

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

B&B Hotels France v. Dhrubo Das
Case No. D2026-0377

1. The Parties

The Complainant is B&B Hotels France, France, represented by FBL Avocats, France.

The Respondent is Dhrubo Das, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

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

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 29, 2026. On January 29, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 30, 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 (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 30, 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 February 4, 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.

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on February 5, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 25, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 26, 2026.¹

¹ Given the absence of a Response, the Panel carefully reviewed the record to ensure that the Respondent received the opportunity for fair notice of this proceeding. See *Nicole Kidman v. John Zuccarini, d/b/a Cupcake Party*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-1415](#). The Center

The Center appointed David H. Bernstein as the sole panelist in this matter on March 9, 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 B&B Hotels France is a Société à responsabilité limitée, headquartered in Paris, France, incorporated on May 28, 1990, and registered under the French Registry of Commerce under No. 378 047 500. The Complainant owns a chain of budget hotels, with 443 locations in France and over 926 locations worldwide, including in Germany, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Belgium, Switzerland, Poland, Austria, Slovenia, Brazil, and the Czech Republic. Since 1990, the Complainant has used the B&B HOTELS name in connection with hotel services, restaurant services, temporary accommodations, and related booking services. The Complainant alleges that it has invested substantially in the development of its services, and in marketing and advertising of its brand, and that, as a result of those efforts, it is well-known. The Complainant further states that it had turnover of over EUR 220 million in 2021.

The Complainant owns more than fifty registrations for trademarks that include the terms “bb” and “hotel”, including European Union Trade Mark No. 004767323 for a design that incorporates the phrase B&B HOTELS, registered on December 12, 2006; French Trademark No. 3182311 for BBHOTEL, registered on August 29, 2002; French Trademark No. 3182312 for HOTELBB, registered on August 29, 2002; and International Trademark No. 1706736 for a design that incorporates the phrase B&B HOTELS, registered on September 29, 2022, designating multiple jurisdictions, including India. The Complainant further states that it owns hundreds of domain names that incorporate the terms “bb” and “hotel”.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 20, 2025. At the time the Complaint was filed, the disputed domain name resolved to a website – which the Complainant characterizes as a “parked page” – that advertised the services of Skywave Next, an IT services company. The Panel notes that various links on the webpage are not functional, even though they purportedly allow visitors to watch a promotional video, create a user account, view more information about the company, select a pricing plan, or visit its social media pages. The website also features purported reviews and testimonials from customers who do not appear to exist as well as employee profiles that appear to be fabricated. Finally, the Panel notes that the phone number listed on the website is not in service, and that the Center did not receive any response to the messages sent to the email address listed on the website and through the message portal on the 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.

First, the Complainant argues that it owns registrations for numerous trademarks that incorporate the terms “bb” and “hotel” and that ownership of those registrations is prima facie evidence that the trademarks are valid and distinctive. The Complainant further argues that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to

sent notification of the Complaint to the Respondent by email and courier (a fax number was not available for the Respondent). Although emails sent to the email address listed in the at the “Contact Us” section of the website to which the disputed domain name resolves were not delivered, emails sent to the postmaster address and to the email address for the Respondent provided by the Registrar appear to have been delivered. The Center also sent Written Notice to the address for the Respondent provided by the Registrar; that written notice was not returned as undeliverable and thus also appears to have been delivered. It thus appears that the Respondent received actual notice of the Complaint, but regardless, the Panel finds that the Center discharged its obligation to provide fair notice to the Respondent as required by the Rules, paragraph 2(a).

the trademarks in which it has rights – including BBHOTEL, BB-HOTEL, BB HOTEL, B&B HOTEL, and B&B HOTELS – because the disputed domain name is identical to those marks, apart from the substitution of the letter “b” for the letter “d” and, in some cases, the addition of an ampersand. The Complainant contends that only the alphanumeric aspects of its various trademarks should be considered when assessing the similarity of the marks and the disputed domain name because design elements and ampersands cannot be reproduced in a domain name. The Complainant also directs the Panel’s attention to numerous successful UDRP complaints filed by the Complainant challenging similar domain names. The Complainant finally argues that its ownership of numerous domain names comprised of the BB HOTEL marks makes confusion even more likely.

Second, the Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. Specifically, the Complainant argues that: (i) the disputed domain name is currently inactive; (ii) the Respondent is not currently, and has never been, known by the name “bdhotel” and is not currently offering, and has never offered, goods or services under that name; (iii) the Complainant has not licensed or authorized the Respondent to use its marks or register the disputed domain name; and (iv) the Respondent has not adduced evidence of legitimate use or preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. In support of its claim, the Complainant submitted screenshots of internet searches for the term “bdhotel” and the Respondent’s name, which did not return any relevant results.

