ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Mediawan v. depad Max, medlawan
Case No. D2026-1555

1. The Parties

Complainant is Mediawan, France, represented by PROMARK, France.

Respondent is depad Max, medlawan, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <medlawan.com> (the "Domain Name") is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on April 13, 2026. On April 14, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On April 14, 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 (Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0177305031) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on April 15, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on April 15, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on April 17, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 7, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on May 8, 2026.

The Center appointed Dinant T. L. Oosterbaan 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 by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

Complainant Mediawan is a French company specialized in the production, distribution and broadcasting of television channels and audiovisual content. Founded in 2015, Complainant is today the premier European independent studio for audiovisual content, which operates in 14 countries across Europe, Africa, America, and Asia. Complainant produces content across all genres, film, animation, documentaries, and fiction.

Complainant has evidenced to be the registered owner of several trademark registrations for MEDIAWAN, including the following:
- European Union trademark registration No. 018055688, registered on September 27, 2019 for the mark MEDIAWAN,
- French trademark MEDIAWAN, No. 4494665, registered on June 21, 2019.

Complainant is also the owner of the domain name <mediawan.com>, registered on July 26, 2006. This domain name is active and is related to Complainant's group activities in the production, distribution and broadcasting sectors.

The Domain Name was registered on January 28, 2026.

As of the date of this decision, the Domain Name resolves to an inactive webpage.

However, Complainant has provided evidence that the Domain Name has been used by Respondent by inserting himself into an existing email chain to send deceptive emails from the email address "[..]@medlawan" with the intent to commit financial fraud.

Respondent, according to the disclosed WhoIs information for the Domain Name, is located in the United States of America.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Name.

Notably, Complainant contends that the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which Complainant has rights. The Domain Name incorporates almost in its entirety the trademarks MEDIAWAN of Complainant. The substitution of the letter "i" by the letter "l" is undoubtedly insufficient to prevent the confusing similarity between Complainant's trademarks and the Domain Name

Complainant submits that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name. Complainant submits that the Domain Name does not resolve to any active website and is only being used with the purpose of engaging in fraudulent activity to deceive Complainant to make unjustified payments and not to host a website. Indeed, the Domain Name has been fraudulently used for phishing, by sending deceptive emails to Complainant's Mauritian subsidiary's accounting assistant with email addresses integrated both the Domain Name and the identity of Complainant's subsidiary's Sales Administration Manager to obtain illegitimate transfer of funds from Complainant's Mauritian subsidiary.

In addition, Respondent did not register the Domain Name with a bona fide intent as Respondent has no connection with Complainant and has no license or authorization by Complainant, to use Complainant's trademarks.

According to Complainant, the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Complainant submits that Respondent has no prior right or legitimate interest that would justify the registration of the Domain Name; it has only registered it opportunistically. Indeed, Respondent registered the Domain Name with the purpose of using it for unlawful actions. The Domain Name is being incorporated in email addresses "[..]@medlawan" confusingly similar to the ones used by Complainant's employees, that are composed of the employee's identity and Complainant's group's name "[..]@mediawan". Those deceptive emails using the Domain Name are falsely purport to be from one of Complainant's employees and instruct another of Complainant's employees to proceed with the payment of an invoice. Given the circumstances of the registration and use, it is clear that Respondent registered and used the Domain Name opportunistically and fraudulently, which constitutes registration and use in bad faith.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs the Panel to "decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable".

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that Complainant prove each of the following three elements to obtain an order that the Domain Name should be transferred :

(i) the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights; and

(ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name; and

(iii) the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel will proceed to analyze whether the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are satisfied in this proceeding.

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 Complainant's trademark and the Domain Name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 1.7.

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 MEDIAWAN is recognizable within the Domain Name. The letter "i" of the trademark has been substituted by the letter "l" in the Domain Name. A domain name which consists of a variation of a trademark (typically a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of a trademark, referred to as typosquatting) is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.9.

The generic Top-Level-Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1.

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 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 Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Respondent has not rebutted 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.

The Panel notes that Complainant has not licensed or otherwise permitted Respondent to use any of its trademarks or to register the Domain Name incorporating its trademarks.

Based on the undisputed submission and evidence provided by Complainant, as summarized above, Respondent used the Domain Name to impersonate Complainant by inserting himself into an existing email chain and by sending deceptive emails from the email address "[..]@medlawan" impersonating a "Sales Administration Manager" of a subsidiary of Complainant to an accounting assistant of another subsidiary of Complainant in order to request the payment of an invoice in order to obtain illegitimate transfer of funds with the intent to commit financial fraud.

The Panel adds that Complainant provided evidence that on February 25, 2026 ,Complainant filed with the Procureur de la République (in English: Public Prosecutor) of the Paris, France, Court a criminal complaint following attempts at fraud, identity theft and fraudulent interference with an automated data processing system providing in detail the facts mentioned above. Complainant mentioned in its complaint added that this attempt was the eighth fraudulent attempt with similar facts.

UDRP panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity such as in the present case impersonation, phishing and an intent to commit financial fraud can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1.

The Panel does not consider such use a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name. Respondent is also not commonly known by the Domain Name nor has it acquired any trademark or service mark rights.

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 Panel finds that the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Noting the overall circumstances of this case, the Panel finds it more likely than not that Respondent knew or in any event should have known Complainant's MEDIAWAN marks. The registration of the Domain Name in awareness of the trademarks and in the absence of rights or legitimate interests amounts under these circumstances to registration in bad faith.

In particular, the Panel takes into account that previous panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, such as applicable to this case impersonation and solicit payment of fraudulent invoices constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4.

The Panel also takes into account that Respondent used false and contradictory contact information during the Domain Name registration which provides additional evidence of bad faith. Respondent provided a street address and phone number in a city in the United States of America. A quick look up by the Panel[1] in publicly available information noted that the street address provided at registration is not located in the claimed state; the phone number provided is not in the name of Respondent but in the name of a Japanese restaurant. The registrant information disclosed by the Registrar obviously contains deliberately false details. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.1, notes that the use of false contact details can be considered as evidence of bad faith registration and use. Panels have consistently found that respondents who deliberately provide false contact information to avoid being contactable demonstrate bad faith conduct, particularly when combined with other evidence of illegitimate activity, such as impersonation and financial fraud.

The Panel finds that 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 Domain Name, <medlawan.com>, be transferred to Complainant.

/Dinant T. L. Oosterbaan/
Dinant T. L. Oosterbaan
Sole Panelist
Date: May 29, 2026

[1] Noting the general powers of a panel articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the UDRP Rules, panels may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record if they would consider such information useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 4.8