

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Société Anonyme des Galeries Lafayette v. su jia xing  
Case No. D2025-4719

### 1. The Parties

The Complainant is Société Anonyme des Galeries Lafayette, France, represented by Dreyfus & associés, France.

The Respondent is su jia xing, Republic of Korea.

### 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <galerieslafayette.vip> is registered with Gname.com Pte. Ltd. (the "Registrar").

### 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on November 14, 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 16, 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 17, 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 18, 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 Yuri Chumak as the sole panelist in this matter on December 19, 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 company that operates a retail group under the name and trademark GALERIES LAFAYETTE, including through physical stores and e-commerce activities, and that it maintains an online presence at “[www.galerieslafayette.com](http://www.galerieslafayette.com)”.

The Complainant owns trademark registrations for GALERIES LAFAYETTE. The Complaint relies on, among others, the following registrations:

1. International trademark registration No. 146213 for GALERIES LAFAYETTE, registered on April 4, 1950 (duly renewed), designating a number of countries;
2. European Union trademark registration No. 003798147 for GALERIES LAFAYETTE, registered May 19, 2006 (duly renewed); and
3. International trademark registration No. 1718969 for GALERIES LAFAYETTE, registered October 13, 2022, designating the United States of America.

The Complainant also operates domain names incorporating its mark, including [<galerieslafayette.com>](http://<galerieslafayette.com>), registered on August 1, 1997.

The disputed domain name [<galerieslafayette.vip>](http://<galerieslafayette.vip>) was registered on October 16, 2025. According to the Complaint, the disputed domain name has been used to direct Internet users to an alert page warning of a dangerous site, and then to an e-commerce website offering various products for sale.

#### **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 reproduces the GALERIES LAFAYETTE mark in its entirety and is confusingly similar to that mark. The Complainant contends that the Respondent is not affiliated with or authorized by the Complainant, and that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, including because the Respondent registered a domain name identical to the Complainant's mark, and because the disputed domain name has been used in connection with a website involving a security warning and a commercial e-commerce site.

##### **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 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 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.

The applicable Top-Level Domain is disregarded for the purposes of the confusing similarity test. The “.vip” Top-Level Domain is a standard registration requirement and does not impact the analysis. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

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.

There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor that the disputed domain name is being used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or for a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

The disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's mark, and its composition carries a high risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1. In addition, the Complaint includes evidence that the disputed domain name resolves to a security warning and then to a commercial e-commerce site. In the circumstances of this case, this does not support a finding of rights or legitimate interests on the part of the Respondent.

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 disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's GALERIES LAFAYETTE mark. The Complainant's trademark registrations significantly predate the registration of the disputed domain name. On the available record, the Panel finds it more likely than not that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the Complainant's mark in mind.

The Complaint indicates that the disputed domain name has been used in connection with an alert page warning of a dangerous site, and then a commercial e-commerce website offering products for sale. In the circumstances of this case, the Panel considers this consistent with an attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to source, affiliation, or endorsement, as contemplated under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

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.

Having reviewed the record, and in view of the composition of the disputed domain name, the timing of registration, the use described in the Complaint, and the Respondent's failure to submit any response, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in 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 <galerieslafayette.vip> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Yuri Chumak/  
Yuri Chumak  
Sole Panelist  
Date: December 26, 2025*