Third, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith. In support of its argument, the Complainant claims that the Respondent was aware of its trademarks before registering the disputed domain name because its trademarks and business are well-known in Europe, and in particular in France. The Complainant asserts that registration of a well-known mark by a third party with no connection to the owner of the mark is, on its own, evidence of bad faith. The Complainant further argues that the Respondent has no legitimate interest in or intention to use the disputed domain name because it directs to a parked webpage. Instead, it argues, the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to attract Internet users to his own website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s marks. According to the Complainant, this lack of legitimate use, combined with the similarity of the Complainant’s marks and the disputed domain name, leads only to the conclusion that the disputed domain name was registered in order to attract Internet users to the Respondent’s website by creating a likelihood of confusion.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that the Complainant prove the following elements by a preponderance of the evidence in order to obtain transfer of the disputed domain name: (1) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; (2) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and (3) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

In the absence of a Response, paragraph 5(f) of the Rules instructs the Panel to proceed to decision based upon the Complaint. Although it may rely on supported and non-conclusory allegations in the Complaint, see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel View on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), section 4.3, the Panel need not credit conclusory allegations that are not supported by allegations of fact or evidence. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.2. Notwithstanding the Respondent’s default, the Complainant bears the burden to establish each element of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.3.

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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark for the purposes of the Policy because it owns several registrations for trademarks that include the terms "bb" and "hotel", including BBHOTEL, HOTELBB, and B&B HOTELS. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1 ("Where the complainant holds a nationally or regionally registered trademark or service mark, this prima facie satisfies the threshold requirement of having trademark rights for purposes of standing to file a UDRP case.").

The Panel also finds that the Complainant's marks are recognizable within the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark BBHOTEL, apart from the substitution by the letter "d" of the second letter "b" in the trademark. It is likewise confusingly similar to the mark B&B HOTEL apart from the substitution by the letter "d" of the letter "b" and the deletion of an ampersand. Although the substitution of one letter in a disputed domain name may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, it does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's marks. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9. Rather, a domain name that consists of a variation of a mark – including one that substitutes one character in the relevant mark with a similar-appearing character – is considered confusingly similar to the mark because the domain name still contains sufficiently recognizable aspects of the mark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9. The lower-case "b" and "d" are similar enough in appearance for the Complainant's mark to be recognizable in the disputed domain name. As a result, 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 therefore finds that the Complainant has established the first element of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides the following non-exhaustive list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name:

- (i) before any notice of the dispute, the Respondent's use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the domain name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or
- (ii) the Respondent (as an individual, business, or other organization) has been commonly known by the domain name, even if the Respondent has acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or
- (iii) the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

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 relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. And, because the Respondent has defaulted, he 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.

First, the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent did not, before notice of this dispute, use or make demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name or a name corresponding to the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Policy, paragraph 4(c)(i). The website to which the disputed domain name resolves appears to advertise the services of an IT services firm known as Skywave Next. However, the Complainant asserts that it is merely a parked page, and no goods or services actually appear to be offered in connection with the disputed domain name. As discussed above, hyperlinks on the webpage that purportedly allow users to create an account or purchase services do not function.

In addition, the testimonials from previous clients appear to be fabricated, so there is no evidence that sales were previously made in connection with the disputed domain name. Moreover, none of the means through which customers can contact the business behind the disputed domain appear to work. Those facts are sufficient to shift the burden to the Respondent on this element to come forward with evidence showing that he has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. As noted above, the Respondent has failed to do so.

Second, the Complainant has made out a prima facie case that the Respondent is not commonly known by the domain name. Policy, paragraph 4(c)(ii). The Complainant submitted evidence that it searched online for the Respondent's name and the disputed domain name and that its searches did not return any relevant responses. The Complainant also submitted evidence that it searched for trademark registrations owned by the Respondent and found none related to the disputed domain name. The Complainant has therefore done enough to shift the burden to the Respondent to come forward with evidence that he is commonly known by the disputed domain name. Again, the Respondent has failed to submit any evidence that it is known by or uses the "bdhotel" name or a variation thereof in connection with any bona fide offering of goods or services.

Third, the Complainant has satisfied its burden of showing that the Respondent is not making legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Policy, paragraph 4(c)(iii). Based on the screenshots of the website to which the disputed domain name resolves, the Respondent is using it either as a parked webpage or to offer IT services. Either of those uses would be commercial. In addition, the website to which the disputed domain name resolves bears no indicia of fair use, such as commentary on the Complainant or its marks, and does not use the mark descriptively or nominatively.

