

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Louis Vuitton Malletier v. Domain Admin  
Case No. D2025-4950

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is Domain Admin, Canada.

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

The disputed domain name <louivuitton.com> is registered with BigRock Solutions Ltd. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 27, 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 confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that 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 1, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 21, 2025. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on December 20, 2025, expressing its willingness to settle the dispute. On December 22, 2025, the Center sent the Possible Settlement email to the Parties. On December 24, 2025, the Complainant requested the Center to proceed with the case. On the same day, the Center informed the Parties that it would proceed with panel appointment.

The Center appointed Hong Yang as the sole panelist in this matter on January 2, 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**

The Complainant is a French fashion house dating back to 1854, being part of the multinational luxury goods conglomerate LVMH Moët Hennessy Louis Vuitton, known as LVMH. The LOUIS VUITTON mark has been used by the Complainant for more than 165 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, ranking as the 11th most valuable brand in the world.

The Complainant owns numerous trademarks containing the term "Louis Vuitton" covering multiple jurisdictions, including the following: International Trademark Registration No. 416052 for LOUIS VUITTON (figurative), registered on June 19, 1975; International Trademark Registration No. 1096591 for LOUIS VUITTON (word), registered on April 6, 2011; Canada Trademark Registration No. TMA288667 for LOUIS VUITTON (word), registered on March 9, 1984.

The Complainant operates its primary website located at the domain name <louisvuitton.com>, registered on February 18, 1997.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 28, 2002 and the Respondent reportedly resides in Canada. At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a webpage displaying a security alert, which upon acceptance redirected to a webpage displaying no active content. Previously, the disputed domain name in different periods redirected to various webpages with different content, including but not limited to: (1) a webpage purportedly offering handbags for sale, i.e., the same products marketed by the Complainant; (2) parking pages featuring sponsored pay-per-click ("PPC") links, some of which purportedly promoting products from the Complainant as well as its competitors; (3) webpages containing a notice claiming the disputed domain name may be "for sale". Moreover, the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter as well as a following reminder to the Respondent, to which the Respondent did not reply.

#### **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 Center received an email communication from the email address of the Respondent as confirmed by the Registrar. The person claims to be the authorized domain administrator of the registrant of the disputed domain name and indicates that the registrant is willing to transfer the disputed domain name to the Complainant and requests that the proceeding be suspended for a settlement with the Complainant. The Respondent did not provide any formal submissions in response to the Complainant's contentions in the proceeding.

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

##### **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.

The disputed domain name incorporates the mark nearly in full, changing only by omitting the letter "s" within the term "louis", which is an obvious misspelling of the mark (i.e., typosquatting) and is considered to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9.

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 notes that the composition of the disputed domain name itself affirms the Respondent's intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant as to the origin or affiliation, incorporating the Complainant's mark almost in full omitting merely one letter. Further, available record shows that the Respondent was not affiliated or otherwise authorized by the Complainant nor held any registration of the LOUIS VUITTON mark anywhere. There is no evidence indicating that the Respondent may be commonly known by the disputed domain name.

At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a webpage with a security alert which upon acceptance redirected to a webpage displaying no active content, corroborating that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in 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 present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent has incorporated the Complainant's trademark nearly in full in the disputed domain name. The Complainant's trademark LOUIS VUITTON is highly well known globally, including in the location where the Respondent allegedly resides, and the Complainant's registration and use of its mark much predates the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name. Moreover, the disputed domain name involves a typosquatting through omitting merely one letter within the Complainant's mark, and is nearly identical to the Complainant's domain name <louisvuitton.com>. This signals the Respondent's intention to target the Complainant and trade off its highly famous mark. Thus, the Panel considers that the Respondent must have known the Complainant's mark at the time of registering the disputed domain name. Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos) to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4

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.

At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a webpage with a security alert which upon acceptance redirected to a webpage displaying no active content. The Panel notes the reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name, the failure of the Respondent to submit a response, and the implausibility of any good faith use to which the disputed domain name may be put, and finds that the non-use of the disputed domain name does 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 finds the Complainant has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

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 <louivuitton.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Hong Yang/*

**Hong Yang**

Sole Panelist

Date: January 16, 2026