

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

MAISON LOUIS ROQUE v. Go Veline

Case No. D2026-0462

1. The Parties

The Complainant is MAISON LOUIS ROQUE, France, represented by VALMY AVOCATS, France.

The Respondent is Go Veline, Cambodia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lavieilleprune.com> is registered with DropCatch.com LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 4, 2026. On February 4, 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 (Not Known) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 5, 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 10, 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 11, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 3, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 4, 2026.

The Center appointed Nayiri Boghossian 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 distillery established in 1905. The Complainant owns trademark registrations for LA VIEILLE PRUNE such as:

- French trademark registration No. 3733235, registered on January 28, 2011; and
- French trademark registration No. 1626504, registered on April 19, 1991.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 17, 2025 and resolves to a website which redirects to an online gaming site.

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 identical to the Complainant's trademark as it reproduces the exact wording of the trademark.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant did not authorize the Respondent to use its trademark in the disputed domain name nor is there a relationship between the Respondent and the Complainant. There is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. There is no bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The only plausible explanation for the registration and use of the disputed domain name is the availability and low traceability of an expired domain name. The business of the registrar of the disputed domain name is the acquisition and temporary holding of expired domain names for resale or short-term use. The disputed domain name is associated with illegal online gambling websites. The Respondent is preventing the Complainant from registering and using the disputed domain name in connection with its business. There was also no response. The Respondent has acted in bad faith in prior WIPO cases.

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 identical to the 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 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 must have been aware of the Complainant’s trademark as the disputed domain name was registered several decades after the registration of the Complainant’s trademark.

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 redirects to a website offering online gaming. In light of the lack of any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name by the Respondent and in the absence of any conceivable good faith use, the Panel finds from the present circumstances that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademarks.

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 <lavieilleprune.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nayiri Boghossian/

Nayiri Boghossian

Sole Panelist

Date: March 12, 2026