ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Lattafa Perfumes Ind. LLC v. Salmaan Mohammed
Case No. D2026-1946

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Salmaan Mohammed, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <bestvaluelattafa.com> is registered with Name SRS AB (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 7, 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 (N/A) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 11, 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 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 5, 2026.

The Center appointed James Bridgeman SC as the sole panelist in this matter on June 12, 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 manufacturer of perfumes and fragrances and uses the LATTAFA and other marks to designate its products. The Complainant is the owner of the following portfolio of trademark and service mark registrations:

- European Union Trade Mark ("EUTM") registration number 018125528 for LATTAFA and design, registered on February 18, 2020, for goods and services in international classes 3 and 35; and

- EUTM registration number 019157728 for LATTAFA and design, registered on July 6, 2025, for goods in classes 3 and 4.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 11, 2025, and resolves to a website that purports to sell LATTAFA-branded perfumes and fragrances at discounted prices.

There is no information available about Respondent except for that provided in the Complaint as amended, the Registrar's WhoIs and the information provided by the Registrar in response to the request by the Center for details of the registration of 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 claims rights in the LATTAFA mark, established by its ownership of its trademark and service mark registrations described above, adding that its rights are reinforced by long-standing and continuous use of the LATTAFA mark in commerce, carrying on business as a prominent luxury perfumery originating from Dubai, specializing in authentic Arabic fragrances and embodying values of elegance, refinement, and cultural authenticity.

The Complainant argues that through such use, the LATTAFA mark has acquired substantial goodwill and recognition among consumers across multiple jurisdictions.

Furthermore, the Complainant relies on evidence of its strong market presence and reputation. In particular, the Complainant states that as shown in exhibits in the annexes to the Complaint, Complainant is widely known on social media platforms, including Instagram under the designation "@lattafa_perfumes", where it has attracted a following of more than 826,000 users. It is argued that this online presence demonstrates both the reach and recognition of the LATTAFA mark, as well as consumer association between the mark and the Complainant's goods.

The Complainant further asserts that its ownership and use of its primary domain name <lattafa.com> since 2011, which resolves to its official website at "www.lattafa.com", constitutes additional evidence of its established rights and commercial presence under the LATTAFA mark, as exhibited in an annex to the Complaint. Through its website, the Complainant distributes LATTAFA-branded products on a global scale, further reinforcing public recognition of the mark.

On the basis of these combined factors—registered trademark rights, longstanding commercial use, substantial goodwill, global distribution, and significant social media following—the Complainant contends that it has clearly established enforceable rights in the LATTAFA mark for purposes of the Policy.

Firstly, the Complainant argues that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the LATTAFA mark in which it has rights, arguing that the disputed domain name incorporates the LATTAFA mark in its entirety, rendering the mark immediately recognizable and distinctive within the disputed domain name.

It is an established principle that where a domain name at issue wholly incorporates a complainant's trademark, the addition of other terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element of the Policy, as articulated in *Dover Downs Gaming & Entertainment, Inc. v. Domains By Proxy, LLC / Harold Carter Jr, Purlin Pal LLC,* WIPO Case No. D2019-0633, and *Facebook Inc. v. Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC / Darren Lazarus,* WIPO Case No. D2019-2296.

The Complainant adds that the additional terms "best" and "value" are descriptive in nature and may suggest discounted products or a favorable price-quality relationship, but do not alter the overall impression created by incorporation of the LATTAFA mark in the disputed domain name.

Additionally, the Complainant submits that the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") extension ".com", should be disregarded because it is a standard registration requirement when assessing similarity between a trademark and a domain name.

Secondly, again referring to screen captures of the Complainant's own website and the website to which the disputed domain name resolves, the Complainant alleges that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, arguing:

- the Respondent does not hold any rights in the LATTAFA trademarks, which are reproduced in the disputed domain name and belong exclusively to the Complainant, as evidenced by the trademark registrations exhibited;

- the Respondent did not, at any time, request—nor, a fortiori, obtain—any authorization from the Complainant to use the LATTAFA marks, including within the disputed domain name;

- the Respondent specifically did not request or obtain authorization to reproduce and imitate the Complainant's trademarks within the disputed domain name <bestvaluelattafa.com>;

- the Respondent has no right to use the Complainant's trademarks in the course of commercial activity, particularly to designate goods identical to those marketed by the Complainant;

- there is no relationship whatsoever between the Parties;

- the Respondent is not affiliated with, authorized by, or connected to the Complainant in any manner;

- the Respondent is not related in any way to the Complainant's business, notwithstanding that the Respondent appears to intend to suggest the opposite in order to capitalize on the Complainant's investments and notoriety;

- the exhibited screen captures illustrate that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name as the address of an e-commerce website offering perfume;

- the Respondent's offering LATTAFA branded products for sale at large discounts, suggests that the disputed domain name is being used as part of a phishing scheme;

- the exhibited screen captures demonstrate the Respondent's intention to divert consumers for commercial gain by taking unfair advantage of the goodwill and reputation attached to the Complainant's trademarks; and

- panels established under the Policy have categorically held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, including the sale of infringing products, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent.

