

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

TICKET FOR THE MOON v. Florent Muller

Case No. D2025-4969

1. The Parties

The Complainant is TICKET FOR THE MOON, France, represented by Selarl Capon et Rault Avocats, France.

The Respondent is Florent Muller, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <tikamoonuk.com> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with Gname.com Pte. Ltd. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 28, 2025. On November 28, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On December 1, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 1, 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 1, 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 did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on December 26, 2025.

The Center appointed Flip Jan Claude Petillion as the sole panelist in this matter on December 30, 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

The Complainant is a furniture company based in France, and is the owner of the following trademarks for TIKAMOON:

- **tikamoon** French figurative mark registered under No. 4698213 on April 30, 2021, in classes 11, 20 and 35;
- **tikamoon** European Union figurative mark registered under No. 018352062 on April 16, 2021, in classes 11, 20 and 35.

The Complainant operates the domain name <tikamoon.com> resolving to its official website.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on April 27, 2024. The Disputed Domain Name resolves to a website mentioning the Complainant's mark and appears to offer products identical or at least similar to the Complainant's products at a reduced price.

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 a trademark in which it claims to have rights.

Second, the Complainant claims that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name, as, according to the Complainant:

- the Complainant has never conceded the use of its trademark to a third party;
- the Respondent is using the Disputed Domain Name to fraudulently and maliciously misappropriate the sales of the Complainant, by presenting itself to the public as the true owner of the rights to the TIKAMOON mark.

Finally, the Complainant claims that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. According to the Complainant:

- the Respondent does not make commercial use in good faith;
- in fact, by using the Disputed Domain Name, the Respondent knowingly attempted to attract Internet users to its website for profit, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's TIKAMOON trademarks;
- the Respondent could not ignore the existence of the Complainant's trademarks and domain name because the Respondent uses exactly the same logo as the one used and registered as a trademark by the Complainant and also reproduced hundreds of photos of the Complainant's products;
- the use of the letters "uk" directly adjacent to the word TIKAMOON in the Disputed Domain Name, when the Complainant is also present in the United Kingdom, is a further indication of the Respondent's malicious intent.

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 textual components of 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.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 observes that the entire textual component of the Complainant's TIKAMOON mark is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name. In such cases, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to the incorporated mark for purposes of UDRP standing. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Additionally, the Panel finds that the addition of the term "uk" 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.

It is well established that generic Top-Level Domains, here ".com", may be disregarded when considering whether the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.

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 the 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 Respondent has not apparently been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name. According to the information provided by the Registrar, the Respondent is "Florent Muller". The Respondent's use and registration of the Disputed Domain Name was not authorized by the Complainant.

Fundamentally, a respondent's use of a domain name will not be considered "fair" if it falsely suggests affiliation with the trademark owner. The correlation between a domain name and the complainant's mark is often central to this inquiry. Generally speaking, UDRP panels have found that domain names identical to a complainant's trademark carry a high risk of implied affiliation. Even where a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term, UDRP panels have largely held that such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

The Disputed Domain Name incorporates the textual component of the Complainant's TIKAMOON trademark in its entirety. In the Panel's view, the combination with the term "uk", which is commonly known as the abbreviation of "United Kingdom", even increases the risk of confusion as Internet users may believe the Disputed Domain Name is linked to the Complainant's business in the United Kingdom. Therefore, the Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant and cannot constitute fair use.

Beyond looking at the disputed domain name and the nature of any additional terms appended to the mark, UDRP panels also assess whether the overall facts and circumstances of the case, and the absence of a response, support a fair use or not. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 2.5.2 and 2.5.3.

The Panel observes that the Disputed Domain Name resolves to a website appearing to offer products identical or at least similar to the Complainant's products at a reduced price. In addition, this website:

- prominently displays the Complainant's figurative mark throughout the website;
- includes pictures directly copied from the Complainant's official website.

In the Panel's view, this neither amounts to a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name. UDRP panels have categorically held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (e.g., impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.

The Respondent had the opportunity to demonstrate its rights or legitimate interests but did not do so. In the absence of a Response from the Respondent, the *prima facie* case established by the Complainant has not been rebutted.

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.

As mentioned above, the Disputed Domain Name resolves to a website displaying the Complainant's figurative trademark and appearing to offer products identical or at least similar to the Complainant's products at a reduced price. The website also uses pictures copied from the Complainant's official website. In the Panel's view, the circumstances of this case clearly indicate that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

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.

In the present case, the Panel finds that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its trademark rights when it registered the Disputed Domain Name as:

- the Disputed Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's distinctive trademark in its entirety with the sole addition of a geographical term;
- the Disputed Domain Name was registered three years after the Complainant registered rights in the TIKAMOON mark; and
- the website linked to the Disputed Domain Name provides additional evidence of the Respondent's knowledge of the Complainant and its mark.

Finally, the Respondent did not formally take part in the administrative proceedings. According to the Panel, this serves as an additional indication of the Respondent's bad faith in the circumstances of this case.

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 <tikamoonuk.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Flip Jan Claude Petillion/

Flip Jan Claude Petillion

Sole Panelist

Date: January 13, 2026