

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

VALEO v. aiman sltanian, sria
Case No. D2025-4710

1. The Parties

The Complainant is VALEO, France, represented by Tmark Conseils, France.

The Respondent is aiman sltanian, sria, Iran (Islamic Republic of).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <valeoiran.com> is registered with CSL Computer Service Langenbach GmbH dba Joker.com (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 13, 2025. On November 14, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 17, 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 (sria) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 18, 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 November 20, 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 November 21, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 11, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on December 12, 2025.

The Center appointed Stefan Bojovic as the sole panelist in this matter on December 18, 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 an automotive technology company from France. The Complainant operates globally as a supplier and partner to automakers, focusing on innovative solutions for smart mobility, intuitive driving, and reducing carbon dioxide emissions. The Complainant also provides and distributes spare parts for both automakers and the independent aftermarket.

The Complainant is the owner of the VALEO trademark which is protected by a trademark registration in many jurisdictions throughout the world, including the following:

- French trademark registration No. 1336046 for VALEO, registered on December 23, 1985;
- European Union trademark registration No. 018363184 for VALEO, registered on August 16, 2023;
- International trademark registration No. 870058 for VALEO (word/device), registered on February 28, 2005;
- United States trademark registration No. 1353733 for VALEO, registered on August 13, 1985.

In addition, the Complainant owns domain name registrations containing VALEO trademark, such as <valeo.com>, registered on March 25, 1997 and used for the Complainant's principal website.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 6, 2023 and resolves to the website of the Iranian company "Valeo Negar Afroz Diba" which claims to be "the only officially licensed online auto parts retailer in Iran" and that it is "the main importer of Valeo parts from France and Korea". This website offers for sale products of the Complainant along with the competing products (spare parts for vehicles) of other manufacturers. The website also contains the section where customers can check the authenticity of the products.

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 its VALEO trademark, which is recognizable within the disputed domain name despite the addition of the geographical term "Iran". The generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" should be ignored as the same does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

With reference to rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant, who is established in 1955, has prior rights that clearly predate the registration of the disputed domain name. The Respondent appears to be the same person that was the respondent in the procedure related to the domain name <valeo.ir> (*VALEO v. Iman Soltanian*, WIPO Case No. [DIR2023-0001](#)), since the names of respondents are very similar, they use the same e-mail address and the domain name <valeo.ir> redirects to the disputed domain name. Therefore, the Complainant deems that prior history of the Respondent clearly indicates lack of rights and legitimate interests. The Respondent is also not commonly known by the disputed domain name. The use of the disputed domain name for unauthorized commercial website displaying the Complainant's trademarks and copyrighted product images does not support finding of any rights or legitimate interests. The website configured on the disputed domain name

will also likely create confusion among the relevant public that would expect this website to be connected to the Complainant or entity authorized by the Complainant.

With reference to the circumstances evidencing bad faith, the Complainant states that due to widespread global use of its VALEO trademark there is no possibility that the disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent by a coincidence. This is particularly true given the fact the disputed domain name refers to content related to the automotive/mobility industry, a sector in which the Complainant is a specialist and well-known. Additionally, the Respondent asserts that it is an official reseller of VALEO products and provides guidelines to the visitors of the disputed domain name on how to distinguish real VALEO products from counterfeits. This demonstrates the fact that the Respondent was aware of the VALEO trademark at the time of the registration of the domain name. The Complainant points out that the disputed domain name currently resolves to an active website reproducing or at least imitating the Complainant's VALEO trademark without authorization and that the Respondent pretends to be an official representative of the Complainant. With such use of the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website or services provided therein.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules: "A Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable." Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy stipulates that the complainant must prove each of the following:

- (i) that the disputed domain name registered by the respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights;
- (ii) that the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) that 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 Complainant's trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, geographical term "Iran") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such 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.

In addition, it is well established that “.com”, as a gTLD, can be disregarded in the assessment of the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

The Panel, therefore, finds that 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 Panel notes that there is no relationship between the Respondent and the Complainant and that the Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, nor has the Respondent otherwise obtained an authorization to use the Complainant's VALEO trademark. There appears to be no element from which the Panel could infer the Respondent's rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, or that the Respondent might be commonly known by the disputed domain name.

