

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Louis Vuitton Malletier v. Nantawadee Saoon  
Case No. D2025-3266

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Louis Vuitton Malletier, France, represented by Studio Barbero S.p.A., Italy.

The Respondent is Nantawadee Saoon, Thailand.

### **2. The Domain Names and Registrar**

The disputed domain names <betvuitonslot.com> and <betvuitonslot.net> (the “Disputed Domain Names”) are registered with NameCheap, 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 15, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Names. On August 15, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Disputed Domain Names which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy, Privacy services provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) 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 amendment to the Complaint on August 20, 2025.



The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 August 21, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 10, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 11, 2025.

The Center appointed Flip Jan Claude Petillion as the sole panelist in this matter on September 17, 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, Louis Vuitton Malletier, is a French fashion house part of the multinational luxury goods conglomerate LVMH Moët Hennessy Louis Vuitton, known as LVMH. The Complainant holds numerous trademarks, including the following:

- LOUIS VUITTON, International trademark registration No. 416052 registered on June 19, 1975, in classes 3, 6, 8, 13, 14, 16, 18, 20, 21, 24, 25, 28, and 34;
- VUITTON, International trademark registration No. 1630417 registered on September 14, 2021, in classes 9, 14, 18, and 25;
- LOUIS VUITTON, Thai trademark registration No. 157211 registered on January 19, 1995, in class 34;
-  , International figurative mark No. 1847380 depicted below, registered on January 31, 2025, in classes 6, 10, 12, 15, 22, 35, and 41, designating, amongst others, Thailand:
-  , International figurative mark No. 1716746 depicted below, registered on December 7, 2022, in classes 4, 11, 20, 21, 26, 27, and 28, designating, amongst others, Thailand:

Both Disputed Domain Names were registered on July 7, 2025. According to the Complainant's evidence, both Disputed Domain Names resolved to websites including slight variations of the Complainant's figurative marks and appearing to offer gambling services. The Disputed Domain Names currently do not resolve to active websites.

On July 29, 2025, the Complainant's representative sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent using the email addresses published on the websites linked to the Disputed Domain Names, requesting to cease any use of, and transfer, the Disputed Domain Names to the Complainant. Apparently, no reply was received.

#### 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 Names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the Disputed Domain Names are confusingly similar to trademarks in which it claims to have rights.

The Complainant further claims that the Respondent has no legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Names as, in summary:

- the Respondent is not an employee, licensee, affiliate or agency of the Complainant or in any other way authorized to use the Complainant's trademarks and was not authorized to register and use the Disputed Domain Names;

- the Respondent cannot reasonably claim to be commonly known by the Disputed Domain Names;
- the Respondent cannot claim any rights in the Disputed Domain Names since, according to the searches conducted by the Complainant on online trademark databases, no trademark application or registration for LOUIS VUITTON could be found in the name of the Respondent;
- the Disputed Domain Names resolved to websites written in Thai language, depicting the Complainant's figurative marks with slight alterations, promoting online gambling services under the name "Betvuitonslot" and inviting internet users to register on a linked website to participate in the games. Such willful conduct clearly demonstrates that the Respondent did not intend to use the Disputed Domain Names for any legitimate purpose and their use cannot be considered a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use, as the Respondent has clearly intended to trade off the Complainant's well-known trademarks to generate traffic to its websites promoting gambling services, which are clearly unrelated to the Complainant and commercial in nature.

Finally, the Complainant claims that the Disputed Domain Names were registered and are being used in bad faith. In summary, according to the Complainant:

- it is inconceivable that the Respondent was not aware of the Complainant's trademark rights at the time of the registration of the Disputed Domain Names;
- the use of the Disputed Domain Names as described above clearly demonstrates that the only purpose of the Respondent was to use the Disputed Domain Names to intentionally attempt to attract Internet users to its websites, for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of its websites according to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy;
- the configuration of MX records for the Disputed Domain Names for email communication purposes may support a finding of bad faith;
- the Respondent's failure to respond to the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter can be evidence of bad faith;
- the Respondent was involved in at least two prior UDRP proceedings concluded with the transfer of the disputed domain names to the complainants.

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

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 Disputed Domain Names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's VUITTON and LOUIS VUITTON marks for the purposes of the Policy. The Disputed Domain Names both include a misspelling of the Complainant's VUITTON trademark, which is also a distinctive part of the Complainant's LOUIS VUITTON mark. The Disputed Domain Names incorporate the Complainant's VUITTON trademark in its entirety except for the removal of a letter "t". This practice is commonly referred to as "typosquatting". The Panel finds that this small change does not prevent the Disputed Domain Name from being confusingly similar. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9.

The Panel finds that the addition of other terms – here, “bet” and “slot” – does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Names and the marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

It is well established that generic Top-Level-Domains (“gTLDs”), here “.com” and “.net”, may be disregarded when considering whether the Disputed Domain Names are confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

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 Names. 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 Names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel notes that the Respondent has not apparently been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Names. According to the information provided by the Registrar, the Respondent is “Nantawadee Saon”. The Respondent’s use and registration of the Disputed Domain Names was not authorized by the Complainant.

According to the Complainant’s uncontested evidence, the Disputed Domain Names resolved to websites promoting online gambling services under the name “BETVUITONSLOT” and depicting slight variations of the Complainant’s figurative marks. Given the use of a typosquatted version of the Complainant’s distinctive VUITTON mark, the Panel finds that this does not amount to any legitimate noncommercial or fair use or use in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services.

The Disputed Domain Names currently do not appear to resolve to active web pages. In the Panel’s view, this does not amount to any legitimate noncommercial or fair use or use in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services either.

The Respondent had the opportunity to demonstrate rights or legitimate interests but did not do so. In the absence of a Response from the Respondent, the prima facie case established by the Complainant has not been rebutted.

Based on the available record, 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 established above, the Disputed Domain Names resolved to online gambling websites mentioning a typosquatted version of the Complainant's distinctive VUITTON mark and depicting slight variations of the Complainant's figurative marks. In the Panel's view, the circumstances of this case indicate that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4. Other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

In the present case, the Panel finds that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its trademark rights when it registered the Disputed Domain Names as:

- the Complainant's evidence and previous UDRP decisions confirm the well-known character of the Complainant's LOUIS VUITTON mark;
- the Disputed Domain Names resolved to websites not only mentioning a typosquatted version of a distinctive element of this mark, but also slight variations of the Complainant's figurative marks.

Moreover, the Panel finds that the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of bad faith conduct. In similar cases, UDRP panels found that the Respondent registered and used domain names in bad faith. See e.g. *Société Anonyme des Bains de Mer et du Cercle des Etrangers à Monaco v. hjiu Bnn, NANTAWADEE SAOON*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-1928](#).

Given the totality of the circumstances discussed above, the fact that the Disputed Domain Names resolve to inactive webpages would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3.

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

### 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 Names <betvuitonslot.com> and <betvuitonslot.net> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Flip Jan Claude Petillion/*

**Flip Jan Claude Petillion**

Sole Panelist

Date: October 1, 2025