The Panel therefore finds that the Complainant has established the second element of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that shall be evidence that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may also 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.

Among the factors that panels have considered is the nature of the disputed domain name, including whether the disputed domain name is a typo of a widely known mark. *Id.* Here, the Complainant has submitted evidence that its mark is widely known in at least certain jurisdictions. Although B&B might be understood as a generic reference to a "bed and breakfast" accommodation in some English-speaking countries (like the United States and the United Kingdom, in which the Complainant operates only 10 hotels), the Complainant has shown that it has nearly one thousand hotels in Europe, with turnover of hundreds of million of Euros annually, and has used its B&B HOTELS mark for over thirty-five years. In addition, although the Complainant does not operate any hotels in India, where the Respondent appears to reside, it owns several registrations for trademarks for B&B HOTELS in the country. This evidence, which is unrebutted, is sufficient to support a finding that the B&B HOTELS mark is widely known at least in Europe (and especially France, where the Complainant operates more than 400 hotels) and thus that the Respondent is likely to have known about the mark when he registered the disputed domain name. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2.

The Complainant also argues that its mark and hotels are famous or well known, and that the famous nature of its marks supports a presumption that the confusingly similar disputed domain name was registered in bad faith. The Panel does not accept these arguments for purposes of this proceeding because the Complainant has not submitted evidence sufficient to substantiate those conclusory assertions. For example, the Complainant has not submitted evidence of consumer or third party recognition of its mark or hotels, nor has it submitted evidence to show the extent of its advertising or marketing using the marks.

Nevertheless, the Respondent's unexplained registration and use of the disputed domain name, which mimics the Complainant's trademark with the modification of only a single letter (especially when the letters "D/d" and "B/b" are easily confused based on their similar look), supports a finding of bad faith registration and use. That is especially the case here given that the Respondent's website does not provide any evidence of use of the disputed domain name in connection with any good faith endeavor.

See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4 ("absence of any conceivable good faith use" of a disputed domain name may support a finding that the respondent registered the domain name to attract users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant and its mark). For example, the Respondent has not provided evidence that he is associated with a hotel offering bona fide accommodation services under the "bd" or "bdhotel" name, nor does the Respondent's website suggest any affiliation with any such hotel.

Another factor that panels sometimes consider in assessing bad faith registration and use is whether there exists a "clear absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with no credible explanation for the respondent's choice of the domain name". [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1. As discussed above, the Complainant has made at least a prima facie case that the Respondent clearly lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Importantly, the Respondent has not come forward with any evidence to rebut that showing. In addition, the disputed domain name has no conceivable connection to the Respondent's name or to the content of the website to which it currently resolves, so the record offers no credible explanation for the Respondent's choice of the disputed domain name. Because the Respondent did not offer any response to this evidence, the Panel accepts the Complainant's undisputed argument that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in order to take advantage of Internet users seeking to visit the Complainant's own website.

In assessing the Complaint, the Panel considered multiple UDRP cases in which the Complainant previously prevailed – which the Complainant cited for the Panel. In a number of those cases, the evidence more persuasively established that the respondent clearly intended to exploit the Complainant's marks or deceive consumers. See, e.g., *B&B HOTELS v. Jeffrey Harper*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3526](#) (finding bad faith where the disputed domain name <bbhotelmarseille.link> resolved to a website used to impersonate the Complainant's hotel); *B&B Hotels v. Santa SAR*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2202](#) (finding bad faith where the disputed domain name <hotelbbc.top> was used to impersonate a well-known third party hotel and/or the Complainant). The Respondent's failure to reply or to articulate any explanation for its registration of the disputed domain name, coupled with its use of the disputed domain name for what appears to be a fake, non-function website, is enough in circumstances of this case to support a finding of bad faith registration and use. In making this finding, the Panel also has considered some of the previous cases in which the Complainant failed, and specifically finds that this case is distinguishable because the respondents in those other cases established that they registered or used the domain names at issue in connection with a legitimate businesses related to the respective domain name. See, e.g., *B&B Hotels v. Jose Ferreiro, FERREIRO SA DE CV*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-2455](#) (no bad faith where respondent owned and operated a boutique hotel under the name B BOUTIQUE HOTEL); *B&B Hotels v. BKN Dutt/ AJMAN BEACH HOTEL*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-4143](#) (no bad faith where respondent stated that it was known as the "Bhatia Brothers Group" and that it operated a hotel in connection with the disputed domain name). The Respondent in this case has not come forward with any such evidence.

The Panel therefore 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 <bdhotel.xyz> be transferred to the Complainant.

/David H. Bernstein/

David H. Bernstein

Sole Panelist

Date: March 23, 2026