

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

PRL USA Holdings, Inc., The Polo/Lauren Company L.P. v. ja ja
Case No. D2025-4905

1. The Parties

The Complainants are PRL USA Holdings, Inc. and The Polo/Lauren Company L.P., United States of America ("United States"), represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is ja ja, Hong Kong, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ralphlauren.fun> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the "Registrar").

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 Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 26, 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 (Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 5, 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 December 8, 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 December 9, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 29, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on December 30, 2025.

The Center appointed Simone Huser as the sole panelist in this matter on January 9, 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

Two Complainants filed the Complaint. The First Complainant is PRL USA Holdings, Inc., and the Second Complainant is The Polo/Lauren Company L.P. (collectively, the “Complainants”). The Complainants are related companies and are both wholly owned subsidiaries of Ralph Lauren Corporation.

The brand and trademark RALPH LAUREN of the Complainants’ Group was created by Ralph Lauren in 1967 and was launched as a neckwear line. Through continuously developing and strengthening its reputation and distinctive image for nearly 60 years, the Complainants’ Group is one of the global leaders in the design, marketing, and distribution of premium lifestyle products across apparel, accessories, home, fragrances, and hospitality, selling its products to customers worldwide via 1,351 stores, and employing 15,000 people globally.

The Complainants own numerous trademark registrations for RALPH LAUREN across various jurisdictions, including:

- RALPH LAUREN, United States Trademark Registration No. 1222278, owned by the First Complainant, registered on January 4, 1983, in international class 3;
- RALPH LAUREN, Chinese Trademark Registration No. 1077314, owned by the Second Complainant, registered on August 14, 1997, in international class 25;
- RALPH LAUREN, European Union Trademark Registration No. 002730323, owned by the Second Complainant, registered on August 18, 2003, in international class 35.

The Complainants also own the domain name <ralphlauren.com>, which is the Complainants’ Group primary domain name, and which has been registered since September 25, 1996.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 18, 2025.

According to the evidence submitted with the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolves to a website where the disputed domain name was advertised for sale.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainants

The Complainants contend that they have satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainants contend as follows:

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the RALPH LAUREN trademark in which the Complainants have rights, because it incorporates this trademark in its entirety. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not sponsored by or affiliated with the Complainants in any way, nor have the Complainants given the Respondent permission to use the Complainants’ trademarks in any manner.

The disputed domain name was registered in bad faith because it is obvious that the Respondent had knowledge of both the Complainants' Group and its well-known trademark RALPH LAUREN at the time it registered the disputed domain name. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name to host a website where the disputed domain name is advertised for sale.

The Respondent is using the disputed domain names in bad faith, by demonstrating an intent to sell, rent, or otherwise transfer the disputed domain name for valuable consideration in excess of his out-of-pocket expenses.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainants' contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, in order to succeed, a complainant must establish each of the following elements:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the 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.

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 Complainants have 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 identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ".fun" in the disputed domain name is a standard registration requirement and as such may be disregarded under the confusing similarity test under the Policy, paragraph 4(a)(i). 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 Complainants have established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainants' 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.

Moreover, given the evidence submitted, the Respondent is using the disputed domain name, which incorporates the Complainants' trademark in its entirety, for a website offering the disputed domain name for sale, which clearly does not characterize a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use under the Policy. The Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name creates a high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainants and the RALPH LAUREN trademark.

Under these circumstances and absent evidence to the contrary, the Panel finds that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name.

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 view of the Panel, noting that the Complainants' trademarks predate the registration of the disputed domain name and considering that the brand and trademark RALPH LAUREN of the Complainants' Group is well known and that the disputed domain name resolves to a website offering the disputed domain name for sale, it is inconceivable that the Respondent could have registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainants' well-known trademark.

Other factors that corroborate the Panel's finding of the Respondent's bad faith are the provision of what appears to be false or incorrect Whois information and the absence of a Response by the Respondent.

For the reasons above, the Respondent's conduct has to be considered as bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds that the Complainants have 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 <ralphlauren.fun> be transferred to the Complainants.

/Simone Huser/

Simone Huser

Sole Panelist

Date: January 23, 2026