

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Louis Dreyfus Trademarks B.V. v. Harari David  
Case No. D2026-0767

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Louis Dreyfus Trademarks B.V., Netherlands (Kingdom of the), represented by Inlex IP Expertise, France.

The Respondent is Harari David, United States of America.

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

The disputed domain name <ldc-au.com> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 23, 2026. On February 24, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 25, 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 (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 27, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. However, the Complainant did not file an amended complaint.<sup>1</sup>

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”).

---

<sup>1</sup> The Panel notes that, notwithstanding the absence of formal amendment, the identity of the underlying registrant has been duly disclosed by the Registrar, and the Respondent has been afforded proper notice of these proceedings. In these circumstances, and in line with established UDRP practice, the Panel sees no procedural impediment to proceeding to a decision on the merits.

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 5, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 25, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 30, 2026.

The Center appointed Alvaro Loureiro Oliveira as the sole panelist in this matter on April 7, 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 Dutch company belonging to the Louis Dreyfus group, a longstanding global merchant and processor of agricultural commodities founded in the 19th century. The group operates in more than 100 countries and is widely recognized as one of the leading participants in global agricultural trade, with substantial commercial presence across multiple jurisdictions.

The Complainant owns and manages the intellectual property rights associated with the Louis Dreyfus group, including the trademark LDC, which constitutes a distinctive and widely used abbreviation of "Louis Dreyfus Company". The record reflects that the Complainant holds an extensive portfolio of trademark registrations for LDC across numerous jurisdictions and classes of goods and services.

By way of illustration, and as evidenced in Annex 4 to the Complaint, the Complainant is the owner of, inter alia, the following trademark registrations:

- Benelux trademark No. 1476212 for LDC, registered on March 22, 2023, in classes 35, 40, and 44.
- International Registration No. 1729911 for LDC, registered on April 7, 2023, in classes 35, 40 and 44.

These registrations confirm the Complainant's rights in the LDC mark for the purposes of the Policy.

In addition, the Complainant operates an extensive domain name portfolio incorporating the LDC mark, including <ldc.com>, <ldcorp.com>, <ldcommodities.com>, among others, which are used in connection with its global commercial operations and corporate communications.

The disputed domain name <ldc-au.com> was registered on February 2, 2026.

The evidence submitted by the Complainant demonstrates that the disputed domain name has been used in connection with a fraudulent impersonation scheme. In particular, the domain name was configured to generate email addresses impersonating employees of the Complainant, which reproduces the identity of an actual employee of the Louis Dreyfus group. Such email addresses were used to contact business partners of the Complainant with the apparent purpose of initiating commercial transactions under false pretenses, thereby creating the misleading impression that such communications originated from the Complainant.

#### **5. Parties' Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its LDC trademark, as it incorporates the mark in its entirety with the addition of the geographical term "au".

The Complainant further submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name has been used for fraudulent purposes, including the impersonation of its employees in phishing schemes directed at third parties.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith and requests the transfer of the disputed domain name.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

The Policy, in its paragraph 4(a), determines that three elements must be present and duly proven by a complainant to obtain relief. These elements are:

- i. The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- ii. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect to 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**

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established rights in the LDC trademark. The disputed domain name incorporates the mark in its entirety. The addition of the term "au" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark.

### **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

The Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. Therefore, the burden of production of evidence shifts to the Respondent.

The Respondent has not rebutted this showing.

More significantly, the record demonstrates that the disputed domain name has been used in connection with impersonation and fraudulent communications targeting third parties.

Panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name, here, claimed phishing, passing off, or other forms of deceptive conduct can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 2.13.1.

Such conduct is inherently incompatible with any bona fide offering of goods or services and precludes any claim to legitimacy under the Policy.

The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name was both registered and used in bad faith.

As a threshold matter, the Panel is satisfied that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its LDC trademark at the time of registration. Taking into account the use and global commercial presence of the Complainant's mark, and the subsequent use of the disputed domain name, the Panel considers that it is implausible that the Respondent selected the disputed domain name independently or coincidentally.

The structure of the disputed domain name — combining the Complainant's trademark in its entirety with a geographic identifier corresponding to a market in which the Complainant operates — further supports a finding of deliberate targeting.

More compellingly, the record establishes that the disputed domain name was actively used as part of a phishing scheme. The Respondent configured the disputed domain name to generate deceptive email addresses impersonating a real employee of the Complainant, thereby seeking to induce third parties to engage in commercial dealings under false pretenses.

Such conduct constitutes a clear example of bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. It evidences an intentional attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the communications.

Panels have consistently recognized that phishing and passing off schemes represent particularly egregious forms of bad faith, as they involve not only the exploitation of trademark rights but also the deliberate deception of third parties and potential financial harm ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4).

In this regard, the present case is closely aligned with the findings in *Louis Dreyfus Trademarks B.V. v. Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-1558](#), in which a domain name incorporating the Complainant's LDC mark was used in connection with fraudulent email activity. In that case, the panel found that such conduct constituted clear evidence of bad-faith registration and use, emphasizing the respondent's awareness of the Complainant and the deliberate configuration of the domain name for deceptive purposes. The Panel considers that the same reasoning applies with equal, if not greater, force in the present circumstances.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

## 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 <ldc-au.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Alvaro Loureiro Oliveira/*

**Alvaro Loureiro Oliveira**

Sole Panelist

Date: April 22, 2026