ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Interparfums v. Grossiste Parfum
Case No. D2026-0421

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Interparfums, France, internally represented.

The Respondent is Grossiste Parfum, Benin.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <grossisteinterparfum.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 February 3, 2026. On February 3, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 4, 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 (NC / Redacted for Privacy, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 4, 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 amendment to the Complaint on February 6, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 February 10, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 2, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 3, 2026.

The Center appointed Philippe Gilliéron 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 is a French company which has been active in the flagrance industry for more than forty years. It was introduced on Euronext stock exchange in 1995. Its holding company Interparfums, Inc. based in the United States of America is listed at the Nasdaq.

The Complainant owns numerous trademarks for INTER PARFUMS, such as:

- French trademark No. 99781389 that was registered on March 12, 1999 in classes 3, 18 and 24; and
- International Trademark No. 763213 that was registered on March 16, 2001 in classes 3, 18 and 24.

The Complainant further owns numerous domain names incorporating its INTER PARFUMS trademark, including <interparfums.com> and <interparfums.fr>.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 25, 2025. The disputed domain name resolves to an active French website where the Respondent identifies itself as wholesaler of quality perfumes throughout the world. The perfumes displayed and arguably sold on the website are famous perfumes manufactured by the Complainant's competitors. At the same time, the website displays an image of a perfume shop with a background notice "Dupe Perfumes Explained". The website further displays pictures of a team that, as demonstrated by the evidence provided by the Complainant, appears to have been reproduced from another third-party website dedicated to the retail of perfumes.

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 entirely incorporates the trademark INTER PARFUMS with the French term "grossiste", which means "wholesaler" in English.

The Complainant then affirms that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant has never granted any license or authorization to the Respondent to use its trademark. The Respondent has no trademark rights on the name INTER PARFUMS.

The Complainant finally is of the view that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Taking into account the extensive and long use of its trademark INTER PARFUMS, the Respondent could not ignore the Complainant's trademark at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name. In light of the use made of the disputed domain name by the Respondent as described above, the Complainant is of the view that the Respondent is clearly trying to divert the Complainant's customers to gain an economic advantage and mislead Internet users into believing that they are buying products affiliated to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to "[…] decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable".

Pursuant to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove each of the following three elements to obtain an order that the disputed domain name should be cancelled or transferred:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or a 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

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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable 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 here, "grossiste", 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 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 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 was most likely aware of the Complainant's INTER PARFUMS trademark when it registered the disputed domain name, as such a choice cannot be a pure coincidence but rather, on balance, reflects a deliberate intent to trade off the Complainant's trademark. The Panel notes in this respect that the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark save for the last "s" with a descriptive French term "grossiste" ("wholesaler" in English).

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 disputed domain name leads to a website where the Respondent portrays itself as a perfume reseller. The perfumes displayed and arguably sold on the website are manufactured by the Complainant's competitors. At the same time, the website displays an image of a perfume shop with a background notice "Dupe Perfumes Explained". The website further displays pictures of a team that, as demonstrated by the evidence provided by the Complainant, appears to have been reproduced from another third-party website dedicated to the retail of perfumes. Even assuming that the products purportedly offered on the website at the disputed domain name are authentic, the use of the Complainant's mark to offer competing third-party products does not amount to a fair use.

The Panel considers, noting the composition and use of the disputed domain name and the absence of any response that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to attract Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark, as established in paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.1.

It should further be pointed out that the Respondent has provided incomplete contact information in the registration details of the disputed domain name.

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 <grossisteinterparfum.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Philippe Gilliéron/
Philippe Gilliéron
Sole Panelist
Date: March 16, 2026