

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Les Parfumeries Fragonard v. Nawaf Hariri, Salla Platform Company For Communication and Information Technology
Case No. D2025-4330

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Les Parfumeries Fragonard, France, represented by MIIP MADE IN IP, France.

The Respondent is Nawaf Hariri, Salla Platform Company For Communication and Information Technology, Saudi Arabia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <fragonardbringer.com> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with Name.com, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 21, 2025. On October 22, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On October 22, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response, confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing additional contact details.

The Center verified that the 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 November 10, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 30, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on December 3, 2025.

The Center appointed Ian Lowe as the sole panelist in this matter on December 12, 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 parfumier founded in Grasse, France in 1926. Since its foundation the Complainant has marketed its products, which now include fashion and personal care goods, under the FRAGONARD mark (the “Mark”). The Complainant’s products are directly distributed to many stores around the world and are also sold by means of a mail-order catalogue, and on online store via the website at “www.fragonard.com”, which promotes the sales of FRAGONARD products. The website is available in the French, English, German, Spanish and Italian languages.

The Complainant is the proprietor of numerous registered trademarks around the world comprising FRAGONARD, including International trademark number 312110 FRAGONARD registered on April 15, 1966, France trademark number 94516079 FRAGONARD registered on May 19, 1995; and Qatar trademark number 075403 FRAGONARD registered on June 25, 2015. The Complainant is also the owner of almost 100 domain names comprising “fragonard” in respect of a very wide range of country-code and generic Top-Level Domains (“gTLDs”), all of which redirect to the Complainant’s principal website at “www.fragonard.com”.

The Domain Name was registered on September 20, 2025. It resolves to a website (the “Respondent’s Website”) styled “Bring Fragonard” in the Arabic language and purporting to offer for sale a wide range of FRAGONARD branded perfumes. The website provides no information as to the operator of the website and no contact details save for a Saudi Arabia telephone number.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Mark, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name and that the Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

For this Complaint to succeed in relation to the Domain Name the Complainant must prove that:

- (i) the 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 Domain Name; and
- (iii) the 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.

Ignoring the gTLD “.com”, the Domain Name comprises the entirety of the Mark with the addition of the term “bringer”. The Panel finds that the addition of this term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the Mark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights, and 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. Accordingly, 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 Complainant has made out a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name. The Respondent has used the Domain Name for a website offering for sale products of the Complainant, featuring the Mark and a number of the product names of the Complainant, without any indication of its lack of relationship with the Complainant, which is not a bona fide offering of goods or services. There is no suggestion that the Respondent has ever been known by the Domain Name. The Respondent has chosen not to respond to the Complaint or to take any steps to counter the prima facie case established by the Complainant. In the circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name.

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 Domain Name comprises the entirety of the Mark with the addition of the term “bringer”. The Respondent has used the Domain Name for a website prominently featuring the Mark with photographs of the Complainant’s products. Accordingly, the Panel is in no doubt that the Respondent had the Complainant and its rights in the Mark in mind when it registered the Domain Name.

The Respondent’s Website fails to disclose accurately and prominently the lack of any relationship between the Respondent and the Complainant. In the circumstances, without any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name, the Panel finds that the Respondent has registered and used the Domain Name to take unfair advantage of the Complainant and to deceive Internet users into believing that the Domain Name is operated or authorized by the Complainant; thereby attracting Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Mark as to its source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith and the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 Domain Name <fragonardbringer.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ian Lowe/

Ian Lowe

Sole Panelist

Date: December 26, 2025