

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Ron Dyens v. Andreas Andreou
Case No. D2025-5453

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Ron Dyens, France, represented by Santarelli, France.

The Respondent is Andreas Andreou, Cyprus.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <sacribleuprod.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 31, 2025. On January 2, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 3, 2026, 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 (The RDAP server redacted the value, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 5, 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 amended Complaint on January 9, 2026.

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 January 13, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 2, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 3, 2026.

The Center appointed John Swinson 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 producer of animated feature films.

In 1999, the Complainant created Sacrebleu Productions, a French organization having No. 421 483 728 on the French Companies Register. This company owns the domain name <sacrebleuprod.fr> and operates a website about its films from that domain name. The website states that: “Founded in 1999 by Ron Dyens, Sacrebleu Productions embarked on the adventure of animated feature films with Long Way North. The film received the Audience Award at Annecy Film Festival and was released in 2016. It attracted nearly 600 000 spectators in France and was sold in over 20 countries worldwide.”

The Complainant owns French Trademark Registration Number 5044488 for SACREBLEU PRODUCTIONS that was filed on April 5, 2024.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 4, 2004.

The Respondent did not file a Response, so little information is known about the Respondent. The Respondent has been referred to as a domain name investor. See, for example, *L&E Group Inc. v. Andreas Andreou*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3980](#).

The Complainant provided evidence that the Complainant was the registrant of the disputed domain name in September 2016, and that the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name in about November 2025.

At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name led the Internet user to a website that mirrored the Complainant’s Sacrebleu Productions website currently available at “www.sacrebleuprod.fr” including reproducing the Complainant’s “four mountains” logo and having the same structure and similar menu items as the Sacrebleu Productions website.

At the present time, the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website.

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 reproduces in its entirety the distinctive part of the Complainant’s trademark, namely “Sacrebleu”.

“Sacrebleu” is a fully distinctive term as regards entertainment services – it is a French expression used as a “cry of surprise, irritation or displeasure”). It is not a generic or descriptive term and “sacrebleu prod” is fully distinctive.

The Complainant’s Company Sacrebleu Productions is a well-known and reputed motion picture producer, recipient of numerous prestigious awards all over the world, including the Festival de Cannes Palme d’Or for Best Short Film in 2010, and the 2025 Oscar for Best Animated Short Film.

By the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name led the Internet user to a website that merely mirrors the Complainant’s website. This is obviously an attempt to mislead the Internet user – and numerous cases already held that impersonation can never constitute a legitimate interest.

Upon registration of the disputed domain name, the Respondent knew, or should have known, that “Sacrebleu Prod” is the name of this prestigious company. The registration of a domain name including

“Sacrebleu Prod” cannot be a coincidence – especially when this domain name is linked with a website that mirrors the one controlled by the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements enumerated in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied, namely:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (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 onus of proving these elements is on the Complainant.

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 (“[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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name includes “sacrebleuprod” part of the Complainant’s mark, and the term “prod” which can be considered as a short form of “productions”. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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, any of which (if found by the Panel to be proved) shall demonstrate that the Respondent has rights or legitimate interests in respect of 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, claimed impersonation/passing off) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Generally speaking, a finding that a domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith requires an inference to be drawn that the respondent in question has registered and is using the disputed domain name to take advantage of its significance as a trademark owned by (usually) the complainant.

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 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

The Complainant's trademark SACREBLEU PRODUCTIONS is distinctive, and it would be unlikely for a person to register the disputed domain name without being aware of the Complainant's trademark. The Complainant provided strong evidence of use and fame of his trademark.

The website at the disputed domain name was at one time a copycat website that impersonated the Complainant, and this appears not to be a legitimate website. It is probable that the website was created for some improper purpose. Clearly the Respondent was aware of the Complainant when the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name. *BV Law Firm TechLaB - Technology Law Boutique v. Venu Olis, Venu Olis*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3799](#).

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity such as, here claimed impersonation of another entity constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel notes that the Respondent has been an unsuccessful respondent in at least one prior decision under the Policy where the Respondent was unsuccessful and where there was evidence of a copycat website. See *L&E Group Inc. v. Andreas Andreou*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3980](#). The Panel does not need to rely on this decision to reach a conclusion in this 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 <sacrebleuprod.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/John Swinson/

John Swinson

Sole Panelist

Date: February 18, 2026