

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Central Way Sasu v. Walter Salazar
Case No. D2026-0110

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Central Way Sasu, France, represented by MW Lawfirm, France.

The Respondent is Walter Salazar, United States of America (“US”).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <territoiredhomme.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 12, 2026. On January 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 13, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 14, 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 a first amended Complaint on January 18, 2026. The Center sent a further request for amendment to the Complainant on January 19, 2026. The Complainant filed additional second, third, and fourth amended Complaints on January 22 and 23, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaints 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 26, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 15, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 16, 2026.

The Center appointed Rebecca Slater as the sole panelist in this matter on February 19, 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 under French law.

The Complainant holds the following trade mark registrations: French Trade Mark Registration No. 95573193 for TERRIOTOIRE D'HOMME word mark (registered May 18, 1995) and European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 018419043 for TERRIOTOIRE D'HOMME composite mark (registered July 6, 2021) (the "Trade Mark").

The Respondent has a listed address in the US. The Respondent did not submit a response, and, consequently, little information is known about the Respondent.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 20, 2005, and updated on October 8, 2025. It previously resolved to a website which offered men's clothing and accessories for sale under the Trade Mark. The website featured photographs of the official collections sold under the Trade Mark. The disputed domain name does not currently resolve to an active website. It displays the message "Sorry, you have been blocked".

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 identical to the Trade Mark.
- The Respondent has no rights to the Trade Mark. The former owner of the Trade Mark registered the disputed domain name in 2005 and used it to sell clothing. The disputed domain name was hacked, so that it could not be accessed. The Complainant is now the owner of the Trade Mark. The Respondent has displayed collections belonging to the Complainant on the website at the disputed domain name.
- The Respondent's display of photographs belonging to the Complainant is evidence of bad faith. The Respondent has also displayed another figurative mark held by the Complainant on the website at the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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

- the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trade mark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;

- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- 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 trade mark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Trade Mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the Trade 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 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 that 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.

The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use the Trade Mark and there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The evidence provided by the Complainant indicates that the disputed domain name has rather been used to either: (a) impersonate the Complainant and its business; or (b) to create the incorrect impression that the Respondent is affiliated with the Complainant. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, possibly impersonation or 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

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.

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 Panel finds it unlikely that the disputed domain name was acquired without knowledge of the Complainant and the Trade Mark, given the composition of the disputed domain name, which includes the Trade Mark. The Respondent's goal in registering and using the disputed domain name appears to be to attract Internet users for potential gain, taking unfair advantage of the Trade Mark. This finding is reinforced by the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to host a website that features the Complainant's Trade Mark and the photographs of the Complainant's clothing collections.

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 <territoiredhomme.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Rebecca Slater/

Rebecca Slater

Sole Panelist

Date: March 4, 2026