

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

ANIMALIS v. jordane takapi, jordane takapi
Case No. D2025-4753

1. The Parties

The Complainant is ANIMALIS, France, represented by MIIP MADE IN IP, France.

The Respondent is jordane takapi, jordane takapi, Cameroon.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <animalsis.com> is registered with Wix.com Ltd. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 17, 2025. On November 17, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 18, 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 (The RDAP server redacted the value) 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 19, 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 15, 2025.

The Center appointed Ganna Prokhorova as the sole panelist in this matter on December 17, 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 operating in the field of pet products and services under the brand name ANIMALIS since 1998. Over the years, the Complainant has developed a significant commercial presence in France, operating more than 100 physical retail stores nationwide and maintaining an active online business. The Complainant also engages in various initiatives related to animal welfare and maintains an established presence on social media platforms. The ANIMALIS brand has been continuously promoted through both offline and online channels.

In September 2024, the Complainant launched a dedicated pet adoption platform under the domain name <animalis-adoption.com>. Since its launch, this platform has facilitated more than 2,500 pet adoptions, further reinforcing the visibility and reputation of the ANIMALIS brand in connection with animal-related services.

The Complainant is the owner of multiple trademark registrations incorporating the mark ANIMALIS, including, inter alia:

- French trademark ANIMALIS (word), No. 3808091, filed on February 21, 2011, registered on June 17, 2011, in class 35;
- French trademark ANIMALIS (figurative), No. 4408048, filed on November 27, 2017, registered on April 27, 2018 in classes 3, 5, 9, 16, 18, 20, 21, 28, 31, 35, 38, 41, and 44;
- International trademark ANIMALIS (figurative), No. 1436468, registered on May 4, 2018, in classes 3, 5, 9, 16, 18, 20, 21, 28, 31, 38, 41, and 44.

The Complainant has also operated the domain name <animalis.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 31, 2025. At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website presenting itself as an animal shelter and adoption center operating under the name “animalis” and purportedly located in the south of France. The website prominently used the Complainant’s ANIMALIS trademarks. As of the date of this Decision, the disputed domain name no longer resolves to an active website.

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:

(1) The disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant’s trademark, since it incorporates the ANIMALIS mark with only a minor misspelling, and the addition of the letter “s” does not prevent confusion. The difference of one character does not change the overall impression of the disputed domain name, which remains visually and phonetically similar to the Complainant’s mark. The “.com” Top-Level Domain (“TLD”) is a standard technical requirement which should be disregarded under the confusing similarity test.

(2) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name years after the Complainant established and widely used the ANIMALIS trademark. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant, has no license or authorization to use the ANIMALIS mark, and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name resolved to a fraudulent website impersonating an animal shelter named “animalis” and reproducing the Complainant’s trademark multiple times, which is not a bona fide offering of goods or services. On the date of the Complaint the website linked to the disputed domain name has been deactivated. Such conduct negates any claim of rights or legitimate interests.

(3) The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The disputed domain name was registered on May 31, 2025. Registering the disputed domain name so obviously connected to a well-known mark without authorization is itself evidence of bad faith. The Respondent used the disputed domain name primarily for commercial gain by pretending to be animal shelter and adoption center named “Animalis”.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules provides that the Panel is to decide the Complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, the Rules, and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

The onus is on the Complainant to make out its case and it is apparent, both from the terms of the Policy and the decisions of past UDRP panels, that the Complainant must show that all three elements set out in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been established before any order can be made to transfer the disputed domain name. In UDRP cases, the standard of proof is the balance of probabilities.

To succeed in a UDRP complaint, the Complainant has to demonstrate that all the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied, namely:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights;
- (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 Respondent was given proper notice of the Complaint and had the opportunity to respond. Under paragraph 5(a) of the Rules, the Respondent was required to submit its response within 20 days of commencement of the proceeding. The Respondent failed to do so.

Pursuant to paragraph 5(f) of the Rules, in the event of such a default, the Panel shall proceed to a decision based on the Complaint. However, the Respondent’s default does not mean that the Complainant automatically prevails; the Complainant continues to bear the burden of proof on each element. The Panel may draw appropriate inferences from the Respondent’s silence, and, where appropriate, accept as true the reasonable allegations in the Complaint that are not contradicted by evidence.

