

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Nature et Découvertes v. Registration Private
Case No. D2025-4186

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Nature et Découvertes, France, represented by IP Twins, France.

The Respondent is Registration Private, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <naturedécouvertes.com> (<xn--naturedcouvertes-hqb.com>) is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 13, 2025. On October 13, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 14, 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, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 15, 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 16, 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 17, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 6, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on November 10, 2025.

The Center appointed Daniel Kraus as the sole panelist in this matter on November 20, 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 retailing company created in 1990, with currently 103 stores including 93 shops in France, and which is part of a larger group since 2019 (the FNAC DARTY group, a European leader in household, leisure, technical and cultural goods and services, with 1500 stores all over the world and 30.000 employees). The Complainant also run or has franchisees shops in Germany, Belgium, Luxembourg, Switzerland and Portugal.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademarks, in particular the following:

- A European Union trademark NATURE & DECOUVERTES No. 013360599, filed on October 14, 2014, registered on May 4, 2015 and designating goods and services in International classes 1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43 and 44;
- A European Union trademark NATURE ET DECOUVERTES No 006579866 filed on December 19, 2007, registered on June 10, 2009 and designating goods and services in International classes 1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44;
- A French trademark NATURE ET DECOUVERTES No. 3335966, registered on January 20, 2005, and designating goods and services in International classes 1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 39, 42, 43 and 44.

The Complainant also owns numerous domain names integrating “nature et découvertes” such as: <natureetdecouvertes.com> registered on November 28, 1996, or <natureetdecouvertes.fr> registered on August 29, 2000.

The disputed domain name is <naturedécouvertes.com> (<xn--naturedecouverteshqb.com>), registered on July 15, 2025.

Before actions were undertaken by the Complainant, the website hosted at the disputed domain name was displaying a fake Nature & Découvertes shop, which content was directly scraped from the official website, reproducing the global branding, as well as the official logo of the trademark NATURE & DECOUVERTES owned by the Complainant, and pretending to sell products and services, reproducing the exact content of the official website.

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 asserts that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its earlier trademarks NATURE & DECOUVERTES and NATURE ET DECOUVERTES. According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name reproduces the distinctive elements of its mark, differing only by the omission of the conjunction “et” or the symbol “&”. Such minor deletions do not materially alter the visual or phonetic impression of the mark, whose essence lies in the combination of the terms “nature” and “découvertes”. The Complainant argues that this constitutes a classic case of typosquatting, citing the WIPO

Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), section 1.9 .

The Complainant further submits that the incorporation of its well-known mark in its entirety is sufficient to establish confusing similarity, referencing consistent UDRP jurisprudence. The generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.com” should be disregarded for comparison purposes. Accordingly, the Complainant contends that the first element of the Policy is satisfied.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is neither affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant to use its trademarks, and the Complainant has identified no trademark rights held by the Respondent corresponding to the disputed domain name.

The Complainant also submits that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, emphasizing that the Complaint was filed shortly after registration, preventing the Respondent from acquiring such recognition.

Further, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has not used the disputed domain name for a bona fide offering of goods or services. Instead, prior to the Complainant’s intervention, the disputed domain name resolved to a fraudulent website impersonating the Complainant’s official online shop, including copied branding and content extracted directly from the Complainant’s site. The Complainant argues that such activity cannot constitute legitimate use.

Given these circumstances, the Complainant asserts that it has made out a prima facie case of no rights or legitimate interests, shifting the burden to the Respondent. The Complainant therefore contends that the second element of the Policy is met.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. It submits that its NATURE & DECOUVERTES trademarks are well known in several European markets and have been in use since 1990, making it highly likely that the Respondent knew of the marks when registering the disputed domain name in 2025. The Complainant argues that the deliberate selection of a long and complex domain name incorporating its distinctive French wording—including the use of the accented “é”—shows that the Respondent targeted its mark.

The Complainant also points to online search results showing only references to the Complainant, and to the Respondent’s failure to conduct any trademark searches, as further indicators of bad-faith registration. The Complainant suggests that the Respondent may have registered the disputed domain name to resell it or to prevent the Complainant from using it.

Regarding use, the Complainant submits that the Respondent operated a fraudulent website mimicking the Complainant’s official shop in order to mislead consumers. Even though the disputed domain name now resolves to a warning page created by the Complainant, the Complainant argues that both the earlier fraudulent activity and the subsequent passive holding support a finding of bad-faith use, consistent with the principles articulated in *Telstra v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0003](#).

Given the well-known character of the Complainant’s trademark, the Complainant asserts that any conceivable use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent would inevitably be illegitimate.

The Complainant therefore submits that the Respondent both registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith, satisfying the third element of the Policy.

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 name. [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 entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Only the term "et" between "Nature" and "découvertes" has been omitted. 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 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here hosting a fraudulent replica of the Complainant's online shop, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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 intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, hosting a fraudulent replica of the Complainant's online constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 <naturedécouvertes.com> (<xn--naturedcouvertes-hqb.com>) be transferred to the Complainant.

/Daniel Kraus/

Daniel Kraus

Sole Panelist

Date: December 4, 2025