

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

L'Oréal v. ren wei  
Case No. D2026-1912

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is L'Oréal, France, represented by Dreyfus & associés, France.

The Respondent is ren wei, China.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <outlets-lancome.top> (the "Disputed Domain Name") is registered with Kenpai International Technology Limited (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 4, 2026. On May 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On May 6, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 6, 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 in English Complaint on May 6, 2026.

On May 6, 2026, the Center informed the parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the registration agreement for the Disputed Domain Name is Chinese. On May 6, 2026, the Complainant confirmed its request that English be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant's submission.

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 in Chinese and English 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 June 1, 2026.

The Center appointed Peter J. Dernbach as the sole panelist in this matter on June 8, 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 French industrial group specializing in the field of cosmetics and beauty. It operates in about 150 countries with a diverse portfolio of international brands, including LANCÔME, covering skincare, makeup, perfume, and hair care.

The Complainant is the owner of the LANCÔME trademarks (the "LANCÔME Mark(s)"), including:

- Chinese Trademark No. 775926 for LANCÔME, registered on January 14, 1995, covering services in class 42; and
- International Trademark No. 1679731 for LANCOME, registered on June 1, 2022, covering goods and services in classes 3, 9, 35, and 41.

The Complainant also owns the domain name <lancome.com> and operates one of its official websites for the LANCÔME brand in Simplified Chinese at the domain name <lancome.com.cn>.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on April 7, 2026. According to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the Disputed Domain Name previously resolved to a French-language website that appeared to sell cosmetics and beauty products at significant discounts (the "Respondent's Website"). The website displayed a copyright notice stating "© Lancôme 2025" at the bottom of the page.

The Respondent appears to be an individual with an address located in China.

#### **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.

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

The Complainant contends that the Disputed Domain Name reproduces the LANCÔME Mark in its entirety. The addition of the generic and descriptive English term "outlets" and a hyphen does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity since it may lead Internet users to believing that the Disputed Domain Name is endorsed by the Complainant or that it will direct them to an official website where the Complainant's discounted LANCÔME products can be bought. The generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".top" should be disregarded for the evaluation of confusing similarity.

(ii) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent is neither commonly known by the name LANCÔME nor in any way affiliated with Complainant. The Respondent is not authorized to use the LANCÔME Mark, to register any domain incorporating the LANCÔME Mark, or to develop any website with a mention LANCÔME

and a claim of affiliation with Complainant. Furthermore, the Respondent did not demonstrate use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Disputed Domain Name or any corresponding name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Respondent's Website is likely to make Internet users wrongly believe it is an official website of the Complainant, which does not represent a use in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services. Rather, the Respondent's Website is an obvious non-legitimate use of the Disputed Domain Name, with intent for commercial gain by misleadingly diverting consumers from the Complainant's official website. Such imitation of Complainant's website cannot provide the Respondent with rights or legitimate interests over the Disputed Domain Name.

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

Regarding registration in bad faith, the Complainant contends that LANCÔME Mark significantly predates the Disputed Domain Name and is well-known throughout the world, including the country where the Respondent is located. The Complainant notes that the Disputed Domain Name reproduces the LANCÔME Mark in its entirety. Additionally, the Complainant asserts, due to the availability of Internet technology and Google/trademark search, it is implausible that the Respondent was not aware of the LANCÔME Mark at the time of registering the Disputed Domain Name. The Complainant asserts that the Disputed Domain Name is used for a website that creates a false affiliation with Complainant.

As to use in bad faith, the Complainant contends that the Respondent uses the Disputed Domain Name to direct Internet users to a website displaying the Complainant's logo in the tab and apparently offering its products, in order to capitalize on or otherwise take advantage of the Complainant's trademark rights through the creation of initial interest of confusion for the consumers who could believe that the Disputed Domain Name is an official website offering LANCÔME products at discount, and that the Respondent is an official reseller of the Complainant. The Complainant also asserts that the Respondent's Website requests confidential data from potential buyers, which represents a significant security risk to users and exposes them to potential fraud and data theft.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **6.1 Language of the Proceeding**

Notwithstanding Chinese being the language of the registration agreement for the Disputed Domain Name, the Panel, in exercising its discretion under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules, determines that the language of the proceeding should be English, as requested by the Complainant, in consideration of the following factors.