Thirdly, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, arguing that the Respondent could not have been unaware of the Complainant, its business activities, and its LATTAFA mark at the time of registration.

The Complainant submits that prior to the registration of the disputed domain name on June 11, 2025, the Complainant had been highly active worldwide for many years in the field of perfumes and fragrances, establishing a strong commercial presence and reputation, including by its marketing on its website at "www.lattafa.com".

The LATTAFA mark was registered by the Complainant and had become well known and distinctive at the time the disputed domain name was registered.

Furthermore, the Complainant argues that its substantial visibility on social media reinforces the conclusion that the Respondent could not have been unaware of the LATTAFA mark.

Additionally, the Complainant contends that the composition of the disputed domain name demonstrates that the Respondent had actual knowledge of the Complainant's rights at the time of registration, because the distinctive element in the disputed domain name is the LATTAFA mark; and the addition of the terms "best" and "value" further evidences the Respondent's awareness and intent to target the mark.

As regards bad faith use, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name resolves to a website that imitates the Complainant's official website and attempts to attract users for commercial gain.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent's website reproduces the Complainant's trademarks and suggests affiliation, thereby misleading the public, by using the Complainant's trademarks and materials to offer identical goods without authorization.

It is also argued that the Respondent appears to be offering counterfeit or unauthorized products at significantly reduced prices.

The Complainant further submits that the Respondent's reproduction of the Complainant's visual identity demonstrates a clear intent to mislead Internet users.

Additionally, the Complainant alleges that the Respondent is concealing its identity, suggesting unlawful or infringing activity.

In conclusion, the Complainant contends that the Respondent's conduct demonstrates an intention to mislead consumers into believing they are dealing with the Complainant or an affiliated entity; and that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name in bad faith by diverting Internet users for commercial gain through confusion with the LATTAFA trademarks and is free riding on the Complainant's reputation.

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 the LATTAFA trademark and service mark for the purposes of the Policy through its ownership of the trademark registrations set out above. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the LATTAFA mark is reproduced 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 terms "best" and "value" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms 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.

In particular, the Respondent is using the disputed domain name as the address of a website on which it purports to offer the Complainant's goods for sale at large discounts, while purporting to represent itself as the Complainant, or to have some association with the Complainant. The Respondent's extensive use of the Complainant's proprietary marketing material while giving no suggestion that the Respondent has no association with the Complainant cannot be considered a legitimate, noncommercial or fair use.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate or illegal activity, here, claimed as the sale of counterfeit goods or passing off, 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.

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity or illegal activity, here claimed as the sale of counterfeit goods or passing off constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

LATTAFA is a well-known mark and the disputed domain name is composed of the mark in combination with the words "best" and "value" which infer a reference to the mark. The Complainant has shown that it has established an extensive reputation for the mark through its extensive use on perfumes, with sales including online on its website at "www.lattafa.com". The Complainant has provided evidence that it has an established Internet presence with more than 826,000 users on Instagram. The disputed domain name was registered on June 11, 2025, whereas the Complainant had registered the LATTAFA mark as early as September 17, 2019.

On balance of probabilities therefore the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith with the Complainant's mark in mind.

The uncontested evidence submitted by the Complainant shows that the Respondent is purporting to market LATTAFA branded fragrances at large discounts. While, notwithstanding that such highly discounted sales are indicative of counterfeit goods or phishing, the Complainant has not proven that the Respondent is presenting counterfeit goods or engaged in phishing.

The uncontested evidence however shows that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to attract for commercial gain Internet traffic to its website, by using the confusingly similar domain name as a web address. On arrival on the Respondent's website, the visitor is presented with images of the Complainant's products offered a large discount. By offering the products in rupees, the inference is that India is the target market. There is no indication on the website that the Respondent and its website have no relationship with the Complainant. Such impersonation of the Complainant by the Respondent constitutes use of the domain name in bad faith for the purposes of 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 <bestvaluelattafa.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/James Bridgeman/
James Bridgeman
Sole Panelist
Date: June 16, 2026