

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Louis Dreyfus Trademarks B.V. v. James John, Van Diemen
Case No. D2025-4960

1. The Parties

Complainant is Louis Dreyfus Trademarks B.V., Netherlands (Kingdom of the), represented by INLEX IP, France.

Respondent is James John, Van Diemen, Netherlands (Kingdom of the).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ldc-nederland.com> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with Name.com, 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 28, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On December 1, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy, Domain Protection Services, Inc.) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on December 11, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on December 11, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on December 15, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 4, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on January 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Dinant T. L. Oosterbaan as the sole panelist in this matter on January 12, 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

According to the information provided in the Complaint, Complainant is a Dutch company which owns all intellectual property rights registered or reserved on behalf of Louis Dreyfus Company. Louis Dreyfus Company, founded in 1851, is a global merchant firm active in agriculture and food processing, originating, processing and transporting approximately 84 million tons of commodities every year. The company accounts for approximately 10% of global agricultural product trade flows, operates in more than 100 countries, and reported net sales of USD 50.6 billion in 2024.

Complainant owns multiple trademarks for LDC including:

- International trademark LDC, registration number 1729911, registration date April 7, 2023, and
- Benelux trademark LDC, registration number 1476212, registration date March 22, 2023.

In addition, Complainant operates multiple websites incorporating the LDC mark, including “www.ldc.com”.

The Domain Name was registered on October 14, 2025. The Domain Name does not resolve to an active website. The Domain Name has been used for a fraudulent scheme.

The trademark registrations of Complainant were issued prior to the registration of the Domain Name.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, Complainant contends that the Domain Name is identical or, at the very least, confusingly similar to Complainant's prior rights in the LDC mark. The addition of the descriptive term “nederland” does not avoid a risk of confusion with Complainant's trademarks. On the contrary, it reinforces it, as the term directly refers to Complainant's country of incorporation.

According to Complainant, Respondent has no rights nor any legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Complainant submits that there is no evidence that Respondent is commonly known by the Domain Name. Neither the content of the associated website nor the Whois information suggests that Respondent's name includes the term “ldc” or that Respondent is commonly known by that name. Respondent has also never been authorized by Complainant to use the name LDC and Complainant has not licensed, permitted, or otherwise allowed Respondent to use any of its trademarks. Furthermore, no business relationship exists or has ever existed between Complainant and Respondent.

According to Complainant the Domain Name is not used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor does it constitute legitimate non-commercial or fair use. In fact, the Domain Name resolves to a parking page. Such use, which is devoid of any real or substantial offering of goods or services, cannot be considered bona fide or legitimate under UDRP standards.

According to Complainant, the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Complainant asserts that Respondent could not have ignored Complainant at the time of registration. Given Complainant's global scale, longstanding reputation, and extensive media coverage, it is implausible that Respondent was unaware of Complainant's existence and its trademark rights. Complainant submits that Respondent registered the Domain Name with the intention to mislead Internet users. All elements demonstrate that Respondent sought to benefit from the attractiveness and reputation of Complainant's well-established name and trademark. The Domain Name is inherently misleading and likely to create confusion among Internet users, who may incorrectly assume that the associated website is linked to, endorsed by, or operated by Complainant.

Complainant submits that Respondent has used the Domain Name for fraudulent purposes. Evidence shows that the Domain Name was used as part of a fraudulent impersonation scheme.

A business partner of Complainant informed Complainant that they received emails from the address "[...]@ldc-nederland.com", created using the Domain Name, for the purpose of commercializing products.

Respondent thus attempted to initiate business transactions while posing as Complainant. This constitutes clear evidence of bad faith. In particular: the email address "[...]@ldc-nederland.com" was created using the Domain Name without any authorization from Complainant. Complainant submits that Respondent is engaged in a phishing scheme. These facts demonstrate that Respondent used the Domain Name to mislead Complainant's suppliers into believing they were communicating with Complainant, with the intention of fraudulently obtaining goods, payments, or confidential information. Such conduct is a textbook example of phishing, a well-recognized form of bad faith under UDRP jurisprudence.

In light of the above, Complainant concludes that it is beyond doubt that the Domain Name was registered and used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs the Panel to "decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable".

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that the complainant prove each of the following three elements to obtain an order that the disputed domain name should be transferred or cancelled:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; and
- (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.

The Panel will proceed to analyze whether the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are satisfied in this 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

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.

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 LDC mark is reproduced within the Domain Name. Accordingly, the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Panel finds that the addition of the geographic term "nederland" in the Domain Name and the addition of the hyphen between the two parts of the Domain Name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [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 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 Complainant has established a *prima facie* case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Respondent has not rebutted Complainant's *prima facie* showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel notes that Complainant has not licensed or otherwise permitted Respondent to use any of its LDC trademarks or to register the Domain Name incorporating its trademarks.

Based on the undisputed submission and evidence provided by Complainant, as summarized above, Respondent used the Domain Name to impersonate Complainant by sending an email to a prospective customer asking for additional information. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity such as impersonation and phishing can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1. The Panel does not consider such use a *bona fide* offering of goods or services, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name. Respondent is also not commonly known by the Domain Name nor has it acquired any trademark or service mark rights.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel finds that the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Noting the status of the LDC mark and the overall circumstances of this case, the Panel finds it more likely than not that Respondent knew or in any event should have known Complainant's LDC mark. The registration of the Domain Name in awareness of the LDC trademark and in the absence of rights or legitimate interests amounts under these circumstances to registration in bad faith.

In particular the Panel takes into account that previous panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, such as applicable to this case impersonation, phishing and sending deceptive emails asking for additional information, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

The Panel finds that 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 Domain Name, <ldc-nederland.com>, be transferred to Complainant.

/Dinant T. L. Oosterbaan/
Dinant T. L. Oosterbaan
Sole Panelist
Date: January 15, 2026