

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Association des Centres Distributeurs E. Leclerc – A.C.D. Lec v. Floyd Chavez

Case No. D2026-2039

1. The Parties

Complainant is Association des Centres Distributeurs E. Leclerc – A.C.D. Lec, France, represented by MIIP MADE IN IP, France.

Respondent is Floyd Chavez, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <eleclerccentre lavage.link> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 12, 2026. On May 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On May 13, 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 (Privacy User #8a9d3d04 PrivacyGuardian.org llc) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on May 15, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on May 18, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 19, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 8, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on June 10, 2026.

The Center appointed Dinant T. L. Oosterbaan 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

According to the information provided in the Complaint, Complainant is a French chain of supermarkets and hypermarkets stores. Complainant has about 750 stores in France, located all over the country, and also stores in several other European countries. It provides car wash services within its stores under the name "Centre de Lavage E.Leclerc" (in English: "Car Wash Center E.Leclerc").

According to the evidence submitted, Complainant owns numerous registrations for the trademark E LECLERC, including:

- European Union trademark E LECLERC No. 002700664, registration date January 31, 2005; and
- European Union trademark E LECLERC No. 011440807, registration date May 27, 2013.

The Domain Name was registered on September 8, 2025. At the time of the decision, the Domain Name does not resolve to an active website. Previously, the Domain Name resolved to a website claiming to be that of Complainant's E.Leclerc car wash in the city of Saint-Orens in France.

The trademark registrations of Complainant were issued prior to the registration of the Domain Name.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Name.

Notably, Complainant contends that the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights. The Domain Name identically reproduces Complainant's E LECLERC trademark. Complainant submits that the mere addition of the terms "centrelavage" (in English: "car wash") within the Domain Name does not lessen the confusion between the Domain Name and Complainant's trademark E LECLERC. On the contrary, this association even increases the risk of confusion since this term directly reflects Complainant's business, as it does in fact provide car wash services.

The element ".link" is not integrated directly into the Domain Name but only constitutes its extension. It is settled case law that the applicable Top-Level Domain ("TLD") in a domain name is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the confusing similarity test.

Complainant submits that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name.

Respondent has not been authorized by Complainant to use the name "E LECLERC". Indeed, Complainant has not authorized, licensed, or permitted Respondent to use any of its trademarks or to apply for or use any domain name incorporating Complainant's trademark. Moreover, there is no business relationship existing between Complainant and Respondent. According to Complainant Respondent's Domain Name is neither used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or/and services nor constitutes a legitimate noncommercial fair use. Indeed, the Domain Name was pointing to a website claiming to be that of Complainant's E.Leclerc car wash in the city of Saint-Orens and displaying its postal address and phone

number. It later started to redirect to an inactive page. Complainant asserts that such uses are highly prejudicial for Complainant and should not constitute a bona fide offering of goods and services and have not been authorized by Complainant.

Complainant submits that the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. It is unlikely that Respondent was unaware of Complainant's activities and of the existence and use of the trademarks E LECLERC at the time the registration was made. Complainant's supermarket / hypermarket network is well-known in France and in several other European countries. Complainant's trademarks E LECLERC are well-known for many years and enjoy a great reputation in France.

According to Complainant the Domain Name is used in bad faith. As indicated above the Domain Name was pointing to a website claiming to be that of Complainant's E.Leclerc car wash in the French city of Saint-Orens and displaying its postal address and telephone number. Later the Domain Name then started to point to an inactive page. These uses are clearly deprived of any real and substantial offer of goods and/or services. On the contrary, Complainant is clearly and directly targeting Complainant and its activities. Complainant finally submits that the Domain Name disrupts Complainant's business and causes harm to Complainant's brand image. Since the Domain Name incorporates in the identical way Complainant's trademark in association with the terms "centre lavage" (in English "car wash") Internet users and especially Complainant's customers may wrongly believe that the website to which it resolves is Complainant's site or that Complainant's website is not correctly functioning or has been hacked. This perception will obviously be very harmful for the activities and image of Complainant.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs the Panel to "decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable".

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that Complainant prove each of the following three elements to obtain an order that the Domain Name should be transferred :

- (i) the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel will proceed to analyze whether the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are satisfied in this proceeding.

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 Complainant's trademark and the Domain Name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

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 E LECLERC mark is reproduced within the Domain Name. Accordingly, the 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, “centrelavage”) 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 Domain Name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. The same holds for the deletion of the space and the dot between the two parts of the trademarks E LECLERC and E.LECLERC respectively. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

The generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.link” is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

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 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 Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Respondent has not rebutted Complainant’s prima facie showing 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 Panel notes that Complainant has not licensed or otherwise permitted Respondent to use any of its trademarks or to register the Domain Name incorporating its trademarks.

Based on the undisputed submission and evidence provided by Complainant, the Domain Name resolved to a website claiming to be that of Complainant’s E.Leclerc car wash in the city of Saint-Orens, France and displaying its postal address and phone number. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity such as impersonation/passing off can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

Moreover, the composition of the Domain Name together with the construction of the website under the Domain Name are misleading and carry the risk of implied affiliation, which does not provide any indication as to how Respondent could possibly be seen as making a bona fide use of the Domain Name. Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Names, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert Internet users or to tarnish the trademarks of Complainant. The Panel does not consider such use a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name. Respondent is also not commonly known by the Domain Name nor has it acquired any trademark or service mark rights.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, there is evidence of registration and use of a domain name in bad faith in the event Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the trademark of Complainant as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of Respondent's website or location or of a product or service offered on Respondent's website or location.

The Panel finds that the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. Noting the status of the well-known E LECLERC marks and the overall circumstances of this case, the Panel finds it more likely than not that Respondent knew or in any event should have known Complainant's E LECLERC marks when registering the Domain Name. The registration of the Domain Name in awareness of the E LECLERC trademarks and in the absence of rights or legitimate interests amounts under these circumstances to registration in bad faith.

The Panel notes that the Domain Name, which incorporate Complainant's E CLERC trademarks in their entirety, resolved to a website which claiming to be that of Complainant's E.Leclerc car wash in the city of Saint-Orens, France and displaying its postal address and phone number, which indicates, in the circumstances of this case, that Respondent registered and used the Domain Name with the intention to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to his website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the trademarks of Complainant as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of his website or location or of a service on his website or location, which constitutes registration and use in bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The fact that the Domain Name does not currently resolve to an active website does not prevent a finding of bad faith.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds Respondent's registration and use of the Domain Name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that 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 <eleclerccentreLavage.link> be transferred to Complainant.

/Dinant T. L. Oosterbaan/

Dinant T. L. Oosterbaan

Sole Panelist

Date: June 26, 2026