First, the Disputed Domain Name incorporates the English word "outlets", and the Respondent's Website was in French and appeared to target international users, demonstrating the Respondent's familiarity with languages other than Chinese.

Second, the Center issued procedural notifications in both Chinese and English, ensuring that the Respondent was fully informed and had a fair opportunity to object to the Complainant's request that English be the language of proceeding, yet the Respondent chose not to participate.

Finally, the Complainant and its representative, who are both located in France, have filed the Complaint in English and claim to have no knowledge of the Chinese language. The Panel believes requiring them to translate the Complaint and all supporting annexes into Chinese would impose an undue financial and administrative burden, cause unwanted delay, and incur unnecessary additional costs to the proceeding.

Accordingly, the Panel determines that English should be the language of the proceeding.

## 6.2 Substantive Issues

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, in order to succeed in this administrative proceeding and obtain the requested remedy (in this case, transfer of the Disputed Domain Name), the Complainant must prove that each of the three following elements are present:

- (i) the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has right;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Disputed Domain Name has been 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.

The Panel finds the Complainant has established that it has rights in the LANCÔME Marks. The Panel finds the Disputed Domain Name confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks, as the Disputed Domain Name <outlets-lancome.top> incorporates the Complainant's LANCÔME Mark in its entirety (omitting the diacritical mark "Ô", which is a technical constraint standard in domain name registrations and does not affect the visual or phonetic recognition of the mark). The addition of the generic term "outlets" and a hyphen does not prevent this finding given that the LANCÔME Mark remains recognizable within the Disputed Domain Name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8. The gTLD (".top") is a standard technical requirement and is generally disregarded when assessing confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied the first element of the Policy.

### 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.

In the present case, the Complainant has explicitly asserted that the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant, nor has the Complainant authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the LANCÔME Mark, to register any domain name incorporating the mark, or to develop any website displaying the mark and claiming such affiliation. Moreover, there is no evidence in the record indicating that the Respondent—named "ren wei" as disclosed by the Registrar—has been commonly known by the name "LANCÔME" or the Disputed Domain Name.

In addition, the Respondent has failed to demonstrate any use of, or preparations to use, the Disputed Domain Name or a corresponding name in connection with any bona fide offering of goods or services. Nor is there evidence showing a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name. In contrast, according to the uncontested evidence submitted by the Complainant, the Disputed Domain Name resolved

to a commercial website that appeared to target the Complainant's industry by offering cosmetics and beauty products, falsely displaying the copyright notice "© Lancôme 2025". The Panel finds that the Respondent's Website was designed to pass off the Complainant, which can never confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.

Considering the above, 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. Therefore, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

Under the third element of the Policy, the complainant must demonstrate that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. 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 the Disputed Domain Name has been registered in bad faith. The Complainant's LANCÔME Mark predates the registration of the Disputed Domain Name by decades and is internationally famous in the cosmetics and beauty industry, including in China where the Respondent is located. Given the widespread availability of online search engines and trademark databases, it is inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's LANCÔME Mark when registering the Disputed Domain Name, which reproduces the mark in its entirety. The Panel is therefore convinced that the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name with full knowledge of the Complainant's pre-existing rights in the LANCÔME Mark, which constitutes registration in bad faith.

The Panel also confidently reaches a finding of bad-faith use. The evidence demonstrates that the Respondent has used the Disputed Domain Name to operate the Respondent's Website that not only appeared to offer cosmetics goods of the same categories of Complainant's products but also displayed the copyright notice "© Lancôme 2025". The Panel finds it is highly likely that the Respondent's Website has been created to mislead consumers into the misbelief that the Respondent's Website is the Complainant's official website offering the LANCÔME products for sale at discount, or that the Respondent is an official reseller of the Complainant. Such use is an attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to Respondent's Website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the LANCÔME Mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's Website or the products or service thereon, which satisfies the criteria of bad faith use under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant has satisfied 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 <outlets-lancome.top> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Peter J. Dernbach/*

**Peter J. Dernbach**

Sole Panelist

Date: June 22, 2026