ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

# ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Lancaster SARL v. Lei lier
Case No. D2026-1994

## 1. The Parties

The Complainant is Lancaster SARL, France, represented by Hogan Lovells (Paris) LLP, France.

The Respondent is Lei lier, United States of America.

## 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lancastervip.com> is registered with West263 International Limited (the "Registrar").

## 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 11, 2026. On May 12, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 13, 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 21, 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 26, 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 27, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 16, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 18, 2026.

The Center appointed Halvor Manshaus as the sole panelist in this matter on June 29, 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 company engaged in the design and sale of leather goods. The Complainant was founded in the 1990s and has since expanded its activities internationally, offering products such as handbags, wallets and travel items.

The Complainant operates more than ten retail stores and sells products online through its official website. The product catalogue comprises more than 750 products per season, and the products are distributed through more than 1,000 resellers in Europe and Asia.

The Complainant holds trademark registrations comprising LANCASTER in several jurisdictions around the world, including:

- International Trade Mark Registration No. 490672C for LANCASTER, registered on February 4, 1985;
- Canadian Trade Mark Registration No. TMA618538 for LANCASTER, registered on September 2, 2004;
- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 018340878 for LANCASTER, registered on March 12, 2021; and
- United Kingdom Trade Mark Registration No. UK00003697688 for LANCASTER, registered on April 29, 2022.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on March 18, 2026.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website operating under the name “Lancaster Paris”, where the Complainant’s trademarks are displayed goods and products branded with the Complainant’s trademark is offered for sale at discounted prices. The website further displays product images, wording and material that is identical or highly similar to those at the Complainant’s official website.

**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 confusingly similar to its trademark as it incorporates the mark in its entirety.

The Complainant further argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not affiliated with, licensed by, or otherwise authorized by the Complainant, nor is the Respondent commonly known by the disputed domain name. Further, the website associated with the disputed domain name impersonated the Complainant without disclosing the lack of relationship with the Complainant. The Complainant argues that such use is neither a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate non-commercial or fair use.

Lastly, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The website’s reproduction of the Complainant’s marks, imagery, and wording demonstrates that the Respondent knew of and targeted the Complainant. The Complainant contends that the Respondent used the disputed domain name intentionally to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement. The Complainant requests transfer of the disputed domain name.

**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 entirety of the 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 other terms here, "vip" 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.

The Panel notes that the Respondent is not affiliated with or authorized by the Complainant to use its trademark, nor is there any evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. Further, the Panel notes that the Respondent uses the disputed domain name to operate a website prominently displaying the Complainant's trademark, using the Complainant's images, and purportedly offering the Complainant's products.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark in its entirety, and that the Complainant's trademark registration predates the registration of the disputed domain name. The Panel therefore finds it unlikely that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's trademark rights at the time of registering the disputed domain name, particularly given that the Respondent purports to sell the Complainant's own products under the disputed domain name.

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.

The Panel finds that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to intentionally attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark. The website features the Complainant's trademark and copyright-protected marketing images and purports to offer the Complainant's products.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed 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.

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 <lancastervip.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Halvor Manshaus/*
**Halvor Manshaus**
Sole Panelist
Date: July 13, 2026