

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

BOLLÉ BRANDS (FRANCE) v. Mac Desta, Solid Green I.T.
Case No. D2026-2673

1. The Parties

The Complainant is BOLLÉ BRANDS (FRANCE), France, represented by Cabinet Regimbeau, France.

The Respondent is Mac Desta, Solid Green I.T., United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <bollegroup.com> is registered with Squarespace Domains II LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 19, 2026. On June 19, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 22, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 25, 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 26, 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 29, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 19, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 21, 2026.

The Center appointed Willem J. H. Leppink as the sole panelist in this matter on July 24, 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 following facts are undisputed.

The Complainant, a French company, operates globally and is specialized in the design, development, and distribution of high-performance eyewear. The group to which the Complainant belongs, owns several brands, including Bollé, under which premium sunglasses, ski goggles, helmets, and prescription eyewear for sports and everyday use, are sold.

The Complainant's main website can be found at "www.bolle.com".

The Complainant has portfolio of trademark registrations which consist of BOLLE or BOLLÉ, including the European Union Trade Mark registration BOLLÉ (word), No. 005232947, with a registration date of July 5, 2007, registered for goods in classes 4, 18, 25 and the United Kingdom trademark registration BOLLE (word), No. UK00001270214, with a registration date of April 21, 1989, registered for goods in class 9, and the United States trademark registration BOLLÉ (word) No. 2965119 with a registration date of July 5, 2007, registered for goods in class 9.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 22, 2019 and at the time of filing the Complaint and at the time of handing down this Decision does not resolve to an active page.

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.

Specifically, the Complainant contends the following.

The BOLLÉ brand, under which the Complainant and its group offer premium sunglasses, ski goggles, helmets, and prescription eyewear for sports and everyday use is well-known. With a strong heritage in innovation, quality, and style, the BOLLÉ brand serves both professional athletes and consumers worldwide.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name. In fact, the Respondent has no connection with the Complainant in any way. It is not an authorized dealer, distributor or licensee of the Complainant and has not been permitted by the Complainant to make any use of its prior rights. Therefore, this registration of the disputed domain name cannot be considered as giving the Respondent rights or a legitimate interest stemming from a "bona fide offer of goods or services" or a "legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name". Even in that case, such use infringes the Complainant's prior rights.

The disputed domain name has been registered since 2019 and is currently not in use. According to the Complainant's investigations, it has never been used. This clearly indicates that the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name solely to prevent the Complainant from registering it, or potentially with a view to selling it to the Respondent. Further, an Internet search for "bolle" has disclosed no references to businesses other than the Complainant's in the top 40 hits.

Moreover, to the Complainant's knowledge, the Respondent does not have prior rights to the word "bolle", nor is it commonly known under this name, whether as an individual, as a company or as another organization.

The Respondent has registered and uses the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Complainant is a well-known and worldwide group, present in over 50 countries. The BOLLE trademarks have acquired extensive and worldwide reputation and must be regarded as well-known trademarks. Following a well-established

case law, the Complainant's worldwide reputation and presence on the Internet indicate that, at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name, the Respondent knew, or at least should have known, the Complainant's prior trademarks existed.

In view of the Complainant's reputation, the Respondent should clearly have been aware of its prior rights on the trademarks and domain names consisting of BOLLE. Incidentally, the Respondent's actual knowledge of the Complainant's prior rights is indicated by the fact that the denomination "bolle" has been entirely reproduced in the disputed domain name.

It has already been ruled that knowledge of a corresponding trademark at the time of the registration of the domain name suggests bad faith. Furthermore, the forty-year gap between the filing of the Complainant's first trademark registration and the registration of the disputed domain name by the Respondent can, in certain circumstances, be an indicator of bad faith. Since the trademarks and domain names of the Complainant have been in existence for a long time, strongly used, it is hard to believe that Respondent coincidentally selected this precise domain name without any knowledge of the Respondent's prior rights to this denomination.

In view of these circumstances, it is even more unlikely that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's prior rights at the time it registered a domain name that identically reproduces the renowned trademarks BOLLE. The Respondent uses a privacy protection service, thereby preventing the Complainant from identifying its identity. Following well-established case law, the use of such service shows that the Respondent specifically tried to block or intentionally delay the disclosure of its identity or coordinates, which is an additional indication that the registration was carried out in bad faith.

Although it is not yet used as a website to sell products or services, this disputed domain name could very well be put to use by the Respondent at any point. Without control of the disputed domain name, the Complainant is unable to control the quality, accuracy and appropriateness of the content of the website.

B. Respondent

The Respondent 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. 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 BOLLE (without an "accent d'aigu") is reproduced within the disputed domain name. And the mark BOLLÉ (with an "accent d'aigu") is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark or marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, "group", 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 disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

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 Respondent has contended that the disputed domain name is not used and has never been used. This has also not been rebutted by the Respondent.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Policy, paragraph 4(a)(iii) requires that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used 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 Complainant has contended that its marks enjoy a global reputation and this has not been rebutted by the Respondent. The Panel has also noted, exercising its power to undertake limited factual research into matters of public record (see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.8), that the Complainant’s group operates under the name “Bollé Group”, e.g. as used in its LinkedIn profile.

On a balance of probabilities and certainly lacking a reply from the Respondent, the Panel finds it, taking into account the above, more likely than not that the Respondent had the Complainant and/or its marks in mind when registering the disputed domain name.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name 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, the Panel, again taking into account the reputation of the Complainant’s trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name 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 name <bollegroup.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Willem J. H. Leppink/

Willem J. H. Leppink

Sole Panelist

Date: August 5, 2026