

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Chateau Lafite Rothschild v. 文桂 (Wen Gui), fdsfsd vcghfg, 王华动 (wanghuadong), Danielle Chavez, xiao qian
Case No. D2025-4283

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Chateau Lafite Rothschild, France, represented by Ebrand France, France.

The Respondents are 文桂 (Wen Gui), Hong Kong, China, fdsfsd vcghfg, Malaysia, 王华动 (wanghuadong), China, Danielle Chavez, United States of America, and xiao qian, Hong Kong, China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <lafiteassocia.com>, <lafitedian.com>, <lafiteglobal.com>, <lafitegroup.com>, <lafitegrouptea.com>, <lafiteintea.com>, <lafiteinterna.com>, <lafiteisos.com>, <lafitelcsop.com>, <lafitelegacy.com>, <lafitelsp.com>, <lafiteofficial.com>, and <lafitesops.com> are registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC.

The disputed domain name <lafitelsp.vip> is registered with NameSilo, LLC.

The disputed domain names <lafitemanor.org>, <lafitemanors.com>, <lafitemanors.net>, and <lafitemanors.vip> are registered with Gname.com Pte. Ltd.

The disputed domain name <lafitemanor.top> is registered with Eranet International Limited.

The disputed domain names <lafitewine.biz>, and <lafitewine.me> are registered with OwnRegistrar, Inc.

GoDaddy.com, LLC, NameSilo, LLC, Gname.com Pte. Ltd, Eranet International Limited, and OwnRegistrar, Inc. are separately and collectively referred to below as the "Registrar".

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on October 20, 2025. On the same day, the Center transmitted by emails to the Registrar requests for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On October 20, 21 and 22, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by emails to the Center verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names that differed from the named Respondent (LAFITE MANOR INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 6, 2025 with the registrant and contact information of the nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant either to file separate complaints for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint in English on November 10, 2025.

On November 6, 2025, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreements for the disputed domain names <lafitemanor.org>, <lafitemanors.com>, <lafitemanors.net>, and <lafitemanors.vip> is Chinese. On November 10, 2025, the Complainant submitted its request that English be the language of the proceeding. The Respondents did not submit any comment on the language of the proceeding.

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 Respondents in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on November 17, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 7, 2025. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents’ default on December 8, 2025.

The Center appointed Matthew Kennedy as the sole panelist in this matter on December 14, 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 wine producer in Pauillac, France. It owns multiple trademark registrations, including the following:

- International trademark registration number 649854 for LAFITE, registered on January 19, 1996, specifying goods in classes 33, and 34; and
- International trademark registration number 1658584 for a figurative DOMAINES BARONS DE ROTHSCHILD LAFITE R mark (the “Arrows logo”), registered on March 10, 2022, specifying goods in class 33.

The above trademark registrations are current. The Complainant has also registered the domain name <lafite.com> that it uses in connection with a website in multiple languages, including Chinese, where it provides information about itself and its wines.

The Respondents are identified as various individuals in the Registrar’s Whois database.

The disputed domain names were registered on the dates and in the names shown below:

Disputed domain name	Date of registration	Registrant
<lafitemanor.org>	September 22, 2024	xiao qian
<lafitemanor.top>	September 29, 2024	王华 动
<lafitewine.biz>	October 10, 2024	Danielle Chavez
<lafitewine.me>	October 10, 2024	Danielle Chavez

<lafitemanors.com>	October 17, 2024	xiao qian
<lafitemanors.net>	October 18, 2024	xiao qian
<lafitemanors.vip>	October 25, 2024	xiao qian
<lafitesops.com>	November 19, 2024	文桂
<lafiteisos.com>	November 27, 2024	文桂
<lafitedian.com>	December 17, 2024	文桂
<lafitelsp.com>	February 23, 2025	文桂
<lafitelcsop.com>	March 12, 2025	文桂
<lafiteinterna.com>	May 5, 2025	文桂
<lafiteintea.com>	June 3, 2025	文桂
<lafitelsp.vip>	June 7, 2025	fdsfsd vcghfg
<lafiteassocia.com>	June 16, 2025	Wen Gui
<lafitegroup.com>	July 6, 2025	Wen Gui
<lafiteofficial.com>	July 24, 2025	Wen Gui
<lafiteglobal.com>	September 8, 2025	Wen Gui
<lafitegrouptea.com>	October 7, 2025	Wen Gui
<lafitelegacy.com>	October 7, 2025	Wen Gui

At the time when the Complaint was filed, the disputed domain names <lafiteglobal.com>, <lafitegrouptea.com> and <lafitelegacy.com> resolved to websites for the 拉菲庄园国际协会 (Lafite Manor International Association). The association's name was displayed alongside the Arrows logo and its contact address was shown as "Château Lafite (France)" in Pauillac, France. The websites' homepages displayed images variously of a wine cellar, a wine bottle rack, and a wine bottle and glasses. They also displayed images of bottles labelled Château Lafite Rothschild, Pauillac, and Romanée-Conti and offered them for sale. The websites were in Chinese but at least one (i.e., the website associated with the disputed domain name <lafiteglobal.com>) also had an English version.

