

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

CACHE-CACHE v. Zhenhe Qiu

Case No. D2025-5352

1. The Parties

The Complainant is CACHE-CACHE, France, represented by MIIP MADE IN IP, France.

The Respondent is Zhenhe Qiu, China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <cache-cache-clothing.shop>, <cache-cache-collections.shop>, and <cache-cache-offers.shop> are registered with Cosmotown, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 19, 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 26, 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 (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 26, 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 29, 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 30, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 19, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Dawn Osborne as the sole panelist in this matter on January 23, 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 well-established French fashion brand founded in 1985. It is the owner of the registered trade mark CACHE CACHE, registered, inter alia, as international registration number 966411 since October 16, 2007. In its corporate name the Complainant uses a hyphen to present its name as CACHE-CACHE.

The disputed domain names which were all registered on October 15, 2025, have all been used for competing sites displaying the Complainant's trademark, and purporting to offer the Complainant's branded products such as clothing under the same general terms and conditions present at the Complainant's official website, including the Complainant's contact details and link to its official website. In particular the site attached to <cache-cache-clothing.shop> exactly mimics the Complainant's website using the Complainant's CACHE CACHE mark in its logo form as a masthead.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that:

The disputed domain names registered in 2025 are all confusingly similar to the Complainant's earlier trademark CACHE CACHE containing it in its entirety and adding the generic terms "clothing", "collections" or "offers", two hyphens and the generic top level domain ("gTLD") ".shop", none of which prevents confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the Complainant's mark.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names, is not commonly known by them or any of them and is not authorised by the Complainant.

The Respondent directed the disputed domain names to sites offering the Complainant's branded products under same general terms and conditions present at the Complainant's official website, including the Complainant's contact details and link to its official website, and in the case of <cache-cache-clothing.shop> exactly mimicking the Complainant's website using the Complainant's CACHE CACHE mark in its logo form as a masthead. These uses were intended to confuse Internet users into believing the websites were associated with the Complainant for commercial gain. The disputed domain names have been registered and used in bad faith

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 each of 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, "clothing", "collections" or "offers" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names or any of them and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8. Nor does the addition of hyphens.

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 all of 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 or any of them such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Respondent is not authorised by the Complainant or commonly known by the disputed domain names or any of them. The disputed domain names have been used to offer the Complainant's branded products such as clothing under the same general terms and conditions present at the Complainant's website, including the Complainant's contact details and link to its official website, and in the case of <cache-cache-clothing.shop> exactly mimicking the Complainant's website using the Complainant's CACHE CACHE mark in its logo form as a masthead, impersonating/passing itself off as the Complainant which is not a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate commercial fair use.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here impersonation/passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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 pointed the disputed domain names to competing sites displaying the Complainant's trademark, and purporting to offer the Complainant's branded products such as clothes under the same general terms and conditions copied from the Complainant's official website, including the Complainant's contact details and link to its official website, and in the case of <cache-cache-clothing.shop> exactly mimicking the Complainant's website using the Complainant's CACHE CACHE mark in its logo form as a masthead. By these uses the Respondent has intentionally attempting to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark and disrupting the Complainant's business.

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here impersonation/passing off constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under 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 <cache-cache-clothing.shop>, <cache-cache-collections.shop>, and <cache-cache-offers.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Dawn Osborne/

Dawn Osborne

Sole Panelist

Date: February 6, 2026