

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Pegase v. Sipeh96 Heng Ong Huat
Case No. D2026-2623

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Pegase, France, represented by MIIP MADE IN IP, France.

The Respondent is Sipeh96 Heng Ong Huat, Malaysia.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <lahallee-commerce.info>, <la-halle.info>, <lahalle.info>, <lahallemarketplace.info>, <lahalles.com>, <lahalles.info>, and <lahalletalent.info> are registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 16, 2026. On June 17, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On June 17, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (See PrivacyGuardian.org) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 18, 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 June 22, 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 June 25, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 15, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 17, 2026.

The Center appointed Clark W. Lackert as the sole panelist in this matter on August 3, 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

Pegase, the Complainant, is a company organized under the laws of France and is active in the fashion industry. The Complainant is part of the Beaumanoir Group, whose companies operate in the fashion industry and own various trademarks including LA HALLE (the “Mark”). Since its beginning in 1981, the Mark has experienced a significant growth and has gained in notoriety. The first shop using the Mark opened in 1981 was originally dedicated to shoes. Three years later, the Mark entered into the clothing market with a boutique dedicated to ready-to-wear clothing and fashion accessories. Today, products using the Mark are sold throughout all of France, and notably through its more than 800 boutiques, thanks to the support of its 6,400 employees and 18 million visitors a year to its official website: “www.lahalle.com”. The Complainant is also followed by more than 500,000 followers on Facebook. Such public awareness has been achieved through significant investments in promoting the brand to consumers, including television advertising campaigns on leading channels such as TF1, one of the France’s leading private television channels, as well as on radio, or by collaborating with well-known personalities, including the singer Jenifer and former Miss France winners (Delphine Wespiser, Laury Thilleman, and Cindy Fabre), to promote the brand.

The Complainant is owner of a number of trademark registrations on the Mark around the world, including:

Jurisdiction	Registration Number	Registration Date
France	4925685	June 2, 2023
European Union	018894652	November 30, 2023
International Registration designating the United States of America	1752612	June 28, 2023

The Complainant registered its principal domain name <lahalle.com> on September 22, 1997.

The Respondent registered all of its disputed domain names on May 22, 2026, and none of which resolves to an active website. The disputed domain name <lahallemarketplace.info> has been used to send fraudulent emails.

A. Complainant

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

The disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights

The Complainant has been using the Mark since the 1980’s and has registered it in a number of jurisdictions. Due to its widespread use, it has become a famous fashion brand. Recently, the Complainant’s attention came across the registration of the disputed domain names <lahalles.com>, <lahalles.info>, <lahalle.info>, <la-halle.info>, <lahallemarketplace.info>, <lahallee-commerce.info>, and <lahalletalent.info>, registered on May 22, 2026. All the disputed domain names reproduce the Mark of the Complainant in its entirety with the addition of generic or descriptive terms. These terms include descriptive terms such as “marketplace”, “e-commerce”, and “talent”, which are descriptive terms in relation

to the fashion industry.

As it has been decided by previous UDRP panels, incorporating a trademark in its entirety can be sufficient to establish that a domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a registered trademark (See, for instance, *Yahoo! Inc. v. Blue Q Ltd., Romain Barissat*, WIPO Case No. [D2011-0702](#)). In accordance with many decisions rendered under the Policy, the addition of descriptive terms to a trademark does not prevent the finding of confusing similarity. In this sense, the words “marketplace” and “e-commerce” are descriptive as they both refer to platforms where products are bought and sold online. It is therefore generic in the fashion world. The additional elements “marketplace” and “e-commerce” do not add any distinctiveness. (See *Paco Rabanne v. John Doe*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3872](#): “The addition of the terms ‘-ecommerce’, ‘-fashions’, ‘-marketplace’, ‘-productcollection’, ‘-productlisting’ and ‘-remote’ in the Domain Names does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Names and the RABANNE trademark.”)

Moreover, it is also a well-established practice to disregard the Generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) like “.info” or “.com”, when assessing whether a domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the mark in issue. (See *EPSON Europe BV for and on behalf of Seiko EPSON Corporation v. Andrey Ushakov*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-0388](#)). Thus, there is a confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant’s prior trademarks rights.