The Panel has reviewed the entire case file and the evidence provided. The Panel is also guided, where pertinent, by the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ([“WIPO Overview 3.0”](#)), which reflects consensus positions of UDRP panels on many common issues. The Panel will make reference to these consensus views in the analysis below as applicable.

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.

Based on the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the Panel finds that the Complainant has shown rights in respect of its ANIMALIS mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the Complainant's mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's ANIMALIS mark in its entirety, with the only differences being the addition of the letter "s". In accordance with [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9, addition of common, obvious, or intentional misspelling would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element, as the Complainant's mark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name.

The Panel further notes that the generic TLD ".com" is required only for technical reasons and is generally ignored for the purposes of comparison of the Complainant's mark to the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark and that the first element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is satisfied.

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 evidence before the Panel shows that the Respondent used the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant and its ANIMALIS brand. At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website purporting to operate as an animal shelter and adoption center under the name "animalis" in the south of France. The website prominently reproduced the Complainant's ANIMALIS trademark multiple times, including on adoption forms and user interfaces.

Several elements support the Panel's finding that the website was fraudulent in nature, including the reference to an implausible copyright date ("©2035"); and the use of the Complainant's trademark as a profile image in chat communications. The Complainant has also claimed that consumers were misled by the website and mistakenly made payments believing they were dealing with the Complainant.

Although the website has since been deactivated, the Panel considers that the Respondent's prior conduct is sufficient to assess rights or legitimate interests. The use of a disputed domain name to impersonate a complainant and mislead Internet users for financial gain cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services under paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use under paragraph 4(c)(iii).

The Panel further notes that the Complainant has established trademark rights in ANIMALIS and has confirmed that it has no relationship with the Respondent. The Respondent has not been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted to use the Complainant's trademark. There is also no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

In light of the Respondent's failure to participate in the proceeding, the absence of any credible evidence of rights or legitimate interests, and the clear impersonation of the Complainant, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, the Complainant has satisfied the requirement of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

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 and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith under paragraph 4(b) of the Policy.

The Complainant is well known in France for being one of the main pet products retailers operating since 1998 under the ANIMALIS brand. The Complainant offers a large range of products for animals, from kibble to hygiene products, from cozy beds to spacious cat trees, from bright aquariums to the most advanced terrarium equipment, from large bird aviaries to the little wheel for rodents.

Given the Complainant's reputation in France and internationally, and the distinctive nature of its ANIMALIS mark, the Panel finds it implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's rights. The registration itself, mirroring the Complainant's trademark in full and adding the letter "s", demonstrates clear targeting.

The disputed domain name incorporates the ANIMALIS in its entirety, merely adding the letter "s" constitutes a classic example of typosquatting and creates a confusingly similar variation. Under [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1, this composition strongly suggests deliberate targeting.

The disputed domain name previously resolved to a fraudulent website impersonating the Complainant, displaying the Complainant's trademark ANIMALIS multiple times and offering fake adoption services. This conduct falls squarely within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, as the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark. Although the website has since been deactivated, this does not negate the Respondent's bad faith. The Respondent's concealment of its identity, and the presence of false content further confirm that the Respondent had no bona fide use in mind, but rather sought to capitalize on the Complainant's reputation. Such conduct also disrupts the Complainant's business by damaging consumer trust and diverting potential customers.

The Respondent has not provided any explanation for selecting the disputed domain name. The absence of any Response further strengthens the inference of bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.3.

Considering the totality of circumstances, including the Complainant's strong trademark rights, the using of the Complainant's trademark as a profile picture in the chatbox on the website at the disputed domain name, the fraudulent website content, the actual consumer harm, the Respondent's failure to deny any of the allegations, and the evident targeting of the Complainant's mark, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

Accordingly, the third element of paragraph 4(a) 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 disputed domain name <animalsis.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ganna Prokhorova/

Ganna Prokhorova

Sole Panelist

Date: December 31, 2025