ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

SOCIETE DE GESTION PIERRE CARDIN v. Elif Özkan Çavdarlı
Case No. D2026-2599

1. The Parties

The Complainant is SOCIETE DE GESTION PIERRE CARDIN, France, represented by Tmark Conseils, France.

The Respondent is Elif Özkan Çavdarlı, Türkiye.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <pierrecardin.top> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 15, 2026. On June 16, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On the same date, 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 (UNKNOWN) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 19, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant did not file an amendment to the Complaint.

The Center verified that the 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 June 26, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 16, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 17, 2026.

The Center appointed Áron László as the sole panelist in this matter on July 20, 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 registered since May 9, 1973. The Complainant is the exclusive licensee of the PIERRE CARDIN trademark rights worldwide, particularly in the fashion field.

The Complainant is the owner of, or holds exploitation rights over, numerous trademark registrations consisting of or including the sign “PIERRE CARDIN” in various jurisdictions, including the following:

- French Trademark Registration No. 1374766, PIERRE CARDIN, registered on October 14, 1986;

- French Trademark Registration No. 4915362, PIERRE CARDIN, registered on November 22, 2022;

- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 013381728, PIERRE CARDIN, registered on March 13, 2015

(the “PIERRE CARDIN Trademark”).

The Complainant also owns domain names reflecting the PIERRE CARDIN Trademark, including <pierrecardin.com>, registered on February 26, 1999. The PIERRE CARDIN brand has been active in the fashion industry since 1950 and enjoys worldwide recognition for clothing, perfumes, cosmetics, accessories, jewellery, and design.

The disputed domain name was registered on February 23, 2026. The record shows that the disputed domain name has been used in connection with a Turkish-language website offering Pierre Cardin-branded products as well as products bearing other brands, including cosmetics, personal care items, and underwear, at discounted prices, reproducing the Complainant’s PIERRE CARDIN Trademark throughout.

The Respondent, according to the information disclosed by the Registrar for the disputed domain name, is Elif Özkan Çavdarlı, located in Türkiye.

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 the Complainant’s PIERRE CARDIN Trademark is well known, as recognized by numerous previous UDRP panels. The disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant’s PIERRE CARDIN Trademark identically, and the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain “.top” does not eliminate the confusing similarity between the Complainant’s registered trademark and the disputed domain name.

Regarding the second element, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. In this regard the Complainant contends that: (i) the Complainant has not authorised or given consent to the Respondent to register or use the disputed domain name; (ii) the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name; and (iii) “PIERRE CARDIN” is not a generic term but a distinctive and famous trademark, and there is no legitimate reason why the Respondent would incorporate it in the disputed domain name.

Regarding the third element, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant contends that the Respondent was inevitably aware of the existence of the Complainant's prior rights at the time of registration, given the worldwide fame of the PIERRE CARDIN Trademark. The Complainant further contends that the disputed domain name resolves to a website selling PIERRE CARDIN products without authorization, thereby misrepresenting the Complainant's identity with the intent to lead Internet users to believe they are on a website created by or approved by the Complainant. The Complainant asserts that this creates a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website, constituting bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Based on the above, the Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

The Panel accepts the Registrar-disclosed registrant as the Respondent.

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to "decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted 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 a complainant must prove each of the following three elements to obtain an order that a domain name should be cancelled or transferred:

i.the domain name registered by the respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; and

ii.the 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.

In view of the Respondent's failure to submit a Response, the Panel shall decide this dispute on the basis of the Complainant's undisputed representations pursuant to paragraphs 5(f), 14(a), and 15(a) of the Rules and draw such inferences as it considers appropriate pursuant to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules.

The Panel is entitled to accept all reasonable allegations set forth in a complaint. However, the Panel may deny relief where a complaint contains mere conclusory or unsubstantiated arguments. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.3.

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 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 PIERRE CARDIN Trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

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 composition of the disputed domain name, which entirely mirrors the Complainant's distinctive and long-standing trademark, is inherently misleading. It falsely suggests authorization by the Complainant, which the Complainant denies, and carries a high risk of implied affiliation. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.1.

The website at the disputed domain name purportedly offers the Complainant's and third-party products, displaying the PIERRE CARDIN Trademark. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to sell its products or register a domain name incorporating its mark. Further, the Respondent's offering of third-party goods on its website also excludes any possibility of bona fide offering of goods or services through the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.8.1.

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 this case, the Panel notes that the Respondent has incorporated the Complainant's well-known trademark, predating the registration of the disputed domain name by decades, in full into the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name resolves to a website that falsely suggests an affiliation with the Complainant and also offers third-party goods. The Respondent is therefore intentionally attempting to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark, which qualifies as bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith, and 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 <pierrecardin.top> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Áron László/
Áron László
Sole Panelist
Date: August 3, 2026