

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Louis Vuitton Malletier v. 丁志国 (dingzhiguo)  
Case No. D2025-4346

### 1. The Parties

The Complainant is Louis Vuitton Malletier, France, represented by Studio Barbero S.p.A., Italy.

The Respondent is 丁志国 (dingzhiguo), China.

### 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <email-louisvuitton.com> is registered with DNSPod, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 23, 2025. On October 23, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 24, 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 November 3, 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 amendment to the Complaint in English on November 6, 2025.

On November 3, 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 November 6, 2025, the Complainant confirmed its request that English 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 amendment to 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 in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on November 7, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 27, 2025. The Respondent sent email communications in Chinese to the Center on November 3 and 7, 2025. The Center notified the Parties of the commencement of panel appointment process on December 2, 2025.

The Center appointed Jonathan Agmon as the sole panelist in this matter on December 6, 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 fashion house who in turn is part of the multinational luxury goods conglomerate LVMH Moët Hennessy Louis Vuitton, also known as LVMH. Founded in Paris, France over 165 years ago in 1854 by Louis Vuitton, the Complainant initially sold canvas coated trunks. The Complainant launched the LOUIS VUITTON brand in 1998, which included shoes, accessories, and jewelry. Since then, the Complainant has continued to launch new lines of products and expand its business into new markets. The LVMH Group currently employs over 210,000 people in over 5,600 stores worldwide. In 2024, it generated around EUR 84.7 billion in revenue. The Complainant's products are primarily available on its official website, at LOUIS VUITTON boutiques, and in luxury department stores.

The Complainant's LOUIS VUITTON mark has been intensively advertised, appearing in international publications such as Vanity Fair, Elle, Glamour, and Vogue. It also has a celebrity following and has featured famous celebrities such as Angelina Jolie, David Bowie, Jennifer Lopez, and Sean Connery in its marketing campaigns. The Complainant also has a strong Internet presence, including its social media presence on Facebook, X, Instagram, YouTube, Pinterest, and LinkedIn. According to InterBrand Best Global Brands, the LOUIS VUITTON mark was valued at USD \$50,900 million in 2024, ranked as the 11th most valuable brand in the world.

The Complainant owns various trademark registrations for LOUIS VUITTON, including the following:-

- International trademark registration no. 416052 for LOUIS VUITTON, registered on June 19, 1975;
- International trademark registration no. 1096591 for LOUIS VUITTON, registered on April 6, 2011;
- European Union trademark registration no. 000015610 for LOUIS VUITTON, registered on March 16, 1998;
- China trademark registration no. 241017 for LOUIS VUITTON, registered on January 15, 1986; and
- China trademark registration no. 241019 for LOUIS VUITTON, registered on January 15, 1986.

The Complainant operates various domain names, including its official and primary domain name, <louisvuitton.com>, registered on February 18, 1997.

The disputed domain name was registered on February 12, 2025. At the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to an inactive website. The Mail Exchange server records ("MX records") of the disputed domain name are present.

## **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 contends that:-

- The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the LOUIS VUITTON trademark in which the Complainant has rights as the disputed domain name incorporates the entirety of the Complainant's LOUIS VUITTON trademark. The mere addition of the generic term "email" and a hyphen does not affect the confusing similarity. In fact, the addition of the term "email" may increase confusion since users could believe that the disputed domain name is owned by the Complainant, or at least, by one of the Complainant's affiliated or authorised entities, and is used for the sending and receiving email communication. The addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is a standard registration requirement and is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test.
- The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not a licensee or authorised agent of the Complainant, and is not authorised to use the Complainant's trademark. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name resolves to an inactive website, and there is no evidence that the Respondent is using, or preparing to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's LOUIS VUITTON trademark in its entirety with the addition of the term "email", which causes it to carry a high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. The Respondent also did not reply to the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter, which demonstrates the lack of any rights or legitimate interests.
- The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The LOUIS VUITTON trademark is well known and has been used extensively since the 1850s in many countries. The Complainant's LOUIS VUITTON products are also promoted and offered online by the Complainant on its website. The Respondent was undoubtedly aware of the Complainant's LOUIS VUITTON trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name, and the fact that the disputed domain name was confusingly similar to the LOUIS VUITTON trademark. It is therefore inconceivable that the Respondent was not well aware of the Complainant's trademark rights at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name. Given the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, it is clear that the Respondent acted in opportunistic bad faith by registering the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademark for the likely purpose of taking advantage of the Complainant's trademark. The disputed domain name resolves to an inactive website, and the non-use and passive holding of the disputed domain name is evidence of bad faith. The Respondent also concealed his details in the public Whois records, which is evidence of bad faith. Further, the MX records for the disputed domain name are set up, which means that the disputed domain name may be used for email communication, and is evidence of bad faith.

### **B. Respondent**

The Respondent did not formally reply to the Complainant's contentions, but sent two email communications offering disputed domain name for sale at the price of 100 (presumably in CNY).

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **6.1 Preliminary Issue: 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 Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including the fact that:-

- The Complainant communicates in English and would be prejudiced if it were required to translate the Complaint and participate in the proceeding in Chinese.
- Requiring the Complainant to translate the Complaint and documents into Chinese would cause delay to the proceedings.
- The Respondent did not raise any issue, or request for the proceedings to be conducted in Chinese, or claim to be unable to understand English after receiving the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter, or the Complaint.
- The Respondent sent an email to the Complainant requesting a sum of money in exchange for the disputed domain name, which means that the Respondent read the Complaint and understood the Complainant's claims.
- The disputed domain name is comprised of Latin characters.
- The disputed domain name contains the English word "email".
- The Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the gTLD ".com", revealing his intention to target an audience of English-speaking users.

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 of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[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**

#### **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 or service mark 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. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of another term here, “email-”, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such a term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

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.

In addition, the evidence shows that MX records are present in the DNS configuration of the disputed domain name. The presence of MX records in the zone files suggests the possible use of the disputed domain name in connection with the receipt as well as the sending of emails from email addresses based on the disputed domain name. There is therefore a likelihood that the disputed domain name may be used in connection with the sending of email communications pretending to be sent from the Complainant or one of its affiliated entities. Such use of the disputed domain name cannot be considered to confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent.

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.

There is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Complainant’s registration of its LOUIS VUITTON trademark long predates the registration of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name resolved to an inactive website, and there is no evidence that the Respondent is using or preparing to use the disputed domain name for any legitimate purpose.

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 registered the disputed domain name a very long time after the Complainant registered its LOUIS VUITTON trademark. Given the significant fame of the Complainant's LOUIS VUITTON trademark, it is highly unlikely that the Respondent was not aware of the Complainant and its trademark prior to the registration of the disputed domain name.

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 evidence shows that MX records are present in the DNS configuration of the disputed domain name. The presence of MX records in the zone files suggests the possible use of the disputed domain name in connection with the receipt as well as the sending of emails from email addresses based on the disputed domain name. There is therefore a likelihood that the disputed domain name may be used in connection with the sending of email communications pretending to be sent from the Complainant or one of its affiliated entities. Setting up of the MX records, especially in connection with a domain name using a well-known mark is a clear indication of bad faith use and registration. See *Tetra Laval Holdings & Finance S.A. v. Himali Hewage*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-0472](#).

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and fame of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

The Respondent failed to reply to the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter dated March 17, 2025, which is evidence of bad faith. The Respondent also refused delivery of the Written Notice from the Center, which is further evidence of bad faith use and registration.

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 <email-louisvuitton.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Jonathan Agmon/

**Jonathan Agmon**

Sole Panelist

Date: December 20, 2025