ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Audemars Piguet Holding S.A. v. Cherip Taycyp
Case No. D2026-0690

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Audemars Piguet Holding S.A., Switzerland, internally represented.

The Respondent is Cherip Taycyp, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <audemarspiguet.news> is registered with Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 18, 2026. On February 18, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 19, 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 (The RDAP server redacted the value) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 19, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant did not amend the Complaint.

The Center verified that 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 March 13, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 2, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on April 8, 2026.

The Center appointed Miguel B. O'Farrell as the sole panelist in this matter on April 14, 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, which is the holding company of the AP Group, and its affiliate companies are one of the oldest independent watch manufactures still in the hands of the founding families. The Complainant was founded in 1875 by two watchmakers, Louis Audemars and Edward Piguet, in Le Brassus in la Vallée de Joux in Switzerland.

The Complaiant's products and its trademarks are used and promoted across the world through its official website "www.audemarspiguet.com" and different channels such as through paid marketing campaigns published in magazines, on websites and various social media platforms.

Over the years, the Complainant's products have been worn by many talented men and women such as the basketball players Shaquille O'Neil, Le Bron James, the actor Arnold Scharzenegger, the Formula 1 drivers Rubens Barrichello and Michael Schumacher, the tennis players Novak Djokovic and Serena Williams.

The Complainant is the owner of many national and international trademark registrations for the house mark AUDEMARS PIGUET in international class 14 for timepieces, watches and jewelry, including the following registrations:

- Swiss Trademark Registration No. 349004 for AUDEMARS PIGUET (word) dated August 29, 1986, in class 14;

- United States of America Trademark Registration No. 1,591,934 for AUDEMARS PIGUET (word) dated April 17, 1990, in class 14; and

- International Trademark Registration No. 331718 for AUDEMARS PIGUET (word) dated January 10, 1967, in class 14 designating multiple jurisdictions, including Bulgaria, China, Poland, Ukraine, France, Italy, Russian Federation, and Viet Nam.

The Complainant owns 207 domain names with the term "Audemars Piguet" including <audemarspiguet.com> under which it runs its official website.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 19, 2026, and does not resolve to an active webpage. The Complainant has proven that it has been used to send fraudulent emails to third parties pretending that they originate from the Complainant to confuse consumers and benefit from such confusion.

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 the Complainant's AUDEMARS PIGUET trademark. The Respondent has no legitimate right or interests in respect of the disputed domain name. Consequently, the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent is deliberately sending fraudulent emails incorporating the email address "[…]@audemarspiguet.news" that purported to come from an actual employee of the Complainant to individuals including potential clients, to induce them to confirm by return email that they can be reached out at the telephone number stated in the content of the email.

The Respondent has therefore used the disputed domain name without the Complainant's consent as part of a scheme to falsely impersonate the Complainant, in the view to the furtherance of some fraud or deception upon the public.

The Complainant requests the Panel to issue a decision ordering the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed as applicable to this case: phishing/identity theft, passing off, or other types of fraud, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1.

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.

The Panel is satisfied that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant's trademark AUDEMARS PIGUET when it registered the disputed domain name on January 19, 2026.

In accordance with section 3.1.4 of the WIPO Overview 3.1, the Panel considers that the inclusion of the Complainant's widely known AUDEMARS PIGUET trademark in the disputed domain name, by the Respondent who has no relationship with the Complainant, creates a presumption of bad faith registration.

The Respondent, when registering the disputed domain name, targeted the Complainant's business and its trademark AUDEMARS PIGUET, with the intention to confuse Internet users and capitalize on the fame of the Complainant's trademark for its own benefit.

The fact that there is an absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with no credible explanation for the Respondent's choice of the disputed domain name is also a significant factor that contributes to the finding that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith (as stated in section 3.2.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.1).

The Complainant has proven that the disputed domain name has been used to send fraudulent emails to third parties pretending that they originate from the Complainant to confuse consumers and benefit from such confusion. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed as applicable to this case: phishing/identity theft, passing off, or other types of fraud, constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 <audemarspiguet.news> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Miguel B. O'Farrell/
Miguel B. O'Farrell
Sole Panelist
Date: April 22, 2026