

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

VETOQUINOL SA v. Registration Private

Case No. D2025-4047

1. The Parties

The Complainant is VETOQUINOL SA, France, represented by BrandShelter, France.

The Respondent is Registration Private, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <col2v.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 3, 2025. On October 3, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 5, 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 (SuperPrivacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 8, 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 13, 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 14, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 3, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on November 11, 2025.

The Center appointed Mireille Buydens as the sole panelist in this matter on November 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

Founded in 1933, the Complainant is an international leader in the research, development, production and marketing of veterinary drugs and products for pets. It has established a distributors' network with over 60 partners in the veterinary healthcare market and is now present in 24 countries.

The Complainant has developed complementary foods for dogs and cats. These supplements may contain undenatured type II collagen, which are then labelled with the mark COL2V. The Complainant is the owner of various trademark registrations for the sign COL2V (hereafter "the COL2V Trademark" or "the Trademark"):

- The European Trademark Registration no. 019141475 for COL2V (word and device mark), registered on August 7, 2025 and filed on February 11th, 2025;
- The International Trademark Registration no. 1850331 for COL2V (word and device mark) registered on February 11, 2025; and
- The French Trademark Registration no. 5120489 for COL2V (word and device mark), registered on February 11, 2025.

The Complainant is also the owner of various COL2V domain names, including <col2v.uk>, <col2v.net>, <col2v.org>, <col2v.us>, registered on February 14, 2025.

The disputed domain name was registered on February 11, 2025, on the same day as the Complainant's applications for the Trademark. According to the Complaint, the disputed domain name redirects to a platform where the disputed domain name is listed for sale at the fixed price of EUR 12,722,91. At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name still resolves to a platform where it is offered for sale at EUR 12,993. The Complainant sent notices to the Respondent as from February 26, 2025 (through the Registrar) but asserts that the Respondent never answered.

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.

First, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name is identical to the COL2V Trademark as it incorporates the Trademark in its entirety (with no addition nor alteration). The generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is a standard registration requirement and does not prevent the disputed domain name from being identical to the COL2V Trademark.

Second, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has no trademark rights in the COL2V Trademark and is not commonly known by the name Col2v. The Respondent is neither affiliated with the Complainant in any way nor has he been authorized by the Complainant to use and register its Trademark. The Complainant underlines that the term "Col2v" is not a generic term which is necessary to describe products, services or any activity. The disputed domain name redirects to a platform where the disputed domain name is listed for sale at the fixed price of EUR 12,722,91, which indicates that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name to obtain financial benefit by taking advantage of the Complainant's Trademark reputation and for valuable consideration in excess of its out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name.

Third, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Notably, the Complainant contends that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name, which is identical to the COL2V Trademark, on the same day as the Complainant's applications for the Trademark, which indicates that the Respondent monitored the Complainant's activities in order to unfairly capitalize on

the Complainant's nascent trademark rights. The Complainant further asserts that the disputed domain name is offered for sale at price well in excess of the Respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name. As a result, there is no doubt that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name for the primary purpose of selling it to the Complainant. Besides, the Respondent never replied to the Complainant's notices sent via the Registrar's contact form. Furthermore, the Complainant explains that it appears from the UDRP decisions that the Respondent reveals a pattern of conduct whereby it registers domain names corresponding to recently filed European Union or other trademark applications.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Dealing with the Respondent's failure to file a response to the Complaint, paragraph 14(b) of the Rules provides that if a party, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, does not comply with a provision of, or requirement under these Rules, the panel shall be entitled to draw such inferences from this omission, as it considers appropriate.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that the Complainant proves each of the following three elements to succeed in its Complaint:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (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 COL2V Trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name, with no addition nor alteration. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Further, the gTLD ".com" is a standard registration requirement and does not prevent the disputed domain name from being identical to the COL2V Trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

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 Respondent is not licensed by, nor affiliated with, the Complainant in any way. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor is there any evidence of use or demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name for a bona fide offering of goods or services. There is no evidence of legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, either. On the contrary, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name reproduces the COL2V Trademark in its entirety with no addition or alteration. As a result, the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation, which cannot constitute fair use as it suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant (if ever put in use, Internet users would likely believe that the disputed domain name redirects to the Complainant’s website dedicated to the products labelled “COL2V”). The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name was registered on the same day as the Complainant’s applications for the Trademark, which, taking into account the fact that the disputed domain name is identical to the Trademark, cannot be the result of mere chance. Instead, as further discussed below, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in order to profit unfairly from the Complainant’s then nascent trademark rights.

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.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant’s COL2V Trademark. The disputed domain name, if put in use, would likely confuse Internet users into believing that the Respondent is affiliated with, or endorsed by, the Complainant. It is also worth noting that the disputed domain name was registered on the same day as the Complainant’s Trademark applications, which indicates that the Respondent was monitoring the Complainant’s activities. Once registered, the Respondent offered for sale the disputed domain name for a price well in excess of the Respondent’s documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name. In the circumstances, and in the absence of any explanation from the Respondent for its choice of the disputed domain name, the Panel has no serious doubt that the registration was made in order to take advantage of the Complainant’s nascent trademark rights. It is clearly recognized in jurisprudence under the UDRP that a registrant may be found to have acted in bad faith when taking unfair advantage of nascent trademark rights. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) Section 3.8.2.

The Panel accepts the Complainant’s evidence of the Respondent’s offer to sell the disputed domain name with a price evolving around EUR 12,000, which is likely well in excess of the Respondent out-of-pocket expenses directly related to the disputed domain name. Noting the specific composition of the disputed domain name, the Panel further finds that the Complainant would have been the clear potential purchaser of the disputed domain name. The Panel therefore concludes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name, as soon as the Trademark applications were published, primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the disputed domain name to the Complainant, for valuable consideration in

likely excess of its documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name (paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy).

The Panel further notes that the Respondent appears to have engaged in a pattern of bad faith registrations, registering other domain names on the same date of the complainants' trademark applications (see *Kingspan Holdings (IRL) Limited v. CATCHDADDY LLC*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-0189](#) () and *Hacona KFT v. Registration Private, CATCHDADDY LLC*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-4506](#)). Although each case must be judged on its own merits, this further reinforces the overall impression of bad faith.

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 <col2v.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mireille Buydens/

Mireille Buydens

Sole Panelist

Date: December 1, 2025