According to a search on the WIPO Global Brand Database , the Respondent does not own any trademark rights including LA HALLE as all the trademarks belong to the Complainant, or LA HALLE TALENT, LA HALLE ECOMMERCE or LA HALLE MARKETPLACE. The Complainant has neither authorized nor licensed the Respondent to use its trademarks in any way. Previous UDRP decisions inferred from this lack of license or authorization that the Respondent had no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, inter alia, *Crédit Industriel et Commercial S.A. v. CIC Banq*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-1875](#) (Annex 6). Typosquatting never confers any rights nor legitimate interests. The disputed domain names <lahalles.com> and <lahalles.info> incorporate the trademark of the Complainant with the additional letter “s” at the end, which correspond to the definition of typosquatting practice, namely where a registrant deliberately introduces slight deviations into famous marks. Typosquatting is additional evidence that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

Moreover, the disputed domain names do not point to an active website. The Respondent does not engage in any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names, nor any use in connection with bona fide offering goods and services. It is therefore obvious that the Respondent has no legitimate interests in registering or using these disputed domain names.

The mail servers of all the contested domain names are configured to send and receive emails. Especially, a fraudulent email address [...]@lahallemarketplace.info has been created and used to commit scams. Before the request for deactivation of the records by the Complainant, this email address was used to impersonate the Complainant and conduct a fraudulent recruitment scheme. In this frame, the victim received an email falsely claiming to originate from the Complainant, offering remote employment opportunities and directing the recipient to continue the process via WhatsApp. The email included misleading supporting documents, including references to historical corporate records, in order to create a false appearance of legitimacy. The company named La Halle mentioned in these documents no longer exists, having been acquired by Groupe Beaumanoir in 2020 and subsequently renamed Pegase. This document also displays the logos of various French and European Union public authorities and institutions, despite these entities having no connection whatsoever with the Complainant or the alleged recruitment process. This demonstrates a deliberate attempt to mislead the recipients by falsely suggesting official endorsement and legitimacy. The apparent purpose of this scheme is to deceive individuals into disclosing personal information and/or making financial payments under the guise of a “genuine” job. By reproducing the Complainant’s trademarks in the disputed domain names, and by impersonating the latter, the Respondent was clearly aware of the Complainant and its trademarks at the time of the registrations. Moreover, the use of one of the disputed domain names to facilitate an email for a phishing scam amounts to use in bad faith. It is therefore in the public interest to transfer the disputed domain names <lahalles.com>, <lahalles.info>, <lahalle.info>, <la-halle.info>, <lahallemarketplace.info>,

<lahallee-commerce.info>, and <lahalletalent.info> to the Complainant in order to avoid that these disputed domain names be used for misleading the consumers.

B. Respondent

The Respondent is in default and 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(s). 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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar 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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

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 light of the reputation of the Complainant's LA HALLE trademark, the composition of the disputed domain names, and the Respondent's use of one of the disputed domain names for fraudulent email activity, the Panel finds that the Respondent knew or should have known of the Complainant and its trademark when registering the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names were registered 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.

The disputed domain name <lahallemarketplace.info> has been used to send fraudulent emails. Panels have held that the use of domain name for illegitimate and illegal activity, here, claimed as phishing/identity theft, 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 <lahallemarketplace.info> constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The disputed domain names <lahallee-commerce.info>, <la-halle.info>, <lahalle.info>, <lahalles.com>, <lahalles.info>, and <lahalletalent.info> do not resolve to any active website. Panels have found that the non-use of domain names would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, including the reputation of the Complainant's trademark and the composition of the disputed domain names, the Panel finds that, in the circumstances of this case, the passive holding of the disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of 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 names <lahallee-commerce.info>, <la-halle.info>, <lahalle.info>, <lahallemarketplace.info>, <lahalles.com>, <lahalles.info>, and <lahalletalent.info> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Clark W. Lackert/

Clark W. Lackert

Sole Panelist

Date: August 17, 2026