On the contrary, based on the evidence presented before the Panel, the Respondent appears to be involved in at least one prior domain name dispute initiated by the Complainant (see *VALEO v. Iman Soltanian*, WIPO Case No. [DIR2023-0001](#)). Although the name of the respondent in the previous proceedings do not completely match the name of the Respondent (aiman sltanian v. Iman Soltanian), the Panel holds that there are clear indicators that demonstrate the identity of these persons (including the same e-mail address, very similar name and use of the domain names for redirection from one to another). The Panel draws conclusion that the Respondent has shown persistency in registering the domain names that target the Complainant and its VALEO trademark. Under such circumstances, it is difficult to imagine any legitimate interest on the Respondent's side that would justify its actions.

The Respondent seems to run business of selling spare automotive parts in Iran (Islamic Republic of), which *per se* is a legitimate business activity. As previously indicated, the website on the disputed domain name contains references that the Iranian company “Valeo Negar Afroz Diba” is “the only officially licensed online auto parts retailer in Iran” and that it is “the main importer of Valeo parts from France and Korea”. This website offers for sale products of the Complainant along with the competing products (spare parts for vehicles) of other manufacturers. The website also contains the section where customers can check the authenticity of the products.

Having in mind the above, the Panel holds that the key question in respect to the Respondent's use of the Complainant's VALEO trademark within the disputed domain name is whether such use can be observed as nominative (fair) use in accordance with the Policy. The Panel holds that the test formulated in *Oki Data*

Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc., WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#) (“Oki Data test”) could be applied in the case at hand (see also [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.8). Under Oki Data test, panels have recognized that resellers, distributors, or service providers using a domain name containing the Complainant’s trademark to undertake sales or repairs related to the Complainant’s goods or services may be making a bona fide offering of goods or services and thus have a legitimate interest in such domain name, provided that the following cumulative requirements are met:

- (i) the respondent must actually be offering the goods or services at issue;
- (ii) the respondent must use the site to sell only the trademarked goods or services;
- (iii) the site must accurately and prominently disclose the registrant’s relationship with the trademark holder; and
- (iv) the respondent must not try to ‘corner the market’ in domain names that reflect the trademark.

In the present case, the Panel finds that the Respondent’s relationship with the Complainant (or, more precisely, the lack thereof) was not accurately and prominently disclosed on the website to which the disputed domain name resolved. As a matter of fact, the Respondent is using the website on the disputed domain name in a misleading manner, creating the false impression that it is an authorized distributor of the Complainant for the territory of Iran (Islamic Republic of). Furthermore, the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to offer the goods of other manufacturers, which are direct competitors of the Complainant. Finally, the choice of the disputed domain name that contains the Complainant’s trademark along with the geographical term “Iran” within the “.com” as the most popular gTLD, can be observed as an attempt of the Respondent to “corner the market” in domain names that reflect the Complainant’s trademark. The above is particularly problematic when it is taken into account that the Respondent was already involved in another domain name dispute with almost identical factual background, related to the domain name <valeo.ir>. The Panel holds that acts of the Respondent show clear intention of monopolizing the domain names that connects the Complainant’s trademark with the territory of the Iran (Islamic Republic of).

When all the above factors are taken into account, the Panel can draw a conclusion that the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name cannot be observed as a nominative (fair) use neither under the Policy nor in accordance with criteria set in Oki Data test.

The Panel also finds that the structure of the disputed domain name, which contains the Complainant’s VALEO trademark in combination with the geographical term “Iran” carries a risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1

Having in mind the above, 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.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its VALEO trademark. It is, therefore, highly unlikely that the Respondent decided to register a domain name containing this trademark in its entirety without having the Complainant in mind when doing so. It should be also borne in mind that the first registration and use of VALEO trademark predates the registration of the disputed domain name for decades, making it unlikely that the Respondent was not aware of the Complainant’s trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. Additionally, the content of the website to which the disputed domain name resolves leaves no room for a doubt about the Respondent’s

knowledge of the Complainant and its VALEO trademark and evidences that the Respondent actually had the Complainant in mind when registering the disputed domain name.

Due to the above, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been registered in bad faith.

As previously mentioned, the disputed domain name resolves to a website which creates the impression that the Respondent is authorized distributor of the Complainant and that there is an affiliation between these subjects. In the Panel's view, such use, in connection with all other circumstances of this case, falls under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, and the Respondent, by using the disputed domain name, has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been both registered and is being used in bad faith, and consequently 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 <valeoiran.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Stefan Bojovic/

Stefan Bojovic

Sole Panelist

Date: January 1, 2026