

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Bollore SE v. Affing, Aff, Derrendinger Annemarie  
Case No. D2025-4764

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is BOLLORE SE, France, represented by Nameshield, France.

The Respondent is Affing, Aff, Poland and Derrendinger ANNEMARIE, France.

### **2. The Domain Names and Registrars**

The disputed domain name <bollore-finrevoux.com> is registered with NETIM SARL.

The disputed domain name <bollorefinrevoux.com> is registered with Name SRS AB.

The disputed domain name <bollorefinrevoux.net> is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (all together the “Registrars”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 19, 2025. On November 19, 2025, the Center transmitted by emails to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On November 20 and 21, 2025, the Registrars transmitted by emails to the Center their verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names 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 24, 2025 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on November 25, 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 26, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 16, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on December 17, 2025.

The Center appointed William A. Van Caenegem as the sole panelist in this matter on December 26, 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, part of the Bolloré Group, is active in transportation and logistics, communications, and industry and is headquartered in France. The Bolloré Group has more than 3,204 employees, and had revenue of 3 billion Euros in 2024.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademark registrations incorporating the term “BOLLORE”, including the International trademark registration BOLLORÉ n° 704697, registered on December 11, 1998, in Nice classes 16, 17, 34, 35, 36, 38, and 39.

The Complainant also owns and operates various domain names on the Internet, the principal one being <bollore.com>, registered on July 25, 1997.

The disputed domain name <bollore-finrevoux.com> was registered on November 10, 2025, and the disputed domain names <bollorefinrevoux.com> and <bollorefinrevoux.net> were registered on November 11, 2025.

The disputed domain name <bollore-finrevoux.com> resolves to a website offering cryptocurrency services. The disputed domain names <bollorefinrevoux.com> and <bollorefinrevoux.net> resolve to websites without content, and mail exchange (MX) servers are configured for <bollore-finrevoux.com>.

#### **5. Parties’ Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

The Complainant seeks consolidation of these proceedings, asserting that the Respondent for <bollorefinrevoux.net>, <bollorefinrevoux.com> and <bollore-finrevoux.com> is one and the same entity. The Complainant points out that the disputed domain names were registered one day apart and share the same structure, that being the trademark BOLLORÉ with the term “finrevoux”. The Complainant argues that this cannot be coincidental. The Complainant adds that before deactivation of one of them, both disputed domain names <bollore-finrevoux.com> and <bollorefinrevoux.com> resolved to cryptocurrency related websites. The Complainant points out that although the disputed domain names were registered with different registrars, two of them were registered with the same registrant information. The Complainant asserts that the Respondents are therefore the same entity, and requests the consolidation of this complaint.

Further, the Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the three disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark BOLLORÉ as the latter is identically reproduced in each. The Complainant contends that the incorporation of its trademark as such in the disputed domain names is sufficient to meet the requirements for confusing similarity, in accordance with consistent panels' practice.

Further, the Complainant says that past panels have held that a respondent was not commonly known by a disputed domain name if the Whois information was not similar to the disputed domain name, which is the case here, and thus the Respondent is not known as the disputed domain names.

The Complainant has also not granted any license or authorization to the Respondent, nor any rights to use its BOLLORÉ registered trademark in a domain name or in any other way. The Complainant contends that the Respondent used the disputed domain name <bollore-finrevoux.com> in a way that fails to confer rights and legitimate interests, as it is used to promote unrelated services, that being cryptocurrency services. The disputed domain names <bollorefinrevoux.com> and <bollorefinrevoux.net> resolve to websites without content and the Complainant says that the Respondent thus does not use those disputed domain names nor has it any demonstrable plan to use them.

The Complainant refers to the size and prominence of the Bolloré Group and says that given the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademarks and reputation, it is inconceivable that the Respondent could have registered the disputed domain names <bollore-finrevoux.com>, <bollorefinrevoux.com> and <bollorefinrevoux.net> without actual knowledge of the Complainant's rights in the trademark BOLLORÉ.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has not demonstrated any activity in respect of <bollorefinrevoux.com> and <bollorefinrevoux.net>, and says that it is not possible to conceive of any plausible actual or contemplated active use of the disputed domain names by the Respondent that would not be illegitimate, such as by amounting to passing off. The Complainant also points to the fact that prior panels have held that the incorporation of a famous mark, as the Complainant contends BOLLORÉ is, into a domain name, coupled with an inactive website, may be evidence of bad faith registration and use.

The Complainant adds that MX servers are configured for the disputed domain name <bollore-finrevoux.com>, which can be used for email purposes, with the impossibility of such use being in good faith.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **Consolidation: Multiple Respondents**

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain names' registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request. Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel must consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that the three disputed domain names all combine the distinctive registered trademark BOLLORÉ with the term “finrevoux”, a name associated in commerce with cryptocurrency. There is no visible reason to combine these two terms and their combination in domain names is not obvious. The disputed domain names were all registered in a period of two days. Although <bollorefinrevoux.net> and <bollorefinrevoux.com> were registered by the same entity “Affing, Aff”, they were registered with different Registrars, but on the same day, which appears deliberate. Before its deactivation, the disputed domain name <bollorefinrevoux.com> resolved to a cryptocurrency trading site, as does the disputed domain name <bollore-finrevoux.com>, although the registrant details for each are different, one being Affing, Aff. In the circumstances, the Panel concludes that the three disputed domain names are under common control.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as “the Respondent”) in a single proceeding.

### **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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, “finrevoux” may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of the 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.

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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Complainant has not authorized the use of its distinctive BOLLORÉ trademark by the Respondent in any way, and there is nothing to indicate that the Respondent is commonly known by that term or any of the disputed domain names or is associated with the term or mark in any legitimate or preexisting manner. The Respondent has supplied meaningless registrant information about two of the disputed domain names and deliberately set out to disguise its singular control of all three disputed domain names, and has not replied to any of the Complainant's contentions.

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 a series of domain names each of which combine the Complainant's distinctive BOLLORÉ trademark, in which the Respondent has no rights, with the term "finrevoux" which is a third-party mark associated with cryptocurrency. In other words, for the apparent purpose of drawing Internet users familiar with the well reputed and long known trademark BOLLORÉ into some involvement with cryptocurrency trading by associating the latter, without permission, with the term "finrevoux". The composition of all three disputed domain names and the fact that they were registered by the Respondent within a short period of time, indicate that the latter was well aware of the BOLLORÉ registered trademark and the Complainant's exclusive rights in relation to it, at the time of registration.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name, here being <bollorefinrevoux.net> 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 reputation of the Complainant's BOLLORÉ trademark, and the disputed domain name's composition, and finds that the passive holding of this disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

In relation to <bollore-finrevoux.com> and <bollorefinrevoux.com>, the former resolves to a cryptocurrency website and the latter did so at one point although it is at present deactivated. Clearly the combination of the terms BOLLORÉ and "finrevoux" was adopted for domain name registration with an intention to attract consumers to cryptocurrency related websites with which the Complainant has in fact no connection whatsoever. The disputed domain names were clearly registered with an intention to mislead Internet users for commercial gain.

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 names <bollore-finrevoux.com>, <bollorefinrevoux.com>, and <bollorefinrevoux.net> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/William A. Van Caenegem/*

**William A. Van Caenegem**

Sole Panelist

Date: January 9, 2026