

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Easyparapharmacie v. Jan Michael Scott
Case No. D2026-1042

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Easyparapharmacie, France, represented by IPSILON, France.

The Respondent is Jan Michael Scott, Poland.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <izypara.com> is registered with CloudFlare, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 11, 2026. On March 11, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On the same date, 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 (DATA REDACTED) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 12, 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 March 19, 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 19, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 8, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 9, 2026.

The Center appointed Andrew D. S. Lothian 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

According to the Complaint, the Complainant is a French company founded in 2007 which specializes in the online sale and distribution of parapharmaceutical products, as well as cosmetics and veterinarian goods throughout Europe, particularly in France, Italy, Spain and the United Kingdom. The Complainant states that its turnover has grown consistently since 2020, amounting to EUR 41,385,238 in that year, rising to EUR 48,008,481 in 2024.

The Complainant claims to be first in search engine optimization traffic among pharmacies and parapharmacies, having around 600,000 monthly visitors and 909,000 annual sessions. The Complainant claims to be ranked third in terms of advertising impression share in online pharmacies and parapharmacies. While evidence was presented in support of these claims in the form of various reports, it is not clear to the Panel whether the reports provided were on a France-only basis, or were pan-European in nature (or, for that matter, global). It must be noted, however, that where country code Top-Level Domains were featured in the reports provided, these were predominantly restricted to the French country code with an occasional example of an Italian or Spanish country code.

The Complainant notes that it has been recognized as one of the best e-commerce websites by the magazine “Capital” in 2025 and by the FEVAD (Federation of E-commerce and Distance Selling). The Complainant also says that it won the “Meilleure Chaîne de Magasins France” award for best e-tailer of the year 2026 in the parapharmacies field, voted for by more than 1.2 million consumers. Again, the geographic extent of these awards is not made clear. “Capital” magazine’s French country code Top-Level Domain, the Complainant’s reference to FEVAD (“La Fédération du e-commerce et de la vente à distance” [Panel’s translation]), and the “Meilleure Chaîne de Magasins France” (“Best Retail Chain in France” [Panel’s translation]) tend to suggest that these are awards most commonly associated with France and a French consumer base.

The Complainant is the owner of the EASYPARA trademark and operates under this mark and the mark EASYPARAPHARMACIE, which it also owns. For example, the Complainant is the owner of European Union Registered Trade Mark Number 018498726 for the word mark EASYPARA, registered on January 18, 2022, in classes 3, 5, 35, 39, and 44. The Complainant uses the domain name <easypara.com> for its official website, which was registered on August 24, 2006.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 24, 2025. The Complainant’s undated screenshot of the website associated with the disputed domain name shows a header featuring the logo of a panda with the words “Izy Para” on the left-hand side, with a drop down menu showing selection of the Turkish language on the right-hand side. The URL containing the letters “tr” suggests that the said site defaults to the Turkish language. Beneath the title section on said site is a larger image of a panda along with boxes for the user to insert their username and password together with a button marked “Giriş Yap” [“Log In”] followed by an invitation to login via a Google account in the alternative, underneath which is a link with an invitation “Kayıt Ol” [“Register”]. The Complainant does not state what happens if the button is pressed or if an attempt is made to register an account.

The Panel visited the said site and examined the source code of the landing page on April 14, 2026. The code on the said site appears to be intended for a payment and financial operations platform, explicitly naming the following payment services, some of which appear to have a Turkish connection: “MyPayz”, “SiPay”, “NOWPayments”, “Gate2Way”, “Finera”, “Bishy”, and “Flashpay”. The code includes business logic in the Turkish language relating to, for example, payment and withdrawal request error ranges containing maximum and minimum amounts.

