the Complainant.

/Mathias Lilleengen/

Mathias Lilleengen

Sole Panelist

Date: September 25, 2025