

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Lattafa Perfumes Ind. LLC v. David Gawdat, lattafaworld
Case No. D2026-0165

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Lattafa Perfumes Ind. LLC, United Arab Emirates, represented by Cabinet Bouchara, France.

The Respondent is David Gawdat, lattafaworld, Egypt.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lattafaworld.com> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on January 15, 2026. On January 15, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 16, 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 (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 16, 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 30, 2026.

The Center verified that 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 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 12, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on February 16, 2026.

The Center appointed Andrea Cappai as the sole panelist in this matter on February 25, 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 LATTAFATA PERFUMES IND. LLC, a limited liability company based in Sharjah, United Arab Emirates, and operates in the perfumes and colognes sector.

The Complainant is the owner of the following trademark registration:

- LATTAFATA – European Union – No. 018125528 – registered on February 18, 2020 (Classes 3, 35).

The Complainant operates online through the domain name <lattafa.com>.

The disputed domain name is <lattafaworld.com>. The disputed domain name was registered on February 20, 2025.

Based on the Complainant's screenshots filed with the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website presenting itself as "Lattafa Perfume World" and offering "Lataffa" and third-party beauty products for sale, with prices displayed in EGP. The record further includes a "Contact Us" page on that website referring to Cairo, Egypt and an email address "[...].@lattafaworld.com".

Following the Registrar disclosure, the Respondent was identified as an individual located in Egypt. Other than the contact details provided through the Registrar verification process, the record contains no further information regarding the Respondent.

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, as it reproduces the mark in its entirety with the addition of the term "world", which the Complainant characterises as descriptive and as increasing the likelihood that Internet users will assume the disputed domain name is connected with the Complainant or an authorised reseller.

The Complainant further submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, asserting that there is no relationship between the Parties and that the Respondent has no right to use the Complainant's trademarks in the course of a commercial activity, and contending that the disputed website seeks to suggest an affiliation, including by displaying the Complainant's official logo and using the Complainant's photographs in connection with the offering of similar products.

Finally, the Complainant argues that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, asserting that the Respondent could not have been unaware of the Complainant's trademarks and contending that the disputed domain name is used to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion, while also alleging that it is presumably used as an e-commerce website selling perfume products and/or in a phishing scheme.

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, such as "world", 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 recognised 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 Respondent has not been authorised by the Complainant to use the Complainant's trademark, and there is no evidence before the Panel that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name resolved to a website presenting itself as "Lattafa Perfume World" and offering "Lattafa" and third-party beauty products for sale, with prices displayed in EGP, and including a "Contact Us" page referring to Cairo, Egypt and an email address "[...][@lattafaworld.com](mailto:[]@lattafaworld.com)". The screenshots submitted in the record of that website do not show any clear disclosure that it is not affiliated with the Complainant. On this basis, the Panel sees no evidence that the Respondent has used, or made demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of

goods or services within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, nor is there any indication that the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name under paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 2.1 and 2.8.

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, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name, which incorporates the Complainant's trademark in its entirety together with the term "world". The disputed domain name was registered after the Complainant's trademark registrations. In light of the composition of the disputed domain name and the timing of its registration, and further having regard to the manner in which the disputed domain name has been used, and absent any explanation from the Respondent, the Panel finds it reasonable to infer that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its trademark at the time of registration and targeted the Complainant.

The screenshots submitted in the record of that website show the disputed domain name resolved to a website presenting itself as "Lattafa Perfume World" and offering "Lattafa" and third-party beauty products for sale, including perfumes, with prices displayed in EGP, and including a "Contact Us" page referring to Cairo, Egypt and an email address "[...]@lattafaworld.com". No clear disclosure the website is not affiliated with the Complainant is visible. Taken together, the circumstances support the conclusion that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website, within the meaning of 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 <lattafaworld.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrea Cappai/

Andrea Cappai

Sole Panelist

Date: March 11, 2026