

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Balenciaga v. Chang-Han Chen

Case No. D2025-5345

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Balenciaga, France, represented by Studio Barbero S.p.A., Italy.

The Respondent is Chang-Han Chen, Taiwan Province of China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <balenciaga-beauty.com>, and <balenciagabeauty.com> are registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 21, 2025. On December 22, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On December 22, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 22, 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 23, 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 23, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 12, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Nayiri Boghossian as the sole panelist in this matter on January 13, 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 fashion house established in 1919. The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for BALENCIAGA such as:

- European Union trademark registration No. 011865805, registered on September 19, 2013;
- United States of America trademark registration No. 1018311, registered on August 12, 1975;
- United States of America trademark registration No. 547687, registered on September 11, 1951.

The disputed domain names were registered on September 8, 2025, and resolve to parking pages with Pay-Per-Click (“PPC”) links. Based on the available record, upon a purchase inquiry made by a marketing agency willing to offer its services to the Complainant’s parent company, a person apparently related to the disputed domain names indicated it was willing to sell the disputed domain names, but declined the agency’s proposed prices, stating “Given the nature of these domains and the brand they reference, their market value should be quite clear to parties familiar with premium domain assets [...]”, and later “Since you mentioned that this would involve a discussion with Kering [the Complainant’s parent company], I would expect the value to be considerably higher”.

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 names are confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark. The disputed domain names reproduce the Complainant’s trademark in its entirety with the addition of the term “beauty” and a hyphen in the case of <balenciaga-beauty.com>. The generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.com” should be disregarded.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not a licensee, authorized agent of the Complainant or in any other way authorized to use Complainant’s trademark. Specifically, the Respondent has not been authorized to register and use the disputed domain names. There is no evidence that the Respondent might be commonly known by a name corresponding to the disputed domain names. There is no evidence of use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. There is no evidence that the Respondent might have used the disputed domain names in connection with a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. The Respondent has used the disputed domain names to redirect Internet users to parking pages with commercial links. The composition of the disputed domain names is inherently misleading and carries high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. The Respondent likely registered the disputed domain names in order to derive profits from selling them to the correspondent trademark owner.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. It is inconceivable that Respondent was not aware of the Complainant’s trademark rights at the time of the registration of the disputed domain names as the Complainant’s trademark existed since 1919 and is well-known. The correspondence with the Respondent demonstrates that Respondent was indeed well aware of the BALENCIAGA trademark and the Complainant. The same correspondence shows that the Respondent

intended to sell the disputed domain names to the Complainant's parent company for an amount well in excess of the out-of-pocket costs. Furthermore, the Respondent has used the disputed domain names to redirect Internet users to parking pages with commercial links. Even if this is considered a case of passive holding, it should not prevent a finding of bad faith use under the circumstances.

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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are 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, "beauty" 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 names 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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel considers that the composition of the disputed domain names carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1. Further, the use of the disputed domain names to resolve to PPC pages does not represent a bona fide offering in this case. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.9.

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: (a) the disputed domain names incorporate the Complainant's trademark in its entirety with the addition of the term "beauty"; (b) the Complainant's trademark is well-known; and (c) the disputed domain names were created more than 50 years after the registration of the Complainant's trademark. Therefore, the Panel finds that the Respondent knew of the Complainant at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2. The Panel also takes note of the emails between an agency that was interested in proposing its services to the Complainant's parent company, and a person apparently associated with the disputed domain names offering to sell the disputed domain names for an amount likely in excess of the out-of-pocket costs.

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.

The Panel finds that by using the disputed domain names for parking websites with PPC links, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online locations by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark. Such use constitutes bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

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 names <balenciaga-beauty.com>, and <balenciagabeauty.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nayiri Boghossian/

Nayiri Boghossian

Sole Panelist

Date: January 16, 2026