

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

COR S.à.r.l. and pjur group Luxembourg S.A. v. BONG KHOLIL
Case No. D2026-1522

1. The Parties

The Complainants are COR S.à.r.l. and pjur group Luxembourg S.A., Luxembourg, represented by Jonas Rechtsanwalts-gesellschaft mbH, Germany.

The Respondent is BONG KHOLIL, Cambodia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <pjurmed.com> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with Gname.com Pte. Ltd. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 10, 2026. On April 10, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On April 13, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the 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 Complainants on April 15, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainants to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainants filed an amendment to the Complaint on April 16, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 April 21, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 11, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 19, 2026.

The Center appointed Mathias Lilleengen as the sole panelist in this matter on May 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 to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant pjur group Luxembourg is the exclusive licensee for the Complainant COR S.à.r.l. The Complainant COR S.à.r.l. has registered several trademarks for PJUR, for example EU trademark no. 018678439 registered September 16, 2022, with priority from March 25, 2022. The Complainants offer intimate products in a range of different categories, including water- and silicone-based personal lubricants, stimulation and delay products. They have been globally active for 30 years under the company name “pjur group Luxembourg S.A.” and have been using the PJUR trademarks. The Complainant pjur group Luxembourg S.A. had a turnover of EUR 13 million in 2025 under the “pjur” name and trademarks. The Complainants offer their products on websites hosted under domain names containing “pjur”, such as <pjur.com> and <pjuractive.com>. The Complainants also used the Domain Name <pjurmed.com> until recently, when they inadvertently missed the deadline for renewing the registration.

The Domain Name was registered on December 1, 2025. The Complainants document that the Domain Name has been used for a webpage that comes across as an imitation of the webpage of the Complainant, inter alia because the Domain Name mirrors the website used by the Complainants when they had control of the Domain Name, and the Domain Name still uses the trademarks, contact details and lists the employees of the Complainants.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainants

The Complainants explain why they have a common grievance against the Respondent. The Complainant COR S.à.r.l. only wants Complainant pjur group Luxembourg as the exclusive licensee to use its registered trademarks. The Complainants provide evidence of trademark registrations and assert that the Complainants' company name keyword “pjur” is protected as a commercial designation under the German Trademark Act. The Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainants' rights. The fact that the Domain Name features the additional element “med”, does not diminish the confusing similarity. “Med” is a common abbreviation for “medical” or “medication” and serves a merely descriptive purpose.

The Complainants argue that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name. The Respondent is not authorized, licensed, or permitted to register or use a domain name incorporating the Complainants' trademark. The Respondent is not known by the Domain Name, and the use of the Domain Name is not bona fide. The Domain Name has been used to impersonate the Complainant. Diverting confused consumers to its website for likely commercial gain cannot be considered a bona fide use, nor a fair or noncommercial use.

The Complainants argue that the Respondent has registered the Domain Name in bad faith with knowledge of the Complainants' rights. It is based on the composition and use of the Domain Name, as well as the fact that the Domain Name previously was used by the Complainant. The Respondent's use of the Domain Name is evidence that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainants' designation as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainants' contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

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 Domain Name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainants have established that they have rights in the trademark PJUR. The Domain Name incorporates the Complainants' trademark with the addition "med". The addition does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the trademark. For the purpose of assessing confusing similarity under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Panel may ignore the generic Top-Level Domain. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

The Panel finds that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainants have

rights in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which a respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

While the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the often impossible 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. 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.

Based on the evidence, the Respondent is not affiliated or related to the Complainants in any way. There is no evidence that the Respondent has registered the Domain Name as a trademark or acquired trademark rights. There is no evidence of 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. On the contrary, the use of the Domain Name is evidence of bad faith. The lapse and subsequent registration and composition of the Domain Name strongly signals the Respondent's intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the Domain Name and the Complainant. The Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

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 Respondent knew of the Complainant when the Respondent registered the Domain Name. It follows from the composition and use of the Domain Name, particularly given that it resolves to the same website as it did under the Complainants' control. The Respondent has not provided any evidence of actual or contemplated good faith use of the Domain Name. On the contrary, the Respondent has used the Domain Name to impersonate the Complainant to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainants' designation as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds that the Complainants have 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 Domain Name <pjurmed.com> be transferred to the Complainant pjur group Luxembourg S.A.

/Mathias Lilleengen/

Mathias Lilleengen

Sole Panelist

Date: June 4, 2026