

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Louis Vuitton Malletier v. Khang Nguyen, Brand Protection  
Case No. D2025-4932

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Louis Vuitton Malletier, France, represented by Studio Barbero S.p.A., Italy.

The Respondent is Khang Nguyen, Brand Protection, Viet Nam.

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

The disputed domain name <louisvuitton-group.com> is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 26, 2025. On November 27, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 28, 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 (Domain Admin, Privacy Protect, LLC (PrivacyProtect.org)) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 28, 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 amendment to the Complaint on December 2, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 4, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 24, 2025. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on December 4, 2025. The Center notified the Parties about the Commencement of Panel Appointment Process on December 26, 2025.

The Center appointed Mihaela Maravela as the sole panelist in this matter on December 29, 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**

According to information in the Complaint, the Complainant is a French fashion house part of the multinational luxury goods conglomerate LVMH Moët Hennessy Louis Vuitton, known as LVMH. The LOUIS VUITTON trademark has been used by the Complainant for more than 170 years in connection with luxury leather goods, products of high-fashion, accessories as well as fragrances and cosmetics. The LVMH Group currently employs over 210,000 people of 190 nationalities and is the world's leading luxury products group. According to InterBrand Best Global Brands, the LOUIS VUITTON trademark – which has been featured in the list since 2000 - was valued at USD 50,900 million in 2024, being ranked as the 11th most valuable brand in the world.

The Complainant is the owner of national and international trademark registrations worldwide for LOUIS VUITTON (word mark), including the following:

- Vietnamese Trademark Registration No. 4-0025889-000 for LOUIS VUITTON, filed on September 20, 1996, and registered on December 10, 1997, in class 18;
- International Trademark Registration No. 1127685, registered on April 16, 2012, and duly renewed, in classes 03, 04, 06, 08, 09, 12, 14, 16, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26, 28 and 34, designating amongst others Viet Nam;
- International Trademark Registration No. 416052, registered on June 19, 1975, and duly renewed, in classes 03, 06, 08, 13, 14, 16, 18, 20, 21, 24, 25, 28 and 34, designating, amongst others, Viet Nam;
- International Trademark Registration No. 1096591, registered on April 6, 2011, and duly renewed, in classes 35, 38 and 41, designating, amongst others, Viet Nam.

The Complainant registered many domain names that include LOUIS VUITTON, such as, *inter alia*, <louisvuitton.com>, registered on February 18, 1997, which the Complainant uses as its primary web portal for global promotion of the LOUIS VUITTON trademark and products as well as its official online store and <louisvuittongroup.com>, registered on November 19, 1999.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 6, 2025 and resolves to a parking page.

#### **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 the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark LOUIS VUITTON in which the Complainant has rights, because the disputed domain name entirely incorporates the Complainant's registered trademark LOUIS VUITTON. The fact that the disputed domain name differs from the Complainant's trademark by the addition of the term "group" and of a hyphen between "louisvuitton" and "group", does not affect the confusing similarity.

With respect to the second element, the Complainant submits that the Respondent is not a licensee, authorized agent of the Complainant or in any other way authorized to use the Complainant's trademarks. Also, the Complainant is not in possession of, nor is aware of, the existence of any evidence demonstrating that the Respondent might be commonly known by a name corresponding to the disputed domain name as an individual, business, or other organization. The disputed domain name has been pointed by the Respondent to a mere parking page. In addition, the disputed domain name, reproducing the LOUIS

VUITTON trademark in its entirety with the addition of a hyphen and the term “group”, is inherently misleading, carrying a high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant.

As regards the third element, the Complainant argues that in light of the fact that the trademark LOUIS VUITTON is well-known and has been used extensively since 1850s in many countries of the world, and considering that the Complainant's LOUIS VUITTON products are also promoted and offered for sale by the Complainant online via its website “[www.louisvuitton.com](http://www.louisvuitton.com)”, the Respondent was undoubtedly aware of the existence of the Complainant's trademark and of the fact that the disputed domain name was confusingly similar to such trademark, at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. Furthermore, given the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the Respondent acted in opportunistic bad faith, by registering the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademark in all likelihood for the purpose of taking some advantage of the same. With respect to bad faith use, the disputed domain name has been redirected by the Respondent to a parking page, but the non-use of a domain name corresponding to a well-known trademark is evidence of bad faith. According to the Complainant, in view of (i) the confusing similarity of the disputed domain name with the Complainant's well-known trademark, (ii) the Respondent's lack of any legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and its failure to reply to the Complainant's Cease and Desist letter, (iii) the Respondent's concealing of its full contact details in the public Whois records and (iv) the implausibility of any good faith use to which the disputed domain name may be put considering its composition, the Respondent's passive holding should not prevent a finding of bad faith use.

