ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Vente-privee.com v. tu monuo
Case No. D2025-5421

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is tu monuo, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <veepee-fr.live> is registered with Name.com, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 29, 2025. On December 30, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 31, 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, Domain Protection Services, Inc.) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 2, 2026, 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 January 5, 2026.

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 January 9, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 29, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 30, 2026.

The Center appointed Catherine Slater as the sole panelist in this matter on February 5, 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 company incorporated in 2001 under French law. The Complainant sells discounted goods and services online via "flash sales" events. In 2019, the Complainant rebranded itself from VENTE-PRIVEE to VEEPEE. The Complainant has over 6,000 employees and, in 2024, its turnover was EUR 3.3 billion.

The Complainant has registered trademarks including:

- European Union Trademark No. 17442245 for VEEPEE (word mark), registered on March 29, 2018; and
- French Trademark No. 4933049 for VEEPEE (stylized mark), registered on January 31, 2023.

The Complainant operates websites at various domain names including at "www.veepee.fr" ("the Complainant's Website") and "www.veepee.com" (the Complainant's .com Website")

The disputed domain name was registered on September 16, 2025.

At the date of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain name directed to a website offering for sale women's clothing via "flash sales". The items for sale were priced in EUR and the text was largely in French. The website contained an image (a CGI of two animals in a row boat made of cloud) that appears on the Complainant's .com Website. It utilises the colour pink as a highlighting feature in a similar way as the Complainant's Website. The footer states (translated from French):

"Partner e-commerce platform of veepee.fr

Veepee.fr is a European e-commerce leader, specializing in footwear and accessories. The platform offers more than 90,000 products from over 700 brands, including sports, leisure, outdoor, and premium items."

This iteration of the website is hereinafter referred to as ("the Respondent's Website").

As at the date of this Decision, the disputed domain name directs to a website offering for sale spectacle holders. The header of the website is "nchrtiui". The only contact details are an email address ending "[…]@avlible-store.com". The items for sale are priced in USD, and the text is in English.

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 its trademark because the disputed domain name identically reproduces the trademark VEEPEE with the addition of FR, being the ISO code for France.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name because the Respondent is not known as VEEPEE, the disputed domain name was registered long after the Complainant's re-branding exercise, the Complainant is unaware of any legitimate third party rights corresponding to VEEPEE, the Respondent has never objected to the Complainant's trademarks, the Respondent is not related to the Complainant, the Complainant has not authorised the Respondent to register/use the disputed domain name and the Respondent makes neither a legitimate noncommercial nor fair use of the disputed domain name. The Complainant further contends that the use made of the disputed domain name is done to pass the Respondent's Website off as being connected to the Complainant and therefore leveraging the reputation of the Complainant's trademark for commercial gain.

The Complainant further contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith because, at registration, the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant's well-known trademark and because the Respondent falsely represents itself as a partner of the Complainant.

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 Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, "-fr", 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 name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, 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 3.1, 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.

For completeness, the Panel is satisfied that use made of the disputed domain name seeks to take unfair advantage of the Complainant's trademark (as discussed in more detail below) and cannot therefore give rise to rights or legitimate interests. Furthermore, the composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. WIPO Overview 3.1, 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, and on the basis of the evidence submitted, the Panel finds the Complainant's trademark to be well-known in relation to use for a retail sale website. That the Respondent knew of, and targeted, the Complainant and/or its trademark is demonstrated by the use of the ISO for France in the disputed domain name, the use on the Respondent's Website of an image from the Complainant's .com Website, the mimicking of the "flash sale" business model, the mimicking of the use of the colour pink, the explicit reference to the Complainant's Website and the false claim to be the Complainant's "e-commerce partner". The Respondent has provided no explanation for its registration and use of the disputed domain name. The Panel infers in the circumstances that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the Complainant's trademark in mind and with the intention of diverting Internet users looking for the Complainant's services to its own competing website.

The Panel therefore finds that, by using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website or of a product or service on its website (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 name <veepee-fr.live> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Catherine Slater/
Catherine Slater
Sole Panelist
Date: February 19, 2026