

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Vente-privee.com v. mu yunyun

Case No. D2025-5409

### 1. The Parties

Complainant is Vente-privee.com, France, represented by Cabinet Degret, France.

Respondent is mu yunyun, Hong Kong, China.

### 2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <veepee-shops.com> and <veepee-shops.top> are 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 December 26, 2025. On December 29, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On December 30, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names that differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on December 30, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on December 31, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on January 7, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 27, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on January 28, 2026.

The Center appointed Jeffrey D. Steinhardt as sole panelist in this matter on February 3, 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**

Complainant has for 25 years owned and maintained an online shopping club offering a broad variety of goods and services through flash sales, enjoying a strong presence in Europe. In 2019, Complainant began the process of rebranding and promotion of its websites, now under the VEEPEE marks.

Complainant owns various registrations for its VEEPEE marks including for example: European Union Trademark Registration No. 017442245 on March 29, 2018, in Nice classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43 and 45 and French Trademark Registration No. 4933049 (figurative), registered on January 31, 2023, in Nice classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, and 45.

Complainant also owns the registration for the illustration in the logo that it uses on its websites (which previously included the words “vente privée”) under European Union Trademark Registration No. 011991965 (figurative), registered on January 3, 2014, in Nice classes 35, 36, 38, 39, 41, 42 and 43.

The disputed domain names were registered on November 15, 2025. At the time of this decision, the disputed domain name (1) <veepee-shops.com> was flagged by web browsers as a “Dangerous site”, presumably found by the browser provider to have engaged in unlawful phishing or offering downloads of malicious software programs; and (2) <veepee-shops.top> resolved to a website prominently displaying Complainant’s trademarks and registered logo, offering the sale of a variety of items and displaying visual elements identical to those on Complainant’s authentic website at “www.veepee.fr”. The Complaint also annexes screen captures showing that the disputed domain name <veepee-shops.com> previously resolved to a website with content nearly identical to the website at “www.veepee-shops.top”.

#### **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 names.

Notably, Complainant avers that it has grown to become one of the world’s pre-eminent e-commerce platforms with sales in the billions of Euros, operating in several countries and currently employing more than 6,000 employees.

##### **B. Respondent**

Respondent did not reply to Complainant’s contentions.

#### **6. Discussion and Findings**

##### **Procedural Matters: Language of Proceedings**

Complainant provides numerous arguments to support its request that the proceedings be conducted in English, and submitted the Complaint and the Amendment to the Complaint in English.

The Rules, paragraph 11(a), provide that UDRP Complaints in most instances should be submitted in the language of the registration agreement “subject to the authority of the Panel to determine otherwise, having regard to the circumstances of the administrative proceeding”.

As confirmed by the Registrar, the registration agreement is in English.

Since the registration agreement is in English, the Panel has determined in its discretion that the proceedings may be conducted in English without addressing Complainant’s arguments respecting this issue. The Panel finds that doing so should not cause any undue burden, undue delay or unfairness to the parties.

#### **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.

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 that 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, the use of hyphen and the word “shops”) 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 and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The Panel finds that the first element of Policy paragraph 4(a) 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.

In this case, the Panel notes that the websites to which the disputed domain names ultimately resolve have used Complainant’s marks and reproduced graphical elements from Complainant’s authentic website, imitating Complainant’s well-established e-commerce websites. The Panel accepts Complainant’s unopposed allegations that Respondent has not been authorized to use Complainant’s trademarks, that Respondent has no business relation with Complainant, and that Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds that Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. 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 disputed domain names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

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

The Panel finds that the second element of Policy paragraph 4(a) has been established.

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

The Panel notes that, for 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 Respondent has, without authorization, used the confusingly similar disputed domain names for websites impersonating Complainant's business conducted under Complainant's well-known marks. The Panel finds that Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's marks, a clear demonstration of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

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 Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 also 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. Under the circumstances, the Panel finds that Respondent's failure to respond to the Complaint in this proceeding is further evidence of bad faith.

The Panel finds that Complainant has established the third element of Policy paragraph 4(a).

### **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 <veepee-shops.com> and <veepee-shops.top> be transferred to Complainant.

*/Jeffrey D. Steinhardt/*

**Jeffrey D. Steinhardt**

Sole Panelist

Date: February 5, 2026