

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

PRL USA Holdings, Inc., The Polo/Lauren Company L.P. v. xiao yan
Case No. D2025-3944

1. The Parties

The Complainants are PRL USA Holdings, Inc. and The Polo/Lauren Company L.P., United States of America, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is xiao yan, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ralphlauren.website> is registered with Gname.com Pte. Ltd. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 26, 2025. On September 29, 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 (Redacted for privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 1, 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 in English on October 3, 2025.

On October 1, 2025, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. On October 3, 2025, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant’s submission.

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 in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on October 7, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 27, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 29, 2025.

The Center appointed Linda Chang as the sole panelist in this matter on November 7, 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

Two Complainants filed the Complaint. The First Complainant is PRL USA Holdings, Inc., and the Second Complainant is The Polo/Lauren Company L.P. (collectively, the "Complainants"). The Complainants are related companies and are both wholly owned subsidiaries of Ralph Lauren Corporation.

RALPH LAUREN is the fashion brand of the Complainants' Group, which was originally created by Ralph Lauren in 1967 and was launched as a neckwear line. Through continuously developing and strengthening its reputation and distinctive image for nearly 60 years, RALPH LAUREN is one of the global leaders in the design, marketing, and distribution of premium lifestyle products across apparel, accessories, home, fragrances, and hospitality. The Complainants' Group has 1,351 stores and employs 15,000 people globally. The Complainants' Group is listed on the New York Stock Exchange and has achieved net revenues of over USD 7,079 million in Fiscal Year 2025.

The Complainants own numerous trademark registrations for RALPH LAUREN across various jurisdictions, including:

- the United States of America trademark RALPH LAUREN Registration No. 1222278 owned by the First Complainant, registered on January 4, 1983, in Class 3; and
- the International trademark RALPH LAUREN Registration No. 1199485 owned by the Second Complainant, registered on November 20, 2013, in Classes 9, 11, 14, 18, 20, 21, 24, 25, 27, 35 and 43, designating among others China.

The Complainants also own the domain name <ralphlauren.com> that incorporates the entirety of the RALPH LAUREN trademark. The domain name was registered on September 25, 1996, and has been resolving to the Complainants' official website.

The disputed domain name <ralphlauren.website> was registered on July 8, 2025. At the time of issuance of this Decision, the disputed domain name resolves to a webpage displaying "The website has been stopped. Sorry, This site has been stopped by the administrator, Please contact the administrator for details." According to the Complainants' evidence, the disputed domain name previously resolved to a website displaying the RALPH LAUREN trademark and a login portal.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainants

The Complainants contend that they have satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainants contend that:

- i) the disputed domain name consists solely of the Complainants' RALPH LAUREN trademark and is identical to the RALPH LAUREN trademark; and

- ii) the Respondent has no affiliation with the Complainants, and the Complainants have not authorized the Respondent to use the RALPH LAUREN trademark for any reason or in any manner; and
- iii) the Respondent has not been commonly known by the disputed domain name; and
- iv) the Respondent is not making a bona fide offering of goods or services or legitimate, noncommercial fair use of the disputed domain name. The Respondent's inclusion of the Complainants' trademark on the website associated with the disputed domain name is a direct effort to take advantage of the fame and goodwill that the Complainants have built in their brand. In addition, by creating the impression that the website associated with the disputed domain name is connected with the Complainants, the Respondent has intention to fool Internet users into divulging their personal information by posting a login portal; and
- v) the Respondent had the Complainants and the RALPH LAUREN trademark in mind at the time of registering the disputed domain name; and
- vi) the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name is with the intention to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the website associated with the disputed domain name by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainants' registered RALPH LAUREN trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website or location or of a product or service on its website or location. In addition, the Respondent is using the website associated with the disputed domain name to fraudulently pose as Complainants for purposes of launching a phishing attack, which is evidence of bad faith use; and
- vii) the Respondent holds several other domain names that incorporate the trademarks of well-known brands and businesses.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainants' contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Procedural Issues – Consolidation of Complainants

The two Complainants have filed one single Complaint together against the Respondent.

The Complainants have convinced the Panel that the First Complainant and the Second Complainant are related companies that share a common grievance and legal interests in the RALPH LAUREN trademark that are owned by the Complainants across various jurisdictions, and their commercial rights are both targeted by the Respondent's conduct of registering and using the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, the Panel determines that it would be equitable and procedurally efficient to permit the Complainants' request for consolidation in this administrative proceeding. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.11.1.

6.2 Procedural Issues - Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainants have requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including the fact that 1) using Chinese as language of the proceeding would unfairly disadvantage and burden the Complainants and delay the proceedings and adjudication of this matter; 2) the disputed domain name contains Latin characters and the website associated with the disputed

domain name displays the Complainant's trademark and logo in Latin characters; 3) the disputed domain name contains no meaning in the Chinese language.

The Respondent did not make any specific submissions with respect to the language of the proceeding.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.5.1).

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

6.3 Substantive Issues

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 Complainants' trademark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Based on the available records, the Complainants have shown rights in respect of the RALPH LAUREN trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".website", as a standard registration requirement, should be disregarded in the assessment of confusing similarity under the Policy.

The dominant part of the disputed domain name is "ralphlauren" which incorporates the entirety of the RALPH LAUREN trademark and is exactly the same as the RALPH LAUREN trademark. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the RALPH LAUREN trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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 information in the case file shows that:

- the disputed domain name resolved to a website displaying the Complainants' RALPH LAUREN trademark and a login portal at the time of filing of the Complaint. Such use of the disputed domain name indicates the Respondent's intention to divert Internet traffic to its own website by confusing the relationship between its own website, the Complainants and the RALPH LAUREN trademark, which cannot be deemed as a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use; and

- there is no evidence proving that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name; and
- the nature of the disputed domain name, which is identical to the Complainants' RALPH LAUREN trademark and to the dominant component of the Complainants' prior domain name <ralphlauren.com>, carries a high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainants; and
- no other factors demonstrate any rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in the disputed domain name.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainants have established a *prima facie* case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainants' *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 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 Complainants obtained the trademark registration for RALPH LAUREN as early as in 1983, which significantly predates the registration date of the disputed domain name (July 8, 2025). According to the Complainants' evidence, the Panel accepts that the RALPH LAUREN trademark has gained a high reputation and distinctiveness through the Complainants' continuous use and advertising. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name that is identical to the Complainants' RALPH LAUREN trademark and it resolved to a website displaying the Complainants' RALPH LAUREN trademark. The Panel determines that the Respondent had actual knowledge of the Complainants and the RALPH LAUREN trademark at the time of registering the disputed domain name, and bad faith is found.

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.

The disputed domain name currently resolves to a webpage displaying "The website has been stopped. Sorry, This site has been stopped by the administrator, Please contact the administrator for details." but was once used to host a website that displayed the Complainants' RALPH LAUREN trademark and a login portal. The Panel holds that by selecting a domain name identical to the Complainants' RALPH LAUREN trademark, and using it in the manner as described above, the Respondent intended to attract, for possible commercial gain, Internet users to the disputed domain name and the associated website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainants' RALPH LAUREN trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website. In addition, through the login portal on the website, the Respondent is able to collect personal information of Internet users who are looking for the Complainants' products and services. Such behavior is of risk of resulting in the leakage of personal information of Internet users. The current non-use of the disputed domain name does not change the Panel's finding of the Respondent's bad faith.

The Panel finds that the Complainants have 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 <ralphlauren.website> be transferred to the Complainants.

/Linda Chang/

Linda Chang

Sole Panelist

Date: November 21, 2025