

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

ARSENE v. Ireneusz Bachurski

Case No. D2026-0225

1. The Parties

The Complainant is ARSENE, France, represented by CLEACH AVOCATS, France.

The Respondent is Ireneusz Bachurski, Poland.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <arsen.online> is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on January 20, 2026. On January 21, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 22, 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 (GDPR Masked) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 22, 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 22, 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 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 Steven A. Maier as the sole panelist in this matter on February 24, 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 French law firm specializing in taxation and strategic advice to companies.

The Complainant is the licensee of SOCIETE CIVILE PHOENIX, which is the owner of France trademark registration number 3263433 for a combined mark ARSÈNE, registered on March 2, 2007 in International Classes 35, 36 and 45.

The Complainant also claims to be a licensee from SOCIETE CIVILE PHOENIX of International and European Union trademarks for a figurative mark ARSENE. However, the Complainant does not provide evidence of the license agreements relied on in this regard.

The Complainant is the owner of the domain name <arsene.fr>. It operates a website at "www.arsene-taxand.com".

The disputed domain name was registered on September 19, 2025.

The disputed domain name has redirected to a webpage at Sedo.com, offering the disputed domain name for sale at a minimum price of USD 299.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant states that its firm comprises over 100 lawyers, and has provided services nationally and internationally for over 20 years. It is the initiator of an international network of tax lawyers named "Taxand", has been ranked among the top 25 business law firms in Paris, and is a regular publisher of articles, reviews and retrospectives on customs-related tax issues.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark ARSÈNE, differing from that trademark only by the omission of the final letter "e".

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. It states that it has no relationship with the Respondent and has never authorized it to use its ARSÈNE trademark, and that the Respondent is making neither bona fide commercial use nor legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name represents a clear case of "typosquatting", and was registered with the intention of selling it to the Complainant for an inflated sum.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered and has been used in bad faith. It states that the purchase price of USD 299 demanded for the disputed domain name well exceeds the Respondent's costs directly associated with the disputed domain name, and also that law firms are well known to be the targets of cyber attacks and phishing scams.

The Complainant adds that the Respondent has previously been found by panels under the UDRP to have engaged in bad faith domain name registrations, e.g., *STADA Arzneimittel AG v. Ireneusz Bachurski*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-4185](#) and *JJA v. Ireneusz Bachurski, Ireneusz Bachurski Przedsiębiorstwo INFO-BI*, WIPO Case No. [DEU2024-0014](#).

The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In order to succeed in the Complaint, the Complainant is required to show that all three of the elements set out under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are present. Those elements are that:

- (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.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has established that it is the owner of registered trademark rights for the mark ARSÈNE. The disputed domain name is nearly identical to the textual element of that trademark, but for the omission in the disputed domain name of the accent and the final letter "e" in the trademark. The Complainant's trademark is therefore recognizable within the disputed domain name, and the first element under the Policy is satisfied.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

While the Respondent has failed to reply to the Complaint, the Panel notes from the Decision in WIPO Case No. [D2021-4185](#) (supra) that it appears to be a domain name investor and has in the past registered domain names having a dictionary meaning in the Polish language. In this case, whether or not the term "arsen" has such a meaning, the Panel takes notice of the fact that "Arsen" is a relatively common personal name in regions including Eastern Europe (and indeed that the name "Arsène" is a personal name in France, where the Complainant is located). To succeed under the second element, therefore, the Complainant must establish, on the balance of probabilities, that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in order to target the Complainant's trademark rights, and not for its value independent of that trademark, e.g. as a personal name.

The Panel does not find the Complainant to have established its case in this regard. First, notwithstanding its lack of a Response, it is credible that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name for a use specific to the term "arsen", e.g. as a personal name, independently of the Complainant's trademark. Secondly, the disputed domain name is not identical to the Complainant's trademark and, moreover, the Complainant appears to be more readily associated in commerce with the "Arsene Taxand" name than with the ARSÈNE trademark alone. Thirdly, the Complainant provides no evidence that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in order to target the Complainant's trademark, e.g. by using it for a website or for emails designed to confuse the Complainant's customers. Furthermore, the Panel finds the relatively modest minimum price of USD 299 requested for the disputed domain name to be more consistent with its intended use as, e.g. a personal name, than with a bad-faith attempt to coerce Complainant into buying the disputed domain name for an inflated price.

The Complainant has failed therefore to establish the second element under the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

While the Panel's finding in respect of the second element is sufficient to dispose of the proceeding, the Panel finds, for similar reasons as above, that the Complainant has also failed to demonstrate that the disputed domain name was registered or has been used in bad faith. The Complainant has not therefore established the third element under the Policy.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Steven A. Maier/

Steven A. Maier

Sole Panelist

Date: March 9, 2026