According to a machine translation, the word “para” in Turkish means “money”. That the site intends to reference “para” meaning “money” in Turkish is also strongly suggested in several examples within the source code, namely the detail: “currency\’:\'Para Birimi\’” [machine translation: “Currency”], the validation error “required\’:\'Para birimi gerekli\’” [machine translation: “Currency required”] and the legend “title\’:\'Para Çekme Talebi\’” [machine translation: “Withdrawal Request”]. The term “Izy” in “Izy Para” does not appear to translate into a Turkish word though the Panel reasonably surmises that it represents a

phonetic rendering of the English word “easy” to make this somewhat more pronounceable by a person whose first language is Turkish. Thus, the title of the site “Izy Para” seems to be intended to indicate “Easy Money,” at least to a Turkish speaker familiar with the English term and phonetic rendering.¹

The Complainant reports that it performed a reverse-image search of the panda on the website associated with the disputed domain name, the first results of which relate to an Instagram page linked to a Telegram channel. The Complainant also noted a TikTok account under the same username as the Instagram page. The activity on these pages appears to be the sale of branded clothing. The Complainant suggests in light of perceived low prices of the related merchandise and the use of direct messages (which it does not discuss further) that the owner of the pages may be engaged in the sale of counterfeit products.

The Complainant notes that a search on the terms “easypara” and “izypara” in a search engine only displays results relating to the Complainant, but it did not include the search on “izypara” in its documentary annexes. The Complainant’s “easypara” search indicated that it was made from a Paris, France IP address, likely returning French-focused results. In the absence of the Complainant’s search on “izypara”, the Panel made its own search for the latter from its own location in the United Kingdom and noted that the results returned consisted exclusively of the website associated with the disputed domain name and an entry for the present administrative proceeding on the Center’s indexing system.

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 its EASYPARA trademark, adding that the former contains sufficiently recognizable elements of the latter, and that it is appropriate to apply an aural or phonetic comparison between the two. The Complainant notes that the “izy” component of the disputed domain name may be pronounced the same way as “easy” despite being spelled differently and asserts that visual similarity may also be noted.

The Complainant asserts that it has found no trademark registered by the Respondent corresponding to the disputed domain name, that there is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name, that the website associated with the disputed domain name contains no contact information which would allow the Complainant to identify the Respondent, that the Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use its trademarks in any form, that a search on the terms “easypara” and “izypara” in a search engine only displays results relating to the Complainant, and that the Respondent has not used or prepared to use the disputed domain name in relation to a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name resolves to a login page “without even mentioning the term “izypara””. The Complainant adds that said website fails to provide any information about the website operator, a visible commercial activity or any catalogue, which it states is an indication that the

¹ The Panel notes that it has been accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record if it would consider such information useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision. This may include visiting the website linked to the disputed domain name (as here) in order to obtain more information about the respondent’s use of the disputed domain name.

Where a panel intends to rely on the information so gathered, where such information may not be general public knowledge or at least readily accessible, it may consider issuing a procedural order to give the parties an opportunity to comment thereon.

[WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.8. In the present case, the Panel determined it was unnecessary to provide an opportunity for the Parties to comment on its factual research because (1) the Respondent may be deemed to know the source code on its website; (2) the said source code is readily accessible by any visitor to the website, including the Complainant, and it is clear that the Complainant has not only visited the said site but it has also conducted a reverse image search on the image found there, whereby it must be deemed to have made all and any investigations into the site content which it considered to be appropriate.

Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and notes that the Complainant's trademark predates the Respondent's adoption of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant notes that the renown of its EASYPARAPHARMACIE trademark has been established in a previous case under the Policy (*Easyparapharmacie v. Domain Privacy, Above.com Domain Privacy*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-3075](#)) whereby the similarity between the domain name concerned (<esayparapharmacie.com>) and the Complainant's said mark was held to render it highly implausible that the Respondent was not aware of such mark at the time that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name. The Complainant submits that, given such notoriety, "at least in France", it is clear that the Respondent knew or should have known when registering the disputed domain name that it was violating the Complainant's earlier rights, reiterating that these predate the registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant submits that such presumed knowledge of the Complainant's rights on the Respondent's part proves bad faith registration, adding that a quick trademark search on EASYPARA would have revealed the Complainant's existence and that of its trademarks.

