

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

PRL USA Holdings, Inc., The Polo/Lauren Company L.P. v. Greg Throop
Case No. D2026-1941

1. The Parties

The Complainants are PRL USA Holdings, Inc., and The Polo/Lauren Company L.P., United States of America (the “United States”), represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Greg Throop, Switzerland.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ralphlaurenid.com> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with Nicenic International Group Co., Limited (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 Domain Name. On May 6, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on May 8, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainants to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on May 12, 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 15, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 4, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 8, 2026.

The Center appointed Ana María Pacón as the sole panelist in this matter on June 10, 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 Complainants, PRL USA Holdings, Inc. and The Polo/Lauren Company L.P., are wholly-owned subsidiaries of Ralph Lauren Corporation and are engaged in the design, marketing, and distribution of apparel, accessories, home products, fragrances, and hospitality services under the RALPH LAUREN brand. The RALPH LAUREN business was founded by fashion designer Ralph Lauren in 1967 and has grown into a globally recognized luxury lifestyle brand.

The Complainants own numerous trademark registrations for RALPH LAUREN in multiple jurisdictions, including:

- Swiss Trademark Registration No. 308773 for RALPH LAUREN, registered on April 9, 1981, in Class 25;
- Swiss Trademark Registration No. 654096 for RALPH LAUREN, registered on January 29, 2014, in Classes 9, 11, 14, 18, 20, 21, 24, 25, 27, 35 and 43; and
- European Union Trade Mark No. 002730323 for RALPH LAUREN, registered on August 18, 2003, in Class 35.

The Complainants also operate their principal website through the domain name <ralphlauren.com>, which was registered on September 25, 1996.

The Domain Name <ralphlaurenid.com> was registered on March 9, 2026. According to the evidence submitted by the Complainants, the Domain Name resolved to an inactive webpage at the time of filing of the Complaint.

The Registrar disclosed the underlying registrant of the Domain Name as Greg Throop, Switzerland.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainants contend that they have satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Name.

Notably, the Complainants argued that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to their RALPH LAUREN trademark because it incorporates the trademark in its entirety together with the term "id".

The Complainants further contend that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name because the Respondent has not been authorized to use the RALPH LAUREN trademark, is not commonly known by the Domain Name, and has not made any bona fide or legitimate use of it.

Finally, the Complainants submit that the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. According to the Complainants, the RALPH LAUREN trademark is well known worldwide, the Respondent was aware of the Complainants and their trademark rights when registering the Domain Name, and the passive holding of the Domain Name supports a finding of bad faith in the circumstances of this case. The Complainants further point to the Respondent's use of a privacy service and the absence of any plausible good-faith use of the Domain Name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Preliminary Issue - Consolidation of Complainants

The Panel notes that the present Complaint has been filed by multiple Complainants who have submitted a request for consolidation of their respective complaints. The record shows that both Complainants are wholly-owned subsidiaries of Ralph Lauren Corporation and have rights in the RALPH LAUREN trademark. The Complainants have a common grievance against the same Respondent arising from the registration of the Domain Name. The Panel therefore finds that consolidation is fair and equitable to all Parties and procedurally efficient. Accordingly, the Panel accepts the consolidation of the Complainants in this proceeding. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.11.1.

B. 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 Domain Name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainants have shown rights in respect of the RALPH LAUREN trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Domain Name incorporates the RALPH LAUREN trademark in its entirety. The Panel finds that the trademark is clearly recognizable within the Domain Name. Accordingly, the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainants' trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of the term "id" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

Then there is the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD"), here ".com". As is generally accepted, the addition of a gTLD such as ".com" is merely a technical registration requirement and as such is typically disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1, and *Accenture Global Services Limited v. Fan zhi*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-0285](#).

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

C. 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 Complainants have established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainants’ prima facie case and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Complainants have not authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the RALPH LAUREN trademark or to register any domain name incorporating that trademark. There is also no evidence in the record that the Respondent is commonly known by the Domain Name.

The Domain Name resolves to an inactive webpage. The record contains no evidence of any bona fide offering of goods or services or of any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name.

In these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name.

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

D. 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 was more likely than not aware of the Complainants and their RALPH LAUREN trademark when registering the Domain Name. The Domain Name incorporates the Complainants’ trademark in its entirety together with the term “id”.

The Panel notes that the Complainants’ trademark registrations substantially predate the registration of the Domain Name and that the RALPH LAUREN trademark has acquired considerable reputation worldwide.

The Domain Name currently resolves to an inactive webpage. However, panels have consistently found that the non-use of a domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes in particular (i) the well-known nature of the Complainants’ RALPH LAUREN trademark, (ii) the composition of the Domain Name, which wholly incorporates that trademark, and (iii) the absence of any Response or evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use by the Respondent.

In these circumstances, the Panel considers it implausible to conceive of any plausible good-faith use of the Domain Name by the Respondent.

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 Domain Name <ralphlaurenid.com> be transferred to the Complainants.

/Ana María Pacón/

Ana María Pacón

Sole Panelist

Date: June 24, 2026