

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Maisons du Monde France v. Abdelrhman setoot  
Case No. D2026-0708

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Maisons du Monde France, France, represented by IP Twins, France.

The Respondent is Abdelrhman setoot, Egypt.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <maisonsdumondes.com> is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 19, 2026. On February 19, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 20, 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 Protect, LLC (PrivacyProtect.org)) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 20, 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 24, 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 March 4, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 24, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 30, 2026.

The Center appointed Zineb Naciri Bennani as the sole panelist in this matter on April 2, 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 furniture and home decor company founded in 1991. The Complainant maintains a presence in numerous countries with 338 stores and an online presence under its own marks.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations of the trademark MAISONS DU MONDE including the following:

- French trademark registration number 99792285 registered on May 10, 1999, for goods and services under classes 3, 4, 8, 11, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27 and 28;
- European Union trademark registration number 005120481 registered on May 27, 2010, for goods in classes 11, 20, 21, 24, and 28;
- United States of America trademark registration number 79249102 registered on November 26, 2019, for goods in classes 20, 21, and 24;

The Complainant is also the owner of the domain name <maisonsdumonde.com> registered on July 22, 2004.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 28, 2025, and resolves to a website proposing furniture for sale. Contact section of the website connected to the disputed domain name displays an email address, using the official domain name of the Complainant.

#### **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 or highly confusingly similar to its registered marks.

According to the Complainant, the impression created by the disputed domain name, particularly with the addition of the letters "so," does not avoid a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant notes that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant contends there is no license or authorization supporting the Respondent's use of the mark in the disputed domain name, and the Respondent's active deployment of the disputed domain name as a storefront impersonating the Complainant signals a classic lack of legitimate interest.

According to the Complainant, the use of the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant and to mislead consumers, evidenced by an email address associated with the Complainant's official domain name, constitutes strong support for this impersonation.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and used in bad faith. It argues that the Respondent knowingly targeted the Complainant's well-known mark and used the dispute domain

name to exploit the mark's reputation, including impersonation through a replica storefront and email identity.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

The Panel should decide a complaint based on the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy and the Rules, and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that the Complainant must establish each of the following:

- (i) that the disputed domain name registered to the Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) that 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 entirety of the mark is reproduced 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.

While each case is judged on its own merits, in cases where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark, or where at least a dominant feature of the relevant mark is recognizable in the domain name, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark for purposes of UDRP standing.

Although the addition of other terms here, "so", 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.

UDRP panels consistently hold that where a complainant's mark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other letters, terms, or abbreviations does not avoid a finding of confusing similarity. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), 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.

To demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name, non-exclusive respondent defenses under UDRP paragraph 4(c) include the following:

- (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.

The Complainant states that it has not licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the trademark, whether in a domain name or otherwise, and there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The evidence further indicates that the disputed domain name has been used for a website presented as an online storefront impersonating the Complainant. The record also shows use of an email address associated with the Complainant’s official domain name in a manner likely to mislead Internet users as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement.

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 the evidence shows that the disputed domain name has been used for a website presented as an online storefront impersonating the Complainant. The record further indicates the use of an email address associated with the Complainant’s official domain name in a manner likely to mislead consumers into believing that the website or related communications originated from, or were authorized by, the Complainant.

In these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website, products, or communications. This constitutes evidence of bad faith registration and use under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of 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 <maisonsdumondeso.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Zineb Naciri Bennani/*

**Zineb Naciri Bennani**

Sole Panelist

Date: April 21, 2026