The Complainant describes the clothing sales which it has identified from the reverse image search for the image on the website associated with the disputed domain name and notes that there are no indications relating to the authenticity of the products, and that some products are advertised at a low price compared to the original pricing of the brands, which it says suggests that they are counterfeit, as does the direction of consumers to private messages. The Complainant notes that previous panels under the Policy have held that the fact that goods offered for sale on a website corresponding to a related domain name seem to be counterfeit products of the complainant can constitute evidence of bad faith. The Complainant asserts that the sale of counterfeit goods, whether involving the Complainant or other well-known entities, serves as evidence of bad faith registration. The Complainant concludes that on the assumption that the disputed domain name is related to the social media accounts which it has identified from the reverse image search, which it asserts to be a fair assumption, it is difficult to oppose the notion that the disputed domain name is being used in bad faith, based upon the alleged unlawful activity observed on said accounts.

The Complainant adds that the Panel may draw inferences from the fact that a complainant has a well-known trademark, that a respondent does not reply to a complaint, and that a respondent has taken steps to conceal its identity, adding that the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark, the alleged unlawful nature of the website associated with the disputed domain name, and the Respondent's activities, are in combination sufficient to conclude that the disputed domain name was registered and has been used in bad faith.

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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable 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.

The Panel notes in particular that the disputed domain name appears to fall into two elements, namely, “izy” and “para”. The Complainant’s mark likewise falls into two elements, “EASY” and “PARA”. The Panel notes that, on comparison, the “para” element is identical. The “izy” and “easy” elements are not identical in alphanumeric terms, but they come very close to identity in aural or phonetic terms, noting that the comparison aspect of the first element assessment may also entail a more holistic aural or phonetic comparison of the Complainant’s trademark and the disputed domain name to ascertain confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7. Indeed, repeating the terms “izypara” and EASYPARA quickly in tandem illustrates that they come close to being indistinguishable, depending upon how one pronounces the letter “i” in “izypara”.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The requirements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are conjunctive. A consequence of this is that failure on the part of a complainant to demonstrate one element of the Policy will result in failure of the complaint in its entirety. Accordingly, in light of the Panel’s findings in connection with the third element assessment under the Policy, it is not necessary for the Panel to address the issue of the Respondent’s rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

In respect of the third element assessment under the Policy, a complainant must typically show that the respondent registered the disputed domain name with the complainant or its rights in mind, and with intent to target these unfairly. Both registration in bad faith and use in bad faith must be demonstrated, as the Policy’s requirement in this respect is conjunctive in nature.

The Complainant hangs the entirety of its case on the third element upon three points: first, its alleged notoriety and that of its trademark, secondly, the apparent confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and such trademark, and, thirdly, the existence of social media pages allegedly selling counterfeit material (with the link to the disputed domain name being the use of the same panda logo found on the associated website).

With regard to the Complainant’s alleged notoriety, and that of its trademarks, it must be noted that even the Complainant itself adds the rider that it and its mark are notorious “at least in France”. This matches the evidence on the present record, which as noted above is mainly focused on the Complainant’s activities in that country despite the fact that the Complainant says that it is active in other places and notwithstanding its claim to its Facebook page being followed by 51,000 users, its Instagram page by more than 146,000 users, its TikTok page by more than 56,000 users and its YouTube page by more than 33,000 users.

The Complainant does not mention any connection to Poland, where the Respondent is reportedly based, or Türkiye, with which the website associated with the disputed domain name appears to be linked through its language selection and its source code. Consequently, while it is not impossible that the Respondent might have registered the disputed domain name in the knowledge of the Complainant’s mark, the evidence does not provide a strong foundation for that notion.

With regard to the perceived similarity of the disputed domain name to the Complainant’s mark, there seems to the Panel to be a more plausible alternative explanation for the Respondent’s selection of the disputed domain name. This arises from the apparent Turkish language connection of the associated website. Although it does not address it in the Complaint, this connection cannot have escaped the Complainant’s attention given that when it took the screenshot of said website it was displayed in the Turkish language. Indeed, this appears to the Panel to be the default setting for the website, although the dropdown menu can be changed to use the English language.

