

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Ceva Sante Animale v. CIERRA JUNE

Case No. D2026-2643

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Ceva Sante Animale, France, represented by BrandShelter, France.

The Respondent is CIERRA JUNE, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <feliway.site> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 17, 2026. On June 18, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 18, 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 (PrivacyGuardian.org llc) 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 filed an amended Complaint on June 24, 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 Philippe Gilliéron as the sole panelist in this matter on August 4, 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

Founded in 1999, the Complainant is an animal healthcare group. It is located in 42 countries and employs more than 3,500 worldwide.

The Complainant owns several trademark registrations in different jurisdictions, consisting in all or in part of the term “feliway”, such as:

- European Union trademark n° 004411691 that was registered on May 18, 2006, in class 5;
- European Union trademark n° 015768799 that was registered on January 20, 2017, in class 5;
- International trademark n° 661612 that was registered on September 25, 1996, in class 5; and
- International trademark n° 1344724 that was registered on December 2, 2016, in class 5.

The Complainant also owns several domain names, such as <feliway.com>, <feliway.eu>, <feliway.fr> and <feliway.us>. It notably exploits the domain name <us.feliway.com> to carry out its online activities.

On December 18, 2025, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name. The Complainant has submitted evidence that the disputed domain name lead to a website that mirrored and replicated the official Complainant’s website and reproduced the Complainant’s trademarks throughout its content.

On January 28, 2026, the Complainant sent a cease and desist letter to the Respondent, drawing its attention upon its trademark rights and inviting it to transfer the disputed domain name in its favor. In spite of the reminder sent on March 25, 2026, the Respondent did not respond.

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 identical to its trademark as it entirely incorporates the term “feliway”.

The Complainant then affirms that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name as it is not commonly known under that name, has not been authorized by the Complainant to use its trademark in any way and does not own any such trademark.

Furthermore, the use made by the Respondent of the disputed domain name, which resolved to a website reproducing the Complainant’s trademarks, logos, photographs and graphic charter, does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services, to the contrary.

Finally, the Complainant is of the opinion that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, since the Respondent acted with opportunistic bad faith when it registered the disputed domain name to exploit a fraudulent website imitating the Complainant’s official one to offer purported “feliway” products at discounted prices.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this 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.”

Pursuant to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove each of the following three elements to obtain an order that the disputed domain name should be cancelled or transferred:

- (i) the disputed domain name registered by the Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or a service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the 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.

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 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 Panel notes that the disputed domain name was used for a website offering for sale the Complainant's products at significantly discounted prices, reproducing the Complainant's trademark, goods and copyrighted images, all without disclosing its lack of relationship with the Complainant. Such use does not amount to a bona fide offering.

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 Respondent was obviously aware of the Complainant's trademark when it registered the dispute domain name, as evidenced by the composition of the disputed domain name and by copying of the Complainant's trademark and product images on the website to which the disputed domain name resolved.

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 the use of the disputed domain name indicates the Respondent's intention to mislead Internet users into believing that the website is operated by the Complainant or at least affiliated or authorized by it, which constitutes bad faith. 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 <feliway.site> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Philippe Gilliéron/

Philippe Gilliéron

Sole Panelist

Date: August 17 2026