The other 18 disputed domain names (or subdomains under them) formerly resolved to websites in Chinese for the 拉菲庄园国际协会 (Lafite Manor International Association). Most of them displayed the association name alongside the Arrows logo. They displayed the same images as the websites described above, with the possible exception of the website associated with the disputed domain name <lafitemanors.net>, for which the archived screenshot shows only its textual elements without images.

At the time of this Decision, 19 of the disputed domain names no longer resolve to any active website but are passively held. The other two disputed domain names are <lafitemanors.com> and <lafitemanors.net>, which resolve to webpages in English advising that interested parties can request to buy them from the owner.

The Complainant provides evidence dated July 14 (with no year) that a consumer who visited the website associated with the disputed domain name <lafiteassocia.com> and paid MYR 51,600 for six bottles of Lafite wine received a certificate signed "Lafite Manor International Association" but never received the wine.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for transfer or cancellation of the disputed domain names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its LAFITE trademark.

The Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. The Respondent registered the disputed domain names for the purpose of impersonating the Complainant. No "Lafite Manor International Association" is registered in France.

The disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith. They were registered for the sole goal of redirecting to a fake LAFITE website and scamming customers. The disputed domain names <lafiteglobal.com>, <lafitegrouptea.com>, and <lafitelegacy.com> still resolve to fake websites while the other disputed domain names are now passively held. All disputed domain names have either at some point redirected to infringing content reproducing the Complainant's trademark and impersonating its identity or are held by the same registrant as one of the disputed domain names that redirected to this content and have all at some point been used in bad faith.

The Complainant requests that the disputed domain names <lafiteglobal.com>, <lafitegroup.com>, and <lafiteofficial.com> be transferred to the Complainant and that the other disputed domain names be deleted.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Preliminary Issues

A. Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that 13 disputed domain names are registered by the same person with the same contact telephone and email address even though for seven of these, this person's name is shown in Chinese as "文桂" and for six others that name is transliterated as "Wen Gui". Although the registrants of the eight other disputed domain names are nominally different, the registrant name for one of them ("fdsfsd vcghfg") is clearly false and all 21 disputed domain names have at some point resolved to websites operated by the Lafite Manor International Association that displayed the same images and shared the same layout. In view of these circumstances, the Panel is satisfied that the disputed domain names or the associated domain names are all under common control.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as “the Respondent”) in a single proceeding.

B. Language of the Proceeding

The Registrar has verified that the language of the Registration Agreements for most disputed domain names is English, except for the disputed domain names <lafitemanor.org>, <lafitemanors.com>, <lafitemanors.net>, and <lafitemanors.vip>, for which the Registration Agreements are in 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 and amended Complaint were filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including the fact that the disputed domain names resolve to webpages that display English words, and the disputed domain names <lafitemanor.org>, <lafitemanors.com>, <lafitemanors.net>, and <lafitemanors.vip> each contain the English word “manor”, which implies that the Respondent is able to understand English; whereas translation of the Complaint into Chinese would impose substantial costs on the Complainant and delay the proceeding.

Despite the Center having sent an email regarding the language of the proceeding, and the notification of the Complaint, in both Chinese and English, the Respondent did not make any submissions with respect to the language of the proceeding.

The Panel notes that two of the disputed domain names for which the Registration Agreements are in Chinese (i.e., <lafitemanors.com> and <lafitemanors.net>) currently resolve to webpages in English. Further, the Panel has already found that all 21 disputed domain names or their associated websites are under common control, the Registration Agreements for 17 of which are in English. In these circumstances, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent understands that language.

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.

6.2 Substantive Issues

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that a complainant must demonstrate each of the following elements with respect to each 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; 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.

The burden of proof of each element is borne by the Complainant.

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. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a LAFITE trademark for the purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain names all incorporate the LAFITE mark as their respective initial elements. They add various words and letters (i.e., "associa", "dian" (most likely a transcription of a Chinese word meaning "shop"), "global", "group", "grouptea", "intea", "interna", "isos", "lcsop", "legacy", "lsp", "manor", "manors", "official", "sops", and "wine"). However, despite the addition of these words and letters, the LAFITE mark is clearly recognizable within each disputed domain name. The only additional element in each disputed domain name is a Top-Level Domain ("TLD") extension (variously, ".com", ".net", ".org", ".top", ".vip", ".biz", and ".me"). Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7, 1.8, and 1.11.1.

