

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Søstrene Grenes Import A/S v. saleasvfd saleasdv
Case No. D2026-1938

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Søstrene Grenes Import A/S, Denmark, represented by Abion AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is saleasvfd saleasdv, Greece.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <soestrenegrene.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 May 5, 2026. On May 6, 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 (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 7, 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 Geert Glas 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 an international Danish lifestyle company which was founded by the Grene family in 1973. Its sales offering is focused on home accessories, kitchenware, gifts and interior furnishing products.

The name Søstrene Grene is Danish for “the Grene sisters”. The Complainant’s Søstrene Grene brand is indeed built around two fictitious sisters: Anna and Clara.

Since its inception, the Complainant has grown significantly. Today it operates 400 Søstrene Grene stores across 17 countries. The Complainant also has an online presence and website at “www.sostrenegrene.com” through which it promotes its products and brand identity.

The Complainant owns trademark registrations in many jurisdictions around the world which cover the words SØSTRENE GRENE. These include:

- Danish trademark registration No. VR199600990, registered on February 16, 1996;
- European Union trademark No. 011971264, registered on January 16, 2014; and
- International trademark No. 1186322 registered on July 10, 2013 and covering countries, including Australia, Japan, New Zealand, and China.

The Complainant has also registered a number of domain names which incorporate the words “sostrene grene”. These include <sostrenegrene.com>, registered in 2012, <sostrenegrene.net>, registered in 2017, and <sostrenegrene.online>, registered in 2020.

The Respondent is only known by the name “saleasvfd saleasdv” and allegedly has its domicile or corporate seat in Greece.

On February 8, 2026, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name.

It appears from evidence provided by the Complainant that the disputed domain name resolves to a parked page hosted by the Registrar.

The contact email address for the Respondent provided by the registrar to the Center is [...]@laredoute-paris.fr. The <laredoute-paris.fr> domain name was registered on January 20, 2026, by an anonymous registrant. The registrar appears to be the same Registrar as for the disputed domain name.

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 identical or confusingly similar to its famous SØSTRENE GRENE mark whereby the Danish letter “ø” has been replaced, as is often done, by the letters “oe”.

The Complainant also contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name as there is no evidence of the Respondent's use of, or demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Complainant never granted any right to the Respondent to use its SØSTRENE GRENE mark in any form. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and is not making any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The Complainant also refers to the name of the Respondent which it considers to be fictitious and to the inherently misleading structure of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant finally is of the opinion that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. In view of the widely known nature of the SØSTRENE GRENE mark, the Respondent cannot have been unaware of the mark and of the Complainant's activities when registering the disputed domain name. As a result, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name while it knew that by doing so it would infringe the Complainant rights in its SØSTRENE GRENE mark. The structure of the disputed domain name also shows that the Respondent registered it with the Complainant in mind. As to the use of the disputed domain name in bad faith, the Complainant is of the opinion that this bad faith is also evidenced by the apparent false registrant information and the use of an email address which refers to a third-party commercial brand. As a result, the Complainant invokes the passive holding doctrine.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 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 is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Indeed the disputed domain name only differs from the Complainant's SØSTRENE GRENE trademark in that the Danish letter "ø" is replaced by the letters "oe". As the Danish letter "ø" is not present in many alphabets, it is often replaced by the letters "oe". So the disputed domain name seems to be the standard transliteration of the Complainant's SØSTRENE GRENE trademark and as a result it is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.14

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.

There is indeed no evidence whatsoever of the Respondent being permitted to use the Complainant’s SØSTRENE GRENE mark in a domain name, of the Respondent using the disputed domain name (or having demonstrable plans for such use) in the framework of a bona fide offering, of the Respondent being commonly known by the disputed domain name or of the Respondent making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

To the contrary, while the Respondent did not make any claim to such right or legitimate interest, the fact that the disputed domain name targets the Complainant and the Grene family which founded and owns the Complainant would undermine any such claim.

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.

As to the registration of the disputed domain name, it should be noted that panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name which is confusingly similar to a famous or widely known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

This is clearly the case as the SØSTRENE GRENE mark had become widely known long before the Respondent registered the disputed domain name. Reference is hereby made to the 400 Søstrene Grene stores in 17 countries. As a result, the Respondent must have had knowledge of the Complainant’s activities and of its SØSTRENE GRENE mark when registering the disputed domain name.

Moreover, the combination of the transliteration of the Danish word “Søstrene” and the family name “Grene” is quite unique. As a result, the presence of these two elements in the disputed domain name cannot have resulted from a good faith registration choice but shows the intention of the Respondent, already when registering the disputed domain name, to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant and its SØSTRENE GRENE mark.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been registered 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. Factors that have been considered relevant in applying the passive holding doctrine include (i) the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant's mark, (ii) the failure of the respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, (iii) the respondent's taking active steps to conceal its identity or (iv) the use of false or inaccurate contact details (noted to be a breach of the respondent's registration agreement). [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the failure of the Respondent to submit a response in these proceedings, the steps it took to conceal its identity and the suspicious nature of its contact details. As to the identity of the Respondent, the only information which can be obtained is that its name would be "saleasvfd saleasdv", which seems rather odd. As to the Respondent's contact details, the Registrar disclosed the email address "[...]@laredoute-paris.fr". La Redoute is of course the name of a major French store and e-commerce platform. It seems very unlikely that La Redoute would have authorized the Respondent to use this email and even more unlikely that La Redoute would have authorized a third party to register this <laredoute-paris.com> domain name which was only registered on January 20, 2026. While the identity of the registrant of this domain name is withheld for privacy reasons we do know that Hostinger is both the registrar of this domain name and of the disputed domain name. As a result, it seems likely that the Respondent's email address was chosen to misleadingly provide an impression of credibility and trustfulness resulting from its alleged link with La Redoute company.

Moreover, the Panel cannot think of a use to which the disputed domain name could be put which would be bona fide or would not create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant.

In view of the above, the Panel finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute bad faith and that the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 <soestrenegrene.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Geert Glas/

Geert Glas

Sole Panelist

Date: June 17, 2026