

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Vente-privee.com v. 杰 陈

Case No. D2025-5432

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is 杰 陈, China, self-represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <veepee-fr.store> 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 30, 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 3, 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 8, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 28, 2026. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on January 8, 2026. The Center also received several email communications from the email address found on the website at the disputed domain name. On January 29, 2026, the Center informed the Parties that it would proceed with panel appointment.

The Center appointed Federica Togo as the sole panelist in this matter on February 2, 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

It results from the Complainant's undisputed allegations that it is incorporated in France and is active in the e-commerce at an international level. The Complainant's activities consist in selling all kinds of goods and services through "e-commerce tools". It runs a website: a shopping club that has been operated for 25 years in connection with the organization of event sales of all kinds of discounted products and services, including those under well-known trademarks (e.g., fashion articles, beauty products, food, travels, shows, discount coupons to be used in the purchase of goods and services, etc.). At the beginning of 2019, it initiated a process of group rebranding to unify all its trademarks under one and only new denomination, i.e. Veepee.

The Complainant is the registered owner of several trademarks for VEEPEE, e.g. European Union trade mark registration no. 017442245 VEEPEE (word), registered on March 29, 2018 for goods and services in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, and 45.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 14, 2025. Furthermore, the undisputed evidence provided by the Complainant proves that the disputed domain name resolves to an e-commerce website displaying without authorization the Complainant's trademark and logo. In addition, the products offered for sale are similar to those marketed on the Complainant's "www.veepee.fr" platform.

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 the Complainant's trademark since it wholly incorporates the Complainant's trademark VEEPEE and only differs by the juxtaposition of the descriptive element "fr", which is the ISO code for France, the territory where the Complainant has established its headquarters.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant, it has never authorized the Respondent to register and use the disputed domain name; the Respondent is not commercially linked to the Complainant and is not known under the denomination Veepee. The Respondent makes neither a legitimate noncommercial use nor fair use of the disputed domain name. Indeed, the disputed domain name redirects towards a merchant website where the famous Complainant's trademark is identically reproduced. Moreover, the website directly competes with the Complainant's business, as the products offered are similar to those marketed daily on the Complainant's "www.veepee.fr" platform. It is therefore obvious that the Respondent is unduly using the disputed domain name in order to pass itself as off the Complainant and to benefit from the reputation of the VEEPEE trademarks for its own personal gain.

Furthermore, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. According to the Complainant, when the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name, it had necessarily the Complainant's names and rights in mind since the VEEPEE trademarks are well known at an international level. Further, the Respondent has reproduced the Complainant's trademark and logo on the website under the disputed domain name. The website is partially drafted in French; the prices of the

products sold on said website are displayed in EUR, the website's payment form is written entirely in French, which further demonstrates that the Respondent is deliberately targeting French consumers, among whom the Complainant's activities are particularly well known. Finally, the Respondent uses the Complainant's iconic pink color within its website's graphic charter.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not formally reply to the Complainant's contentions. On January 8, 2026, the Respondent sent an email communication from the email address indicated in the Registrar verification to the Center, in reply to the Center's acknowledgement of Receipt of the amendment to the Complaint, asking: "Is veepee-fr.store going to be taken down?" Further similar email communications were sent to the Center on between January 9 and February 3, 2026 from the email address found on the website under the disputed domain name stating, for example, "Thank you for reaching out. It seems that we are unable to locate your order based on the information provided. To assist you further, could you please confirm the email address associated with your order? Additionally, if you could provide the time when the order was placed, along with any receipt or order number you may have received, it would greatly help us in resolving this matter for you. Looking forward to your response. Have a great day!".

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to "decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable". Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires a complainant to prove each of the following three elements in order to obtain an order that each disputed domain name be transferred or cancelled:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel will therefore proceed to analyze whether the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are satisfied.

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 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 3.0](#), 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 3.0](#), 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 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.

Moreover, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name contains the Complainant’s registered trademark and a geographic abbreviation (“fr”) and a hyphen. The nature of this disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation: in fact, geographic terms (e.g., <trademark-usa.com>, or <trademark.nyc>) are typically seen as tending to suggest sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner, see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) at 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.

One of these circumstances is that the Respondent by using the disputed domain name, has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website or online location or of a product or service on its website or online location (paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy).

In the present case, the Panel notes that it results from the Complainant’s documented allegations that the disputed domain name resolves to a website displaying without authorization the Complainant’s registered trademark and logo, and offering for sale similar products to those marketed by the Complainant.

By the time the disputed domain name was registered, the Panel considers it to be unlikely that the Respondent did not have knowledge of the Complainant and its mark, which is entirely included in the disputed domain name, together with the additional term referring to the Complainant’s location. Consequently, and in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, the Panel is convinced that the Respondent knew that the disputed domain name included the Complainant’s trademark when it registered the disputed domain name.

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. In

this regard, the further circumstances surrounding the disputed domain name's registration and use confirm the Panel's findings that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith:

- (i) the nature of the disputed domain name (wholly incorporating the Complainant's trademark plus a geographic abbreviation "fr" standing for France, the country in which the Complainant is incorporated);
- (ii) the content of the website to which the disputed domain name resolves (i.e. displaying without authorization the Complainant's registered trademark and logo, images, and offering for sale similar products to those marketed by the Complainant);
- (iii) a clear absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with no substantive response and explanation for the Respondent's choice of the disputed domain name; and
- (iv) the Respondent concealing its identity through a privacy service.

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.store> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Federica Togo/

Federica Togo

Sole Panelist

Date: February 10, 2026