

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

TV5MONDE v. Flavien BONOU

Case No. D2026-1626

1. The Parties

The Complainant is TV5MONDE, France, internally represented.

The Respondent is Flavien BONOU, Togo.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <tv5-monde.com> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 16, 2026. On April 17, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 20, 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 (Anonymous Respondent) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 20, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant did not file an amendment to the Complaint.

The Center verified that 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 29, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 19, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Mireille Buydens as the sole panelist in this matter on May 28, 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 large worldwide French language TV network created in 1984 and currently available in nearly 437 million households in more than 198 countries. The Complainant offers various French-language programs subtitled in 11 languages, under the brand “TV5 Monde”, which is also the Complainant’s company name.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademarks registered in many jurisdictions covering the sign TV5 MONDE (hereafter “the TV5 MONDE Trademark” or “the Trademark”), including the following:

- The French trademark registration no. 3090507 for TV5 MONDE (word mark), registered on August 24, 2001;
- The European Union trademark registration no. 002148625 for TV5 MONDE (word mark), registered on June 17, 2002; and
- The International Trademark Registration no. 766488 for TV5 MONDE (word mark), registered on July 30, 2001.

The Complainant is also the owner of various domain names containing the TV5 MONDE Trademark, including <tv5monde.com> (registered on May 21, 2001). The domain name <tv5monde.com> hosts the Complainant’s official website.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 10, 2026. It resolves to a website displaying news and information in French concerning Africa and presents itself as “TV5 Monde Info – Africa edition”. On the website, the TV5 MONDE Trademark is prominently displayed.

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.

First, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the TV5 MONDE Trademark, as it includes the Trademark in its entirety. The only difference between the TV5 MONDE Trademark and the disputed domain name is the addition of a hyphen between “tv5” and “monde”, which cannot prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Complainant’s TV5 MONDE Trademark and the disputed domain name.

Second, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant has never granted the Respondent a license or authorization to use its TV5 MONDE Trademark, and there is no legal relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent. Moreover, the disputed domain name resolves to a website where the Complainant’s TV5 MONDE Trademark is reproduced and where the Respondent offers services identical to those offered by the Complainant under the TV5 MONDE Trademark (news and information services in French). In addition, the front page of the website under the disputed domain name prominently depicts the TV5 MONDE Trademark, without the hyphen of the disputed domain name, and with the word “info” (for information in French, as on the Complainant’s website).

The Complainant finally contends that the Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain name in bad faith. Concerning the registration in bad faith, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent could not have been unaware of the Complainant’s prior rights to the TV5 MONDE Trademark when it registered the disputed domain name because (1) the TV5 MONDE Trademark predates the registration of the disputed domain

name and has a substantial reputation, (2) the Complainant has a long-standing Internet presence through its <tv5monde.com> domain name and (3) the disputed domain name is almost identical to the Complainant's TV5 MONDE Trademark and its <tv5monde.com> domain name.

Concerning the use in bad faith, the Complainant contends that the Respondent uses the disputed domain name for resolving to a website which presents services identical to those offered by the Complainant, *id est* news and information in French. By using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's TV5 MONDE Trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of its website.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that the Complainant proves each of the following three elements in order to succeed in its Complaint:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name was registered and is 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 name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the entirety of the TV5 MONDE Trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. The only difference between the TV5 MONDE Trademark and the disputed domain name is the addition of a hyphen. The Panel finds that the addition of the hyphen between "tv5" and "monde" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

Further, the generic Top-Level Domain ".com" is a standard registration requirement and does not prevent the disputed domain name from being confusingly similar to the TV5 MONDE Trademark.

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. [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.

According to the Complaint, which has not been rebutted by the Respondent, the Respondent is not licensed by, nor affiliated with, the Complainant in any way. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor is there any evidence of use or demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name for a bona fide offering of goods or services. There is no evidence of legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, either. On the contrary, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name reproduces the TV5 MONDE Trademark in its entirety with the mere addition of a hyphen between “tv5” and “monde” (which can go unnoticed by most Internet users). The composition of the disputed domain name, coupled with its use, in the Panel’s view, affirms the Respondent’s intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant as to the origin or affiliation of the website at the dispute domain name.

In this regard, the Panel also notes the nature of the website at the disputed domain name: the website displays the TV5 MONDE Trademark (without the hyphen as in the disputed domain name), and presents exactly the same services (news and information in French) as the Complainant’s website. Besides, the website under the disputed domain name presents itself as “TV5 MONDE Info – Africa edition”. As a result, the Panel finds, on balance, that the Respondent intended to induce Internet users into falsely believing that the disputed domain name resolves to a website operated or endorsed by the Complainant.

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 notes that the Respondent has composed the disputed domain name by reproducing the TV5 MONDE Trademark, with only a minor difference, namely the addition of a hyphen between “tv5” and “monde” (which can go unnoticed by most Internet users). However, the front page of the website under the disputed domain name prominently depicts the TV5 MONDE Trademark, without the hyphen as in the disputed domain name, which indicates, on balance, that the Respondent has targeted the Complainant and its Trademark and added a hyphen in the disputed domain name because the domain name <tv5monde.com> was already registered by the Complainant. Furthermore, the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in “.com”, which is also the generic Top-Level Domain used by the Complainant for its official website (<tv5monde.com>). Taking into account the reputation of the Complainant’s TV5 MONDE Trademark, registered more than two decades before the disputed domain name and widely used worldwide for providing news services in French, the Panel takes the view that the Respondent was well aware of the Complainant’s TV5 MONDE Trademark when it registered the disputed domain name and registered it with the intention to mislead Internet users into believing that the disputed

domain name is affiliated with, or endorsed by, the Complainant. In the circumstances, and in the absence of any explanation from the Respondent for its choice of the disputed domain name, the Panel can only reasonably infer that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in the knowledge of the Complainant's prior TV5 MONDE Trademark and with the intention of taking unfair advantage of the goodwill attached to it by causing confusion among Internet users.

Furthermore, in the present case, as noted above, the disputed domain name resolves to a website prominently displaying the TV5 MONDE Trademark for offering services identical to those offered by the Complainant, id est, news services in French. The website under the disputed domain name presents itself as "TV5 Monde Info – Africa edition" and, based on the available records, does not contain any information allowing Internet users to identify the company operating the website and its (lack of) relationship with the Complainant. In light of this, it seems unlikely that the Respondent would have registered and used the disputed domain name for a reason other than seeking to unduly benefit from the Complainant's rights, its TV5 MONDE Trademark, and associated goodwill.

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 <tv5-monde.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mireille Buydens/

Mireille Buydens

Sole Panelist

Date: June 11, 2026