

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

ILLI&CO v. Karl Schnurch, EdenMedia

Case No. D2025-4815

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is ILLI&CO, France, represented by Cornet Vincent Segurel, France.

The Respondent is Karl Schnurch, EdenMedia, Seychelles.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <illicado.com> is registered with Key-Systems GmbH (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 19, 2025. On November 20, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 21, 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 21, 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 24, 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 Pablo A. Palazzi as the sole panelist in this matter on December 22, 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 in this administrative proceeding is ILLI&CO, a French company with headquarters located in Croix, France. The Complainant was previously named SYNEDIS.

The Complainant was created in 2005 and is specialized in the marketing of gift cards and digital solutions, both for individuals and professionals. The Complainant promotes and commercializes its service via a website located at “www.illicado.com” which is actively used since 2006.

The Complainant is the owner of several French trademarks, including:

- ILLICADO n°3395815 registered on June 6, 2005, and which was renewed in 2025; and
- ILLICADO (and design) n°4913725 registered on November 16, 2022.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 10, 2016. The disputed domain name is not active.

#### **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.

##### **B. Respondent**

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

#### **6. Discussion and Findings**

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) 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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable 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.

A domain name which consists of a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of a trademark is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9. Here, the Respondent has deleted the letter “I” from the trademark ILLICADO.

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.

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 Complainant’s trademark is fanciful, registered since 2005, and it is inconceivable that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant. The Respondent , was most likely seeking to create an association with the Complainant’s activities and mark ILLICADO.
- Another aspect is the consensus view of UDRP panels that the practice of typosquatting (“ILICADO” instead of “ILLICADO”) may in itself be evidence of a bad faith registration of a domain name (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1).

- The Respondent, Karl Schnurch / EdenMedia, has been a party in fourteen (14) prior UDRP proceedings, and in every single case, panels have found that he registered and used the corresponding disputed domain name in bad faith. This consistent pattern of conduct across multiple proceedings demonstrates a clear and established history of bad faith domain name registration and use. This pattern affirms the Panel's finding of the Respondent's bad faith in the present case. The Respondent's repeated engagement in conduct that has been consistently determined to violate the Policy across fourteen (14) separate proceedings establishes a modus operandi of bad faith registration and use.

As numerous UDRP panels have recognized, a respondent's prior history of cybersquatting and abusive domain name registrations constitutes strong evidence of bad faith under Policy paragraph 4(a)(iii). A pattern of abuse has also been found where the respondent registers, simultaneously or otherwise, multiple trademark-abusive domain names corresponding to the distinct marks of individual brand owners. See also [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.2.

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 <ilicado.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Pablo A. Palazzi/*

**Pablo A. Palazzi**

Sole Panelist

Date: January 4, 2026