ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

CAROLL INTERNATIONAL v. Domain Admin
Case No. D2025-4951

1. The Parties

The Complainant is CAROLL INTERNATIONAL, France, represented by MIIP MADE IN IP, France.

The Respondent is Domain Admin, Hong Kong, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <maisoncaroll.com> 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 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 27, 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 Purposes, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) 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 amended Complaint on December 3, 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 5, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 25, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on December 26, 2025.

The Center appointed Clive Duncan Thorne 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 which trades using the brand CAROLL for women's clothing. The Complainant was established in 1963, initially specializing in knitwear and wool garments. Since then the brand CAROLL has expanded to include a full range of contemporary, feminine clothing, accessories, and shoes. During the 1980s and 1990s the brand became a well-known reference for accessible elegance, targeting active women looking for stylish, easy-to-wear pieces.

The brand subsequently became part of the French Vivarte group, a leading French retail company, which supported its expansion across France and overseas. In 2021, the Complainant was acquired by the Beaumanoir Group, a major French retail group, further strengthening its position in the "premium accessible" market segment.

The Complainant's products are sold in more than 500 stores in France and elsewhere as well as online through its website "www.caroll.com/fr_fr/". Extracts from the website which is multilingual in French, Spanish, German, Italian, English, and Portuguese were exhibited in Annex 3 to the Complaint.

The Complainant promotes its goods and trademarks through social media. It has 146,000 followers on Instagram and 119,000 on Facebook. The brand is regularly featured in articles by major media outlets like le Parisien, Marie Claire, and Fashion Network. Annex 8 to the Complaint.

The trademark CAROLL is registered by the Complainant worldwide including in France, and the European Union. A list of the registrations is exhibited in Annex 4 to the Complaint including, in particular, registrations in, inter alia, classes 14 for jewelry, 18 for leather goods, and 25 for clothing.

The Complainant also exhibits evidence from the relevant trademark registry databases for the following trademark registrations:

- European Union Trade Mark No. 009892431 for CAROLL in classes 14,18, and 25, registered on September 16, 2011;

- International trademark No. 1208979 for CAROLL in classes 18, 25, and 35, registered on February 25, 2014 (designated to apply in numerous jurisdictions including Australia, United Kingdom, India, United States of America, and China); and

- France trademark No. 1233265 for CAROLL in classes 18 and 25, registered on April 15, 1983.

The Complainant is also the owner of several domain names incorporating the mark CAROLL including the domain name <caroll.com> which directs to the Complainant's website "www.caroll.com/fr_fr/".

The disputed domain name was registered on November 7, 2025, which is later than the dates of registration of the Complainant's trademarks relied upon and the date the Complainant commenced trading using the mark CAROLL.

The Complainant contends that in registering the disputed domain name, the Respondent has used a privacy service and the email address "[…]@gmail.com" to which 2166 domain names are also associated. The Respondent uses the name "DOMAIN ADMIN". The Complainant has adduced evidence that the address does not exist in Hong Kong, China.

In the absence of a Response, the Panel finds the evidence adduced by the Complainant to be true.

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:

i. the Complainant owns prior trademark registrations for the mark CAROLL and that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to that mark;

ii. there is no evidence that the Respondent has rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and

iii. the disputed domain name was registered and is used in bad faith.

The Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant's prior trademark rights. The evidence shows that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name to sell it in contravention of the Policy.

B. Respondent

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

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 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.

The disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's mark CAROLL in its entirety together with the prefix "maison". As the Complainant's trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (in this case "maison") would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. 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.

There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or is using it on a bona fide basis. The Respondent has not been licensed or authorized by the Complainant to use the trademark CAROLL and there is no evidence of a legal or business relationship between the Parties.

Taking into account the evidence adduced by the Complainant, 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 finds that there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or is using it for a bona fide supply of goods or services. Rather the evidence set out in Annex 7 to the Complaint shows that the disputed domain name was offered for sale at a price of USD 1,999 which is absent an evidence to the contrary, is a figure likely to be in excess of the out-of-pocket expenses that would be incurred in registering the disputed domain name.

The Complainant's evidence falls within section 4(b)(i) of the Policy in establishing that the registration and use of the disputed domain name is in bad faith based upon its registration for the purpose of selling for valuable consideration in excess of the Respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name.

The Complainant cites a number of earlier Panel decisions which support this contention including *EFG Bank European Financial Group SA v. Jacob Foundation*, WIPO Case No. D2000-0036.

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 <maisoncaroll.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Clive Duncan Thorne/
Clive Duncan Thorne
Sole Panelist
Date: January 16, 2026