

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Vanessa Wu, Xianqin Weng, Xiang Wu, Lirenn Diffusion v. Ahmed brami
Case No. D2026-1620

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Vanessa Wu, Xianqin Weng, Xiang Wu, Lirenn Diffusion, France, represented by Havard Duclos & Associés, France.

The Respondent is Ahmed brami, France.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <vawustore.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 April 16, 2026. On April 16, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 21, 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 (Unknown Respondent) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 5, 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 May 7, 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 May 8, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 28, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 29, 2026.

The Center appointed Vincent Denoyelle as the sole panelist in this matter on June 4, 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 family-owned business specializing in the design, manufacture and distribution of shoes and handbags for women.

The Complainant is the owner of the following VANESSA WU trade marks:

- French Trade Mark VANESSA WU No. 4053983, registered on April 4, 2014;
- French Trade Mark (semi-figurative) VANESSA WU VW No. 4662260 registered on December 18, 2020.

The Complainant is the owner of several domain names reflecting its VANESSA WU trade mark including <vanessawu.com> (registered on May 9, 2008) and <vawu-store.com> (registered on April 13, 2026).

The disputed domain name was registered on March 9, 2026, and it currently points to a single web page stating "This deployment is temporarily paused". The disputed domain name used to point to a website fraudulently impersonating the Complainant and passing itself off as the Complainant. The Complainant has produced evidence of complaints from defrauded customers who had placed orders through the website associated with the disputed domain name and never received the products they had paid for.

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 VANESSA WU trade mark as it includes key parts of the VANESSA WU trade mark. The Complainant also contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its <vawu-store.com> domain name.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent is neither sponsored by nor affiliated with the Complainant, its subsidiaries or affiliates, nor has it been licensed or authorized to use the Complainant's trade mark. The Complainant submits that the Respondent is not making a legitimate, noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name as it appears that the Respondent has chosen the disputed domain name to trade off the reputation and goodwill associated with the Complainant's trade marks, to cause confusion amongst Internet users and the Complainant's customers, and to use the disputed domain name for malicious purposes.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trade mark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the Respondent's website, or of a product or service on the Respondent's website. The Complainant highlights that the Respondent is passing itself off as the Complainant and defrauding unsuspecting Internet users who will place orders on the Respondent's website, make payment and never receive any products in return.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Preliminary question: Multiple complainants

Paragraph 10(e) of the UDRP Rules grants a panel the power to consolidate multiple domain name disputes.

In assessing whether a complaint filed by multiple unrelated complainants may be brought against a single respondent, panels look at whether (i) the complainants have a specific common grievance against the respondent, or the respondent has engaged in common conduct that has affected the complainants in a similar fashion, and (ii) it would be equitable and procedurally efficient to permit the consolidation. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.11.1.

Having reviewed the case, it appears that the Complainants are clearly related, which would be sufficient for the consolidation of the multiple complainants in this proceeding. Furthermore, three of them co-own the VANESSA WU trade marks and the fourth and last one is a licensee of the VANESSA WU trade marks.

As such, the Panel finds that they have a specific common grievance against the Respondent and accepts the consolidation of the Complainants in this case (referred to as the "Complainant" throughout the decision).

6.2 Substantive issue

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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the VANESSA WU trade mark can be recognized within the disputed domain name as a result of the inclusion of the first two letters of the first part of the trade mark in addition to the second part of the trade mark. To reach this finding on recognizability, the Panel has taken into account the broader context of the case (website content trading off the Complainant's reputation) which supports a finding of confusing similarity with the Complainant's trade mark. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the VANESSA WU trade mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, "store", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trade mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

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

Whilst this does not affect the panel's finding under the first element, the panel finds that the Complainant's claims in relation to its domain name <vawu-store.com> are ill-founded for the purpose of the Policy. This is because (i) the Policy protects registered and unregistered trade marks and the Complainant did not make any demonstration as to how it could successfully assert unregistered or common law trademark rights in relation to its domain name <vawu-store.com> and (ii) the domain name <vawu-store.com> was registered three days before the filing of the Complaint by the Complainant.

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.

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

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

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed passing off and fraud, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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.

In the present case, the Panel finds that, on the balance of probabilities, the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant's VANESSA WU trade mark and must have targeted the Complainant at the time of registration given (i) the online visibility of the VANESSA WU trade mark of the Complainant, (ii) the fact that the disputed domain name has been registered some twelve years after the VANESSA WU trade mark, (iii) the targeted choice of generic word used in the domain name "store" and (iv) the content made available on the website and the timing thereof, very shortly after registration of the disputed domain name which clearly demonstrates the Respondent's intent to specifically target the Complainant.

[WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

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

Turning to use of the disputed domain name in bad faith, 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. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy.

[WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the previous content of the website associated with the disputed domain name and finds that in the circumstances of this case the current passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

As for the previous use of the disputed domain name, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed passing off and fraud, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 name <vavustore.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

Vincent Denoyelle
Vincent Denoyelle
Sole Panelist
Date: June 18, 2026