

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Etablissements Richard Pontvert et CIE v. Muhammad Ibrar  
Case No. D2026-2065

### **1. The Parties**

Complainant is Etablissements Richard Pontvert et CIE, France, represented by Cabinet Lavoix, France.

Respondent is Muhammad Ibrar, Pakistan.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <parabootmichael.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 13, 2026. On May 15, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 16, 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 named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on May 19, 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 21, 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 21, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 10, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on June 11, 2026.

The Center appointed Gabriel F. Leonardos as the sole panelist in this matter on June 16, 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

Complainant is a French company known for its shoes and models commercialized under the PARABOOT trademark. Complainant has gained worldwide renown for the elegance and the durability of its shoes, mainly due to the quality of the materials used, especially the leather. One of Complainant's main models is the shoe model named "Michael".

As shown in the examples below, Complainant owns several trademark registrations for PARABOOT:

Registration Number	Trademark	Jurisdiction	International Class	Registration Date
4135107		France	18 and 25	March 13, 2015
001434307	PARABOOT	European Union	18	February 12, 2001
UK00801249091		United Kingdom	18 and 25	April 6, 2016

Complainant also owns domain names containing the PARABOOT trademark, such as <paraboot.com>, registered since December 25, 1999, which resolves to the company's main website.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 1, 2025, and resolves to a webpage that displays Complainant's trademarks and sells its products at lower prices.

#### 5. Parties' Contentions

##### A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, Complainant contends that the disputed domain name reproduces the PARABOOT trademark in its entirety with the mere addition of the term "michael", which represents one of Complainant's signature products and therefore may lead consumers to believe that it is simply a variation of its earlier domain name <paraboot.com>. Therefore, according to Complainant, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's trademarks, fulfilling paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

Complainant affirms that Respondent is not known by the disputed domain name and was not authorized to use Complainant's trademarks in any way. Accordingly, there are no circumstances that justify Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name, especially when considering its apparent intention to divert and confuse Internet users into believing that Respondent is associated with Complainant's business. Therefore, it states that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, fulfilling paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

Also, Complainant urges that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith. Complainant affirms that Respondent must have been aware of Complainant's reputation and trademarks at the time of registration of the disputed domain name, especially considering the renown of the PARABOOT mark.

According to Complainant, Respondent has failed to demonstrate any legitimate use of the disputed domain name. On the contrary, Respondent is intentionally attempting to attract Internet users and obtain commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's trademarks, falsely advertising Complainant's goods through the disputed domain name. Such conduct also presents a significant risk of damage to Complainant's reputation

Finally, Complainant contends that the fact that Respondent has hidden its identity further indicates its bad faith.

Thus, according to Complainant, the requirements for the identification of a bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name have been fulfilled, pursuant to paragraphs 4(a)(iii) and 4(b) of the Policy.

Accordingly, requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to Complainant.

## **B. Respondent**

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

To succeed in a UDRP complaint, Complainant must demonstrate that all the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied, as following:

- (i) the disputed 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 disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The burden of proving these elements is upon Complainant.

Respondent had 20 days to submit a response in accordance with paragraph 5(a) of the Rules and failed to do so. Paragraph 5(f) of the Rules establishes that if a respondent does not respond to the complaint, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the panel's decision shall be based upon the complaint.

### **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 disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions, ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 PARABOOT trademark 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 term “michael” may bear assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that 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. Also, in this sense, see *Microsoft Corporation v. Montrose Corporation*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-1568](#); *Meta Platforms, Inc. and Meta Platforms Technologies, LLC v. Libin*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-4996](#); and *Formula One Licensing B.V. v. Holding Theunisse*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-0760](#).

Therefore, based on the available record, 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 Complainant, panels have recognized that proving 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 Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to Respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on Complainant). If Respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, 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 disputed 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 disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Based on the available record, Respondent is not entitled to any trademark, trade name, or any other right associated with the disputed domain name. Additionally, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and has not been authorized by Complainant to use the PARABOOT trademark, and there is no commercial relationship between the Parties.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here claimed as passing off and sale of potential counterfeit goods, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a Respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

In light of these circumstances, the Panel finds that no rights or legitimate interests can be found on behalf of Respondent.

Accordingly, 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 Respondent has registered the disputed domain name that is confusingly similar to Complainant's PARABOOT trademark. Also, based on the available record, it was established that Respondent has no affiliation with Complainant and its trademarks, nor has it sought authorization or a license to utilize the referred trademarks. Also, Respondent does not own any trademarks containing the term "PARABOOT" or showed any rights over the trademarks or any related terms.

Respondent evidently knew or should have known of the existence of Complainant's prior trademark rights and domain names, which were matters of public record, before registering the disputed domain name. The registration of the disputed domain name was carried out by Respondent, who had the responsibility to verify the existence of the referred trademark.

Considering Complainant's activities and the composition of the disputed domain name, it may be inferred that the registration and use of the disputed domain name was done with the intention to take advantage of the PARABOOT trademark and attract Internet users for commercial gain.

As stated and shown in the Complaint, the website linked to the disputed domain name displayed Complainant's trademarks, its shoe models, as well as the company's overall visual identity, expressly offering Complainant's products on discounted prices. Previous panels have already recognized bad faith in the registration of domain names composed by registered trademarks and aimed at the commercialization of replicas of the trademark owner's products, such as in *Hermes International v. Yue Wang*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-1163](#) and *Bulgari S.p.A v. Giuseppe Daniele*, WIPO Case No. [DCC2025-0019](#).

Furthermore, the Respondent has been found to be involved in prior trademark-abusive domain name registrations (e.g., *Gallery Department, LLC v. Muhammad Ibrar, Web Designer*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-4818](#); *Gallery Department, LLC v. Privacy Service Provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf / Muhammad Ibrar, Web Designer*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-3193](#)).

In the view of the Panel, this behavior demonstrates a pattern of conduct by the Respondent and further supports a finding of the Respondent's bad faith. Previous UDRP panels have held that establishing a pattern of bad faith conduct requires more than one, but as few as two instances of abusive domain name registration, see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.2. The Panel considers that this is the case here.

Therefore, based on the available record, 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 disputed domain name <parabootmichael.com> be transferred to Complainant.

*/Gabriel F. Leonardos/*

**Gabriel F. Leonardos**

Sole Panelist

Date: July 6, 2026