

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Sarenza v. Host Master, Transure Enterprise Ltd
Case No. D2025-3921

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Sarenza, France, represented by MIIP MADE IN IP, France.

The Respondent is Host Master, Transure Enterprise Ltd, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <sarenza.icu> is registered with Above.com Pty Ltd (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 25, 2025. On September 26, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 30, 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 (Above.com Domain Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 30, 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 October 1, 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 October 1, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 21, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 27, 2025.

The Center appointed Masato Dogauchi as the sole panelist in this matter on October 30, 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 e-commerce company specializing in selling shoes and accessories. Founded in September 2005, the Complainant has delivered products to several European countries. The Complainant has expanded throughout Europe since 2009. In June 2014, the Complainant received an investment of EUR 74 million to increase its international expansion. In 2021, the Complainant employed between 250 and 499 people. The Complainant has eight sites in 22 countries, and sells more than 750 brands. According to the data shared by the Complainant dated September 25, 2025, the Complainant's official Instagram account has more than 149,000 followers and the Facebook account has more than 517,000 followers. The Complainant promotes its business at "www.sarenza.com".

The Complainant has registered its SARENZA trademark in many countries, such as:

- French Registration for SARENZA No. 3361235, applied and registered since May 25, 2005;
- United Kingdom Registration for SARENZA No. UK00904933867, registered on March 6, 2007; and
- Swiss Registration for SARENZA No. 666610, registered on November 25, 2014.

The disputed domain name <sarenza.icu> was registered on September 15, 2025, and it resolves to an 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.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 15(a), a panel shall decide a case on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable. Since the Respondent has not made any substantive arguments in this case, the following decision is rendered on the basis of the Complainant's contentions and other evidence submitted by the Complainant.

In accordance with the Policy, paragraph 4(a), in order to qualify for a remedy, the Complainant must prove each of the following:

- (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 for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name includes the Complainant's SARENZA trademark as a whole. Such fact supports a finding that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's SARENZA trademark. It is also well established in prior UDRP decisions that the applicable Top-Level Domain ("TLD") ".icu" contained in the disputed domain name should be disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test.

Accordingly, 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.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has made a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and the Respondent did not come forward with relevant evidence rebutting the prima facie case. Further, the disputed domain name has not been actively used. Therefore, there is no evidence showing that the disputed domain name has been used for a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

Accordingly, 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, in consideration of the fact that the Complainant has been doing e-commerce in the market of shoes and accessories under the SARENZA trademark since 2005, it is unlikely that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's SARENZA trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name on September 15, 2025. Therefore, it is found that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith.

On the other hand, with regard to the requirement that the disputed domain name is being used in bad faith, although the disputed domain name only resolves to an error page, such non-use of the disputed domain

name does 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, the composition of the disputed domain name which is identical to the Complainant's trademark, and the lack of the response from the Respondent, 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.

In addition, the Complainant's evidence shows that the Respondent has been the respondent in many prior UDRP cases, such as *International Business Machines Corporation (IBM) v. Host Master, Transure Enterprise Ltd*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-3282](#) (transfer), *Accenture Global Services Limited v. Host Master, Transure Enterprise Ltd*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-0676](#) (transfer), and *Ford Motor Company v. Host Master, Transure Enterprise Ltd*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-1514](#) (transfer).

Accordingly, 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 <sarenza.icu> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Masato Dogauchi/

Masato Dogauchi

Sole Panelist

Date: November 10, 2025