

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

L'Oréal v. Iyu jin jin, wen er hong, 张世通 (Shi Tong Zhang), 蒋汉城 (Han Cheng Jiang), Rosenylda Gomes torres, 张宝龙, 韦明杰, mingjiewei
Case No. D2026-0999

1. The Parties

The Complainant is L'Oréal, France, represented by Dreyfus & associés, France.

The Respondents are Iyu jin jin, China; wen er hong, Hong Kong, China; 张世通 (Shi Tong Zhang), China; 蒋汉城 (Han Cheng Jiang), China; Rosenylda Gomes torres, Brazil; 张宝龙¹; 韦明杰, China; and mingjiewei, China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <w1-lancomebet.com> is registered with Gname.com Pte. Ltd.

The disputed domain names <lancomebetnavi.com>, <lancomebetcs.com>, and <lancomebetv.com> are registered with July Name Limited.

The disputed domain name <lancomebet4.com > is registered with Domainipr Limited.

The disputed domain name <lancomebetbr1.com> is registered with OwnRegistrar, Inc.

The disputed domain name <lancomebetb.com> is registered with Key-Systems GmbH.

The disputed domain name <lancomebetpg.com> is registered with Chengdu West Dimension Digital Technology Co., Ltd.

The disputed domain name <lancomebetoi.com> is registered with West263 International Limited.

Gname.com Pte. Ltd, July Name Limited, Domainipr Limited, OwnRegistrar, Inc., Key-Systems GmbH, Chengdu West Dimension Digital Technology Co., Ltd., and West263 International Limited are separately and collectively referred to below as the "Registrar".

¹ The Registrar did not provide the information of "country" related to this Respondent. However, the Panel notes that the information of Address, City, Province, and Phone number suggests that this Respondent is in China.

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 9, 2026. On the following day, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On March 10, March 11, March 12, and March 16, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names that differed from the named Respondents (Amazonas / WhoisSecure / Registration Private) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 17, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting that the Complainant either file separate complaints for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all disputed domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed first and second amended Complaints in English on March 24 and March 25, 2026, respectively.

On March 17, 2026, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreements for certain disputed domain names is Chinese. On March 24, 2026, the Complainant confirmed its request that English be the language of the proceeding. The Respondents did not submit any comment on the Complainant’s submission.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaints 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 Respondents in English and Chinese of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 26, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 15, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents’ default on April 16, 2026.

The Center appointed Matthew Kennedy as the sole panelist in this matter on April 22, 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 cosmetics company. It has been operating in Brazil since 1939 and has had a subsidiary in China since 1997. Today, the Complainant operates via a portfolio of 37 brands, including LANCÔME, a luxury beauty and skincare brand founded in 1935. The Complainant holds trademark registrations in multiple jurisdictions, including the following:

- Brazilian trademark registration number 004075757 for LANCÔME, registered on October 14, 1980, specifying goods in class 3;
- Chinese trademark registration number 775926 for LANCÔME, registered on January 14, 1995, specifying services in class 42; and
- International trademark registration number 1679731 for LANCOME, registered on June 1, 2022, designating multiple jurisdictions, including China, and specifying goods and services in classes 3, 9, 35, and 41.

The above trademark registrations are current. The Complainant and its affiliates also use various domain names, including the domain name <lancome.com> (registered on July 8, 1997), which resolves to a website that provides information about the Complainant's LANCÔME products.

The Respondents are lyu jin jin, China; wen er hong, Hong Kong, China; 张世通 (Shi Tong Zhang), China; 蒋汉城 (Han Cheng Jiang), China; Rosenylda Gomes torres, Brazil; 张宝龙; 韦明杰, China; and mingjiewei, China.

The disputed domain names were registered on the dates, and in the registrant names, shown below.

Disputed Domain Name	Date of Registration	Registrant
<lancomebetv.com>	August 1, 2025	韦明杰
<lancomebetb.com>	August 5, 2025	Rosenylda Gomes torres
<lancomebetbr1.com>	September 23, 2025	lyu jin jin
<w1-lancomebet.com>	September 25, 2025	wen er hong
<lancomebetoi.com>	October 3, 2025	张世通 (Shi Tong Zhang)
<lancomebetpg.com>	October 4, 2025	蒋汉城 (Han Cheng Jiang)
<lancomebetnavi.com>	October 7, 2025	张宝龙
<lancomebetcs.com>	October 7, 2025	张宝龙
<lancomebet4.com>	November 25, 2025	mingjiewei

The disputed domain names all resolve or formerly resolved to similar websites in Portuguese offering betting services or promoting an online casino named "Lancomebet". Most of the websites invite Internet users to log in or register for the casino, although the website associated with the disputed domain name <lancomebetb.com> provides information regarding bonuses available in the casino. Most of the websites display advertisements showing the addresses of other gambling websites as well. On January 19, 2026, the Complainant contacted the Registrar to request deactivation of the websites. The disputed domain name <lancomebetoi.com> subsequently ceased to resolve to an active website, while the other websites remain active.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its LANCÔME mark.

The Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. The Respondents are neither affiliated with the Complainant in any way nor has it been authorized by the Complainant to use and register its trademark, or to seek registration of any domain name incorporating said mark. The disputed domain names resolved to an online gambling website, where users could place bets, which cannot be considered a legitimate commercial use.

The disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith. The Complainant is well known throughout the world. The Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its trademarks and registered the disputed domain names based on the attractiveness of Complainant's trademarks. By diverting traffic, the Respondents use the Complainant's marks for their own commercial purposes. The passive holding of the disputed domain name <lancomebetoi.com> does not prevent a finding of bad faith.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Preliminary Issues

A. Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaints were filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that the disputed domain names were registered within a relatively short period of time, and that the earliest and latest registrations appear to have been made in the same name in different scripts (i.e. “韦明杰”, which may be transcribed, with the given name first, as “mingjiewei”). The disputed domain names all follow a naming pattern that combines “lancome” and the word “bet” with other characters, and they all resolve or resolved to various gambling websites in Portuguese related to the same online casino named “Lancomebet”. In view of these circumstances, the Panel has reason to believe that the disputed domain names are under common control.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as “the Respondent”) in a single proceeding.

B. Language of the Proceeding

The Registrar confirmed that the language of the Registration Agreements for the disputed domain names <lancomebetv.com>, <lancomebetoi.com>, <lancomebetpg.com>, <lancomebetnavi.com>, <lancomebetcs.com>, and <lancomebet4.com> is Chinese and for the disputed domain names <lancomebetb.com>, <lancomebetbr1.com>, and <w1-lancomebet.com> is English.

Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint and amended Complaints were filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including the fact that it is not proficient in Chinese, and conducting the proceeding in Chinese would impose significant translation costs on it. Moreover, the disputed domain names are in Latin characters.

Despite the Center sending an email regarding the language of the proceeding and the notification of the Complaint, in Chinese and English, the Respondent did not comment on the language of the proceeding or indicate any interest in otherwise participating in this proceeding.

Moreover, the Panel has already found that all the disputed domain names are under common control. Given that the Registration Agreements for three of them are in English, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent is able to communicate in that language.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time, and costs. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.5.1.

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

6.2 Substantive Issues

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that a complainant must prove each of the following elements with respect to the disputed domain names:

- (i) the disputed domain names are 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 of the disputed domain names; and
- (iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and are 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 names. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the LANCÔME and LANCOME trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the mark is recognizable within all the disputed domain names. Despite the addition of the word "bet" and other characters (variously, "b", "br1", "cs", "navi", "oi", "pg", "v", "4", or "w1-"), the LANCÔME mark (minus the circumflex for technical reasons) and the LANCOME mark remain clearly recognizable in the disputed domain names. The only additional element in each disputed domain name is a generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") extension (".com") which, as a standard requirement of domain name registration, may be disregarded in the assessment of confusing similarity for the purposes of the first element of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7, 1.8, and 1.11.1.

Therefore, 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. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

In the present case, the disputed domain names resolve to betting websites. Although the combination of the LANCÔME luxury beauty and skincare trademark with the word “bet” and other characters is incongruous, Internet users may mistakenly believe that the disputed domain names are connected to the Complainant due to their incorporation of the Complainant’s distinctive mark. By the time that Internet users reach the associated websites and realize that they are not affiliated with the Complainant, the disputed domain names have already achieved their diversionary purpose. This is not a use of the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services. Nor is it a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names for the purposes of the Policy.

Moreover, the Registrar has verified that the Respondent’s names are those set out in the table in Section 4, none of which resembles the disputed domain names. Nothing in the record indicates that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain names.

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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Based on the record, 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 fourth circumstance is as follows:

“(iv) by using the [disputed] domain name, [the respondent has] intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [the respondent’s] 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 respondent’s] website or location or of a product or service on [the respondent’s] web site or location.”

The disputed domain names were all registered in 2025, years after the registration of the Complainant’s LANCÔME and LANCOME marks, including in both Brazil and China, where the Respondent is apparently based. The disputed domain names have no meaning other than as a combination of the LANCÔME or LANCOME mark, the word “bet”, and additional characters. The mark is highly distinctive and enjoys a strong reputation in the luxury beauty and skincare sector due to its longstanding and widespread use by the Complainant, including in Brazil and China. The Respondent provides no explanation for the composition of the disputed domain names. In view of these circumstances, the Panel considers it more likely than not that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant’s mark when it registered the disputed domain names.

As regards use, all but one of the disputed domain names continue to resolve to similar websites in Portuguese offering betting services via an online casino, or promoting that casino. Given the findings in Section 6.2B above, the Panel considers that, by using the disputed domain names, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent’s websites and the online casino, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark as to the source,

sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's websites or the online casino within the terms of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel takes note that the disputed domain name <lancomebetoi.com> has now ceased to resolve to an active website. However, UDRP 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. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's LANCÔME and LANCOME marks, the composition of this disputed domain name, and the fact that it formerly resolved to a website similar to those associated with the other disputed domain names, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of this disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Therefore, 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 names <lancomebetb.com>, <lancomebetbr1.com>, <lancomebetcs.com>, <lancomebetnavi.com>, <lancomebetoi.com>, <lancomebetpg.com>, <lancomebetv.com>, <lancomebet4.com>, and <w1-lancomebet.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Matthew Kennedy/

Matthew Kennedy

Sole Panelist

Date: May 1, 2026