

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LAGARDERE SA v. Unlimited Cohen, Stella Kennion, Laurence
CASTELNAU, Affing Aff
Case No. D2025-4895

1. The Parties

The Complainant is LAGARDERE SA, France, represented by Nameshield, France.

The Respondents are Unlimited Cohen, Armenia, Stella Kennion, Tunisia, Laurence CASTELNAU, France, and Affing Aff, Poland.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <lagardere-revolux.com> is registered with NETIM SARL.

The disputed domain names <lagardererevolux.com> and <lagardererevoluxtech.com> are registered with MainReg Inc.

The disputed domain name <lagardere-revolux.net> is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com. (the "Registrars").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on November 25, 2025. On November 25, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On November 26, 2025, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification response 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 December 1, 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 December 1, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on December 8, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 28, 2025. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents’ default on January 5, 2026. One of the Respondents sent an email communication to the Center on January 6, 2025.

The Center appointed Alexandre Nappey as the sole panelist in this matter on January 13, 2026. 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

Created in 1992, the Complainant is an international group with operations in more than 45 countries worldwide. It employs more than 33,000 people and generated revenue of EUR 8,942 million in 2024.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademarks including the term LAGARDERE, such as:

- the European Union Trade Mark No. 1905371, for LAGARDERE, registered on March 7, 2002 in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 38, 41, 42;
- the International trademark No. 751186, for LAGARDERE, registered on October 18, 2000 in classes 9, 16, 35, 38, 41, 42; and
- the United States of America trademark No. 3784869, for LAGARDERE, registered on May 4, 2010 in classes, inter alia, 6, 35, 36, 38, 41, 42.

The Complainant also owns and communicates on the Internet through various domain names, the main one being <lagardere.com>, registered on August 2, 1995.

The disputed domain names resolve to website templates offering services related to cryptocurrencies. The disputed domain names were registered on the following dates: <lagardere-revolux.com> on November 12, 2025; <lagardere-revolux.com> on November 18, 2025; <lagardere-revolux.net> on November 19, 2025; and <lagardere-revoluxtech.com> on November 19, 2025.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark LAGARDERE as it is identically contained.

The Complainant then asserts that the Respondents are not commonly known by the disputed domain names. The Complainant contends that the Respondents are not affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant in any way. The disputed domain names resolve to websites offering cryptocurrency services. Impersonation of a complainant, by using its trademark in a disputed domain name and seeking to defraud or confuse users, indicates a lack of rights or legitimate interests by a respondent.

Given the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademarks and reputation, the Complainant contends that it is inconceivable that the Respondents could have registered the disputed domain names without actual knowledge of the Complainant's rights in the trademark. The disputed domain names resolve to websites offering cryptocurrency services. The Complainant contends that the Respondents attempt to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark.

B. Respondents

The Respondents did not reply to the Complainant's contentions. The registrant of the disputed domain name <lagarderevoluxtech.com> sent an email to the Center on January 6, 2026, stating: "Just to let you know that this domain doesn't belong to us."

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 name 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 will 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 disputed domain names were registered in a short period of seven days in November 2025. The disputed domain names follow a naming pattern consisting of the trademark LAGARDERE, the words "revolux" and/or "tech" and the generic Top-Level Domain ".com" and ".net", and all resolve to websites dedicated to cryptocurrencies each with similar formatting and identical images to certain others. This gives the Panel reason to find that these four disputed domain names or their associated websites 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, “revolux” and/or “tech”, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names 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 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 intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of 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 names <lagardere-revolux.com>, <lagardererevolux.com>, <lagardere-revolux.net> and <lagardererevoluxtech.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Alexandre Nappey/

Alexandre Nappey

Sole Panelist

Date: January 27, 2026