Furthermore, the Respondent was involved as respondent in a prior UDRP proceeding concluded with the transfer of a domain name to the complainant (see *Compagnie Générale des Etablissements Michelin v. Khang Nguyen*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-0831](#)).

## **B. Respondent**

In the informal communication sent to the Center, the Respondent contends that it accidentally bought the disputed domain name, that it has not used it, and that it will not dispute, also agreeing to transfer the disputed domain name without dispute.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

No formal response has been received from the Respondent in this case. Accordingly, the Panel considers it can proceed to determine the Complaint based on the statements and documents submitted by the Complainant as per paragraph 15(a) of the Rules. The applicable standard of proof in UDRP cases is the “balance of probabilities” or “preponderance of the evidence”, and the Panel can draw certain inferences in light of the particular facts and circumstances of the case. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), section 4.2.

Even if the Respondent has not formally replied to the Complainant's contentions, the Complainant still bears the burden of proving that all requirements are fulfilled. To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied: (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.

### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

Under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that it has rights to a trademark, and that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to that trademark. This first element under the Policy functions primarily as a standing requirement. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the trademark LOUIS VUITTON for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

As regards the second limb of the first element, the test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the trademark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. It is well established that the generic Top-Level Domain may be ignored when assessing the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademarks as they are viewed as a standard registration requirement. See section 1.11.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

The entirety of the mark is reproduced 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.

Although the addition of other terms (here, "group") and a hyphen may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such 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 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. Rather, the informal email communication from the Respondent might be construed as an admission by the Respondent that it lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

There is no evidence showing that the Respondent holds any rights for LOUIS VUITTON trademarks. The Panel also notes that there is no evidence showing that the Respondent is authorized or licensed to use the trademark LOUIS VUITTON. The disputed domain name does not resolve to an active page, which does not confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent, given the substantial reputation and goodwill of the Complainant's trademark or capacity to otherwise mislead Internet users.

Furthermore, the nature of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation and cannot constitute a fair use as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. See section 2.5.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

Also, there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

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.

According to the unrebutted assertions of the Complainant, its LOUIS VUITTON trademark was widely used in commerce well before the registration of the disputed domain name and is famous. The Complainant has trademark rights also in Viet Nam, where the Respondent is apparently located. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark which is a distinctive coined term trademark that enjoys reputation and is well-known worldwide (See e.g. *Louis Vuitton Malletier v. Whois Privacy, Private by Design, LLC / Julien Colinet*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-3000](#)). Under these circumstances, it is most likely that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademark at the registration date of the disputed domain name. The Respondent provided no explanations for why it registered the disputed domain name.

As regards the use, panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the non-use of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith in the circumstances of this proceeding. Although panels will look at the totality of the circumstances in each case, factors that have been considered relevant in applying the passive holding doctrine include: (i) the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant's mark, (ii) the failure of the respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, (iii) the respondent's concealing its identity or use of false contact details (noted to be in breach of its registration agreement), and (iv) the implausibility of any good faith use to which the domain name may be put. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and renown of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name, and the wrong contact details provided at registration (the courier service was not able to deliver the Center's Written Notice to the Respondent), and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Also, there appears to be a pattern of abusive registrations by the Respondent, as the unrebutted evidence in the case file shows that the Respondent was involved in at least one previous UDRP proceeding where similar facts caused the concerned UDRP panel to decide in favor of the complainant (See *Compagnie Générale des Etablissements Michelin v. Khang Nguyen, supra*). This fact also supports a finding grounded on paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy, referring to a respondent registering "the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that you have engaged in a pattern of such conduct".

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 <louisvuitton-group.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mihaela Maravela/  
**Mihaela Maravela**  
Sole Panelist  
Date: January 3, 2026