

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

PRL USA Holdings, Inc, The Polo/Lauren Company L.P. v. qwe, qwe wqe
Case No. D2026-0437

1. The Parties

The Complainants are PRL USA Holdings, Inc, United States of America ("United States"), and The Polo/Lauren Company L.P., United States, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is qwe, qwe wqe, United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <ralphlauren.homes>, and <ralphlauren.pics> are registered with NameSilo, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 3, 2026. On February 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On February 4, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (User #4747af42 Privacy / User #1657c3d0 Privacy / See PrivacyGuardian.org) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on February 5, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainants to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainants filed an amended Complaint on February 6, 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 February 9, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 1, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 4, 2026.

The Center appointed Kathryn Lee as the sole panelist in this matter on March 20, 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 Complainants are wholly-owned subsidiaries of Ralph Lauren Corporation, and registrants of RALPH LAUREN marks around the world, including the following: Chinese Trademark Registration Number 278871 registered on February 20, 1987; United States Trademark Registration Number 1222278 registered on January 4, 1983; United Kingdom Trademark Registration Number 00002027087 registered on June 21, 1996; and European Union Trademark Registration Number 002730323 registered on August 18, 2003.

The RALPH LAUREN mark has been used since 1967 when the American fashion designer Ralph Lauren launched his fashion company under the mark. Ralph Lauren is the recipient of two Menswear Designer of the Year awards from the Council of Fashion Designers of America as well as their lifetime Achievement Award, and was recognized as a Design Legend by GQ UK in 2018, and as a Fashion Innovator by Wall Street Journal. Further, he received a British Knighthood in 2019, the Legion D'Honneur in 2019, and the Presidential Medal of Freedom in 2025. Ralph Lauren Corporation now has 1,351 stores and 15,000 employees globally, and in fiscal year 2025, had net revenues of approximately USD 7,079 million.

The Complainants operate their website through the domain name <ralphlauren.com>, registered since September 25, 1996.

According to information provided by the Registrar, the Respondent is an individual or entity with an address in the United States.

The disputed domain names were both registered on March 28, 2025, and neither resolves to any website with active content.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainants

The Complainants contend that they have satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for transfer of the disputed domain names.

Notably, the Complainants contend that the disputed domain names are identical to the RALPH LAUREN mark in which they have rights, and that the elimination of the space in the Complainants' trademark does nothing to distinguish the disputed domain names from the Complainants' trademark.

The Complainants also contend that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names and confirms that they have not authorized or licensed rights to the Respondent in any respect.

Finally, the Complainants contend that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. The Complainants contend that RALPH LAUREN is a distinctive and famous mark of the Complainants and that there can be no legitimate reason to register the disputed domain names other than to act in bad faith by intentionally seeking to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the website at the disputed domain names. Further, the Complainants contend that the Respondent's passive holding of the disputed domain names and its use of a privacy shield to hide its identity support a finding of bad faith on the part of the Respondent.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainants' 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 Complainants have 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 names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are identical to the RALPH LAUREN 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 Complainants have established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainants' prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Moreover, UDRP panels have found that domain names identical to a complainant's trademark carry a high risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1. Here, the disputed domain names consist only of the Complainants' mark, which is likely to mislead Internet users into believing that the disputed domain names are owned by the Complainants, contrary to the fact. Further, should the Respondent start making use of the disputed domain names, it would confuse Internet users into believing that the content on the websites are from the Complainants or those affiliated with the Complainants.

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.

First, the disputed domain names consist solely of the Complainants' famous RALPH LAUREN trademark. Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4. The Panel considers that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names with the intention to mimic the Complainant's domain name <ralphlauren.com>.

There is no evidence that the disputed domain names were ever connected to any website showing content. However, Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainants' trademark, the composition of the disputed domain names, the failure of the Respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good faith use, the Respondent's concealment of its identity, and the implausibility of any good faith use for the disputed domain names by the Respondent, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Complainants have 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 names <ralphlauren.homes>, and <ralphlauren.pics> be transferred to the Complainants.

/Kathryn Lee/

Kathryn Lee

Sole Panelist

Date: April 3, 2026