

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

BREMA FRANCE v. LuXiangPing, LuXiangPing
Case No. D2025-5374

1. The Parties

The Complainant is BREMA FRANCE, France, represented by CLEACH AVOCATS, France.

The Respondent is LuXiangPing, LuXiangPing, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ltpiver.com> is registered with 22net, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 22, 2025. On December 23, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 24, 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 and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 24, 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 in English on December 29, 2025.

On December 24, 2025, the Center informed the parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. On December 29, 2025, the Complainant confirmed its request that English be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant’s submission.

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 in Chinese and English, 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 Deanna Wong Wai Man as the sole panelist in this matter on January 22, 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 part of a French perfume house trading under the name L.T. PIVER, which was founded in 1774 and claims to be one of the oldest perfume houses in France. Historically, the Complainant served as an official supplier to the royal court of Louis XVI and other foreign courts, and its clientele included well-known figures such as Sarah Bernhardt and members of the Bonaparte family. Over time, the Complainant has established itself in the perfumery and cosmetics sectors. The Complainant currently operates more than 30 retail shops in six countries and reports an annual turnover of approximately EUR 5 million.

The Complainant owns an international portfolio of trademark registrations in the L.T. PIVER mark in various jurisdictions. These include, inter alia, French trademark registration number 1344529 for L.T. PIVER (word mark), registered on August 8, 1986, in class 3; Norwegian trademark registration number 0418606 for L.T. PIVER (word mark), registered on October 30, 1995, in class 3; and International trademark registration number 254488 for L.T. PIVER (figurative mark), registered on April 9, 1962, in class 3 and 21, with designations including the United Kingdom and the Russian Federation.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 14, 2023. The Complainant provides evidence that the disputed domain name resolved to the Sedo domain name auction platform, indicating that it was offered for auction with offers starting at a minimum price of EUR 99. However, the Panel notes that on the date of this Decision the disputed domain name directs to a blank, inactive webpage.

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 it owns registered trademark rights in the sign L.T. PIVER in numerous jurisdictions, covering in particular perfumes and cosmetics. The disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's trademark in its entirety. According to the Complainant, the inclusion of a generic Top-Level Domain does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, and the incorporation of the trademark as such is sufficient to satisfy the first element of the Policy.

As regards paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, the Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant states that it has not authorised the Respondent to use its trademark in any manner and that there is no relationship between the Parties. The disputed domain name was registered long after the Complainant acquired its trademark rights. The Complainant further asserts that the Respondent has not used the disputed domain name for any bona fide offering of goods or services, nor for a legitimate noncommercial or fair use, as the disputed domain name resolves to a webpage where it is offered for sale.

Finally, in relation to paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, the Complainant argues that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant points out that the disputed domain name is offered for sale at a price exceeding typical registration costs, which it submits evidence an intent to profit from the Complainant's trademark. The Complainant further notes that the Respondent has employed a privacy or proxy service to conceal its identity, which it considers to be an additional indication of bad faith in the circumstances of the case. The Complainant also refers to the Respondent's involvement in prior UDRP proceedings resulting in adverse findings, which it submits demonstrates a pattern of abusive domain name registrations.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Preliminary Issue: Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English, and the Complainant requests that English be the language of the proceeding for several reasons, including that English is widely used in international relations; that the disputed domain name is composed of Roman characters rather than Chinese characters; that the disputed domain name resolves to a landing page in English; that communications with the Registrar, in light of the Respondent's use of a privacy service, were conducted in English; and that the relevant registration agreement is also available in English. The Complainant further states that it and its representative are based in France, and that requiring translation of the Complaint and annexes into Chinese would impose unnecessary cost and delay, contrary to considerations of fairness and procedural efficiency underlying the Policy.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.5.1).

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

6.2. Substantive Issues

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 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 Complainant's mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name, with the mere omission of the dots present in the trademark registrations. 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 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.

Based on the evidence provided, the Panel notes that the Respondent is not licensed by the Complainant in any way and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and that there are no elements in this case that point to the Respondent having made any reasonable and demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Instead, according to the evidence, the Respondent has only connected the disputed domain name to a website on the Sedo domain name auction platform, indicating that it was offered for auction for bids starting at a minimum price of EUR 99. The Panel finds that in the circumstances of this case the Respondent’s mere offer for sale of the disputed domain name to the highest bidder does not represent a bona fide offering of goods or services. Such use of the disputed domain name cannot confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent. (see also *American Airlines, Inc. v. 胡雪 (Ni Cary)*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-3324](#))

Additionally, the Panel notes that on the date of this Decision, the disputed domain name directs to an inactive or blank webpage. In this regard, the Panel finds that holding a domain name passively, without making any use of it, also does not confer any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name on the Respondent in the circumstances of this case (see in this regard earlier UDRP decisions such as *Bollore SE v. 赵竹飞 (Zhao Zhu Fei)*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-0691](#); and *Vente-Privee.Com and Vente-Privee.com IP S.à.r.l. v. 崔郡 (jun cui)*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-1685](#)).

Finally, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name, being nearly identical to the Complainant’s mark, carries a high risk of implied affiliation and cannot constitute fair use, as it effectively impersonates the Complainant and its services or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

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 registered a domain name which is nearly identical to the Complainant’s prior trademark for L.T. PIVER, incorporating it in its entirety, merely omitting the dots in the trademark registrations. The Panel also notes that some of the Complainant’s trademarks in this case predate the registration date of the disputed domain name by several decades. Even a cursory Internet search or trademark search at the time of registration of the disputed domain name would have made it clear to the Respondent that the Complainant owned prior rights in its trademarks for L.T. PIVER and used them intensively, and the Panel therefore finds that the Respondent could not have been reasonably unaware of them. In the Panel’s view, the above elements clearly indicate bad faith on the part of the Respondent, and the Panel therefore finds that it has been demonstrated that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith.

As to the use of the disputed domain name in bad faith, the evidence shows that the Respondent connected it to a website on the Sedo domain name auction platform, indicating that it was offered for auction for bids starting at a minimum price of EUR 99. On the balance of probabilities, the Panel finds that the Respondent was using the disputed domain name to attempt to sell it to the Complainant, the owner of the L.T. PIVER mark, or to the Complainant's competitors, in order to obtain an unjustified financial benefit. The Panel finds that this constitutes direct evidence of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy.

As to the fact that the disputed domain name currently directs to a blank webpage, panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Finally, the Panel also finds that the Complainant has sufficiently demonstrated that the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of abusive domain name registrations. In this regard, the Panel notes that the Respondent has been involved in multiple prior UDRP proceedings in which the respective panels found that the Respondent had acted in bad faith, including but not limited to *Jacquemus SAS v. LuXiangPing, YanSong*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-0522](#) and *GROUP Fourteen IP Pty Ltd. v. LuXiangPing*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-0391](#). The Panel considers these prior adverse findings to constitute persuasive evidence of a pattern of bad-faith registration and use under the Policy. In the Panel's view, these elements clearly establish the Respondent's bad faith in the present 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 <ltipiver.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Deanna Wong Wai Man/

Deanna Wong Wai Man

Sole Panelist

Date: January 26, 2026