

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Etablissements Richard Pontvert et Cie v. Wu Shifu
Case No. D2025-3841

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Etablissements Richard Pontvert et Cie, France, represented by Cabinet Lavoix, France.

The Respondent is Wu Shifu, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <paraboot-online.shop> 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 September 22, 2025. On September 22, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 23, 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 September 30, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 20, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 24, 2025.

The Center appointed Olga Zalomiy as the sole panelist in this matter on October 31, 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 French shoemaker. The Complainant owns multiple registrations for the PARABOOT trademark, such as:

- French registration No. 4135107 for the stylized PARABOOT trademark, registered on March 13, 2015 and renewed;
- the International registration No. 1249091 for the stylized PARABOOT trademark, registered on March 17, 2015 and renewed; and
- European Union Trade Mark No. 001434307 for the PARABOOT trademark, registered on February 12, 2001 and renewed.

A prior UDRP panel found the Complainant's mark to be well-known.¹ The Complainant also owns the <paraboot.com> domain name that incorporates its trademark.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on July 9, 2025. When the Complainant filed the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website containing pay-per-click ("PPC") links to third-party websites offering competing products. At the time of this Decision, however, the disputed domain name resolves to "page not found" error page.

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 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 PARABOOT trademark because the disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's mark in its entirety. In the Complainant's view, the addition of the term "online" to its trademark does not prevent confusing similarity.

The Complainant contends that the hyphen and the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".shop" in the disputed domain name have no impact on the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and its mark. The Complainant argues that Internet users will perceive the disputed domain name as a reference to the Complainant's domain name <paraboot.com>.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because (i) the Respondent has not been licensed or authorized by the Complainant to use its PARABOOT trademark in the disputed domain name; (ii) the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark and its domain name; (iii) the website associated with the disputed domain name displaces PPC links to third party websites offering competing products; (iv) the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name; and (v) the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name is neither legitimate nor fair.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith, because it likely registered the disputed domain name with the Complainant's trademark in mind given that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name many years after the Complainant's trademark registration and the Complainant is well-known. The Complainant argues that by registering the disputed domain name, the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's

¹*Etablissements Richard Pontvert Et Cie v. Charles Jones*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-3442](#).

website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website, location, product or service. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name to prevent the Complainant from reflecting its trademark in a corresponding domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Pursuant to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed in this proceeding, the Complainant must prove each of the following elements with respect to the disputed domain name:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. The inclusion of the gTLD ".shop" is typically disregarded in the context of the confusing similarity assessment, being a technical requirement of registration. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

Although the addition of other terms, here, the term "online" and the hyphen, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

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 evidence on record shows that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor has it been authorized by the Complainant to use the Complainant's trademark in a domain name. The Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name, which is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark and its domain name shows that the Respondent likely intended to confuse users seeking or expecting the Complainant, which negates finding of fair use of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent is making neither legitimate noncommercial use of the disputed domain name, nor is the Respondent using it for a bona fide offering of goods or services. In the past, the disputed domain name resolved to a parking page comprising PPC links to third-party websites offering competing products. Prior UDRP panels have found that the use of a domain name for a webpage comprising PPC links does not represent bona fide offering of goods and services where such links compete with the reputation and goodwill of the complainant's mark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.9.

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 notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name, which fully incorporates the Complainant's well-known mark, over 20 years after the Complainant's first trademark registration. Apart from the gTLD ".shop", the term "online" and the hyphen, the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's trademark and its domain name associated with its official website. Therefore, it is likely that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but 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.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) 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 distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's trademark, 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 also finds that the change in use (from prior commercialization to current passive holding) rather reinforces the finding that there was no good faith intention behind the registration and prior use of the disputed domain name.

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 <paraboot-online.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Olga Zalomiy/

Olga Zalomiy

Sole Panelist

Date: November 12, 2025