ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Lattafa Perfumes Ind. LLC. v. Name Redacted
Case No. D2026-1945

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Lattafa Perfumes Ind. LLC., United Arab Emirates, represented by Cabinet Bouchara, France.

The Respondent is Name Redacted.[1]

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lattafaus.com> 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 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 11, 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").

[1] The Respondent appears to have used the name of a third party when registering the disputed domain name. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted the Respondent's name from this decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this decision an instruction to the Registrar regarding transfer of the disputed domain name, which includes the name of the Respondent. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in this proceeding and has indicated Annex 1 to this decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST- 12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. D2009-1788.

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 18, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 7, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. A third party sent an email communication to the Center on May 29, 2026, claiming identity fraud. The Center notified the parties of the Commencement of Panel Appointment on June 15, 2026.

The Center appointed Aaron Newell as the sole panelist in this matter on June 18, 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 Dubai-based manufacturer of perfumery. It has since 2011 promoted its business at the domain name <lattafa.com> and since 2024 at the domain name <lattafa-usa.com>.

Searches of public databases indicate that the Complainant has owned registered trademark rights in the name LATTAFA (including in class 3 for perfumes) since at least as early as 2012, and that it owns a trademark portfolio that includes rights in its LATTAFA name across over twenty countries.

These registered trademark rights include:

i) European Union trademark registration No. 018125528 for a device mark including the term LATTAFA, filed September 17, 2019, and registered February 18, 2020, in classes 3 and 35;

ii) United States of America trademark registration No. 7350169 for a device mark including the term LATTAFA, filed May 9, 2022, and registered April 9, 2024, in classes 3 and 35.

The disputed domain name was registered on February 20, 2025. At the time that the Complaint was filed, the disputed domain name resolved to a website that emulated the Complainant's website, claimed to be "authentic" and purported to sell the Complainant's products, including numerous at a deep discount. This website remains accessible at the time of this Decision.

There is nothing in the available record to indicate that the Respondent engaged with the Center, the Complainant or these proceedings generally.

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:

i) the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its registered trademark rights because it contains the LATTAFA mark in its entirety;

ii) the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, because the Respondent has no right or authorization to use the Complainant's trademarks, there is no relationship whatsoever between the Respondent and the Complainant, and the disputed domain name is being used to divert the Complainant's customers for commercial gain;

iii) the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, because it was registered in full knowledge of the Complainant and its rights in its LATTAFA trademark, and the Respondent is free riding on the Complainant's reputation in order to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the disputed domain name by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant, either on the basis that the website originates with the Complainant or gives the impression of being an official distributor or supplier of authentic products when it is not.

B. Respondent

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

On May 29, 2026, the Center received an email from an individual who, having received the Center's postal correspondence relating to the Complaint, confirmed that their name and postal address corresponded to those provided by the Registrar as belonging to the Respondent, but that the email address, phone number and other information relating to the purported registrant of the disputed domain name were not connected with them. That individual notably stated that "It appears that someone has used part of my identity to purchase the domain". The Panel has accordingly redacted the Respondent's identity as discussed above.

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 that the entirety of textual element of the Complainant's registered trademark 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.

Although the addition of the term "us" in the disputed domain name 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 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.

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.

Further, Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate conduct (here claimed to be the unauthorized use of the Complainant's trademark in respect of a domain name and associated website that misleads consumers that it either originates or is affiliated with the Complainant) 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 notes that the Respondent has, without license or authorization from the Complainant, established a website that emulates the Complainant's business and purports to sell at deeply discounted prices the Complainant's products, while communicating to visitors of the website that its conduct is "authentic", using the Complainant's logo and reproducing images in which the Complainant owns the copyright, using the Complainant's LATTAFA trademark throughout the website in a way that could be taken to indicate both the source of the products and the source of the website itself.

The Complainant alleges that there is no connection between it and the Respondent, the Respondent's website, and/or the products purported to be offered on the website. The Complainant alleges that, accordingly, the Respondent's conduct is fraudulent, misleading and unlawful and therefore indicative of bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent has done nothing to rebut these allegations. Further, taking at face value the communication from the individual who contacted the Center noting that they had, by virtue of the Respondent's misuse of their name and address, been incorrectly connected to the proceedings, the Respondent has also intentionally masked its identity and, in doing so, potentially engaged in identity theft.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.1.

These include circumstances indicating that a respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its web site or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the respondent's web site or location or of a product or service on its web site or location.

The Respondent's conduct falls squarely within this description. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4. Further, panels consistently view the provision of false contact information as an indication of bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.6.

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 <lattafaus.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Aaron Newell/
Aaron Newell
Sole Panelist
Date: July 5, 2026