While the precise purpose of the website associated with the disputed domain name is not identifiable from the home page, the source code from which the page is rendered provides a much stronger indication than the visible page itself. The nature of the code suggests that the site is or was intended for some form of

payment processing service or payment gateway with a Turkish connection. The term “para” is referred to in such source code in several different examples which strongly support the notion that the Respondent is referencing the corresponding Turkish word which translates as “money” rather than trying to mimic the Complainant’s EASYPARA mark. Given the payment connotations, it does not seem unreasonable to the Panel to infer on the balance of probabilities that the Respondent selected the term “Izy Para” as an English/Turkish language play on the common phrase “easy money”. Read in that way, the Panel considers that the disputed domain name was most likely registered without any intent to reference the Complainant’s EASYPARA mark, whereby the apparent similarity is coincidental.

There is nothing on the website associated with the disputed domain name that suggests an intent to target the Complainant’s mark (even accepting that such mark is in force in Poland, where the Respondent is reportedly based). There is no suggestion, for example, that the Respondent’s panda logo reproduces any aspect of the Complainant’s own branding, or that the look and feel of the website associated with the disputed domain name matches or calls to mind the look and feel of the Complainant’s official website. The Complainant does not submit that the login page is intended to capture the personal details of the Complainant’s customers for fraudulent purposes, or that such customers would necessarily be confused into providing their personal data should they stumble upon the website. It seems to the Panel that despite the apparent phonetic similarity in its first element, no customer of the Complainant would be confused into believing that the disputed domain name was operated by the Complainant. The connection is too tenuous for any confusion to arise. Importantly, the Complainant did not produce evidence of its search whereby it asserted that “izypara” produces references to the Complainant, and the Panel could not reproduce this, nor did the Complainant’s search for “easypara” itself produce any references to the disputed domain name.

The Panel turns to the third element of the Complainant’s case on this topic, namely, its reverse image search on the panda logo found on the website associated with the disputed domain name. The Complainant has identified that the same image is used on certain social media sites which it asserts are selling counterfeit material. The link between the Respondent and these sites is tenuous to say the least and, crucially, the sites are not connected in any way to the registration or use of the disputed domain name itself. The disputed domain name is not referenced on those sites, nor has any hyperlink or other reference to the website associated with the disputed domain name been identified there. It does appear that the panda logo is a shared feature (identifiable only by the Complainant’s reverse image search) as is an apparent Turkish language connection. But that is as far as the evidence goes. It is perfectly possible that the Respondent has simply obtained an identical panda image from the same source as did those behind the social media site. It is equally conceivable that both sites might have been designed by the same web developer who has reused the logo. Crucially, the shared logo does not have any direct bearing on the registration or use of the disputed domain name itself.

The Complainant indicates that the products being sold on the social media sites constitute unfair targeting of its rights in terms of the Policy. In the first place, as noted above, there is no link of any substance between the sites and the registration and use of the disputed domain name. Secondly, there is a plausible basis for the existence of the disputed domain name and its use which has nothing to do with the alleged sale of counterfeit products or any intent to target the Complainant’s rights. Thirdly, the website associated with the disputed domain name is not being used for any obvious illegal or illegitimate activity, nor does it link to the social media sites identified by the Complainant, and the disputed domain name is not reproduced on any of the social media pages concerned in the alleged sale of counterfeit products. For completeness, it might also be noted that the Complainant does not suggest that the alleged counterfeiting targets its own mark in any way, only the marks of third parties. There is therefore no basis on the present record for a finding of registration and use in bad faith within the meaning of the Policy.

The evidence in the case file as presented does not indicate that the Respondent’s aim in registering the disputed domain name was to profit from or exploit the Complainant’s trademark.

The Panel finds the third element of the Policy has not been established.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Andrew D. S. Lothian/

Andrew D. S. Lothian

Sole Panelist

Date: April 28, 2026