Therefore, 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. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

In the present case, the disputed domain names (or subdomains under them) resolve or formerly resolved to websites for the 拉菲庄园国际协会 (Lafite Manor International Association) offering wines for sale. The websites displayed the Complainant's Arrows logo and a street address that was in fact the Complainant's address. The websites gave the impression that they were operated by the Complainant or its affiliate. Certain of the disputed domain names combined the LAFITE mark simply with a word such as "global", "group" or "official" and a TLD extension, creating a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. However, it is clear from the Complaint that the Respondent has no license from, or other relationship with, the Complainant. There is evidence that one disputed domain name (<lafiteassocia.com>) has been used to defraud an Internet user into paying for wine that was never delivered. At the time of this Decision, 19 of the disputed domain names are passively held while two (<lafitemanors.com> and <lafitemanors.net>) resolve to webpages in English merely indicating that they are for sale. None of these uses constitutes a use of the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services for the purposes of the Policy.

Further, the Registrar has verified that the Respondent's names are those shown in Section 1 above. Although the websites formerly resolved to websites for a "Lafite Manor International Association", which includes the name "Lafite", the evidence presented by the Complainant shows that this association does not exist at the address shown on the Respondent's websites or elsewhere in France. An Internet search for the association returned no results indicating that it exists at all. Accordingly, nothing on the record shows that the Respondent has been commonly known by any of the disputed domain names.

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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Based on the record, 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 fourth circumstance is as follows:

"(iv) by using the [disputed] domain name, [the respondent has] intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [the respondent's] 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 or location or of a product or service on [the respondent's] web site or location."

In the present case, the disputed domain names were registered in 2024 and 2025, many years after the registration of the Complainant's LAFITE trademark. The disputed domain names wholly incorporate that mark as their respective initial elements, combined with additional words and letters. The websites that were live at the time when the Complaint was filed resolved to websites that displayed the Complainant's Arrows logo, its address, and images of the Complainant's wine labels. All the disputed domain names resolved or formerly resolved to websites displaying images of cellars and bottles and offering wine for sale, indicating an awareness of the nature of the Complainant's business. Due to its longstanding and widespread use, the Complainant has a strong reputation in the LAFITE mark in the wine industry, in which the Respondent purports to be present. In view of these circumstances and the findings in Section 6.2B above, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names with the Complainant's LAFITE mark in mind.

As regards use, at the time when the Complaint was filed, the disputed domain names <lafiteglobal.com>, <lafitegrouptea.com> and <lafitelegacy.com> resolved to websites for the 拉菲庄园国际协会 (Lafite Manor International Association) giving the false impression that they were operated by the Complainant or its affiliate and offering wine for sale. This use was intentional and for commercial gain. Accordingly, the Panel finds that these circumstances fall within the terms of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

At the time when the Complaint was filed, the other 18 disputed domain names were passively held. The Panel notes that these disputed domain names (or subdomains under them) formerly resolved to websites for the 拉菲庄园国际协会 (Lafite Manor International Association) that also gave the false impression that they were operated by an affiliate of the Complainant and offered wine for sale. In these circumstances, the Panel finds that the non-use of these disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3.

The Panel notes that the use of certain disputed domain names has recently changed. The disputed domain names <lafiteglobal.com>, <lafitegrouptea.com> and <lafitelegacy.com> no longer resolve to active websites and the disputed domain names <lafitemanors.com> and <lafitemanors.net> now resolve to webpages indicating that they are for sale. These changes in use do not alter the Panel's conclusion; if anything, they may be further indications of bad faith.

Therefore, 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:

- (i) the disputed domain names <lafiteglobal.com>, <lafitegroup.com>, and <lafiteofficial.com> be transferred to the Complainant; and
- (ii) the disputed domain names <lafiteassocia.com>, <lafitedian.com>, <lafitegrouptea.com>, <lafiteintea.com>, <lafiteinterna.com>, <lafiteisos.com>, <lafitelcsop.com>, <lafitelegacy.com>, <lafitelsp.com>, <lafitelsp.vip>, <lafitemanor.org>, <lafitemanors.com>, <lafitemanors.net>, <lafitemanors.vip>, <lafitemanor.top>, <lafitesops.com>, <lafitewine.biz>, and <lafitewine.me> be cancelled.

/Matthew Kennedy/

Matthew Kennedy

Sole Panelist

Date: December 24, 2025