

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Vente-Privee.Com v. 333 3333, Create a glorious future together
Case No. D2026-2815

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Vente-Privee.Com, France, represented by Cabinet Degret, France.

The Respondent is 333 3333, Create a glorious future together, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <veepee.dog> and <veepee.family> are registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 29, 2026. On June 29, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 30, 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 / Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 30, 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 July 3, 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 July 6, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 26, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 29, 2026.

The Center appointed Alvaro Loureiro Oliveira as the sole panelist in this matter on August 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 Complainant, Vente-Privée.Com, is a French company established in 2001 and active in the e-commerce sector. It operates an online shopping platform offering discounted goods and services, including fashion, beauty, travel, entertainment, and other products. In early 2019, the Complainant undertook a rebranding process under which its activities were unified under the denomination VEEPEE.

The Complainant owns several trademark registrations, including:

- European Union figurative Trade Mark VENTE-PRIVEE, Registration No. 011991965, filed on July 17, 2013, and registered on January 3, 2014;
- European Union word Trade Mark VEEPEE, Registration No. 017442245, filed on November 8, 2017, and registered on March 29, 2018; and
- French figurative trademark VEEPEE, Registration No. 4,933,049, filed on January 31, 2023 and registered on February 24, 2023.

The above trademark registrations predate the registration of the disputed domain names.

The Complainant has operated under VEEPEE since 2019 and has submitted evidence of substantial commercial activity under that name. The record also contains evidence that the VEEPEE mark has been recognized in previous UDRP decisions and other domain name proceedings.

The disputed domain names <veepee.dog> and <veepee.family> were both registered on December 4, 2025. They are registered with the same Registrar and resolve to the same websites.

According to the evidence submitted with the Complaint, the disputed domain names both resolve to commercial websites in the English language which prominently reproduce the Complainant's VEEPEE trademark and logo and closely replicate the overall look and feel and trade dress of the Complainant's official website, including its visual presentation, while offering goods of the same nature as those offered by the Complainant.

The Registrar disclosed the registrant as "333 3333", with the organization identified as "Create a glorious future together".

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

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

As to the first element, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to its VEEPEE trademark. In particular, the disputed domain names reproduce the VEEPEE mark in its entirety, with the only addition being the respective Top-Level Domains ("TLDs") ".dog" and ".family".

As to the second element, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. The Complainant states that the Respondent is not commonly known by the VEEPEE name, has no relationship with the Complainant, and has never been authorized or licensed to use the Complainant's trademarks.

The Complainant further submits that the disputed domain names resolve to commercial websites reproducing the Complainant's VEEPEE trademark and logo and closely replicating the trade dress of the Complainant's official website, while offering goods of the same nature as those offered by the Complainant.

As to the third element, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. According to the Complainant, the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its VEEPEE trademark when registering the disputed domain names, as evidenced by the reproduction of the trademark and logo and the replication of the trade dress and visual presentation of the Complainant's website. The Complainant argues that the Respondent thereby seeks to attract Internet users to its websites by creating confusion with the Complainant and its trademark.

The Complainant further relies on the registrant information disclosed by the Registrar, arguing that the use of the names "333 3333" and "Create a glorious future together", together with apparently inaccurate or fabricated contact details, constitutes additional evidence of bad faith.

The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain names.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

The Policy, in its paragraph 4(a), determines that three elements must be present and duly proven by a complainant to obtain relief. These elements are:

- i. the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- ii. the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect to the disputed domain name; and
- iii. the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Respondent has not submitted a Response. Nevertheless, the Complainant must establish each of the three elements required under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy on the basis of the evidence submitted.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain names. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has established rights in the VEEPEE trademark, including the European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 017442245.

The disputed domain names <veepee.dog> and <veepee.family> reproduce the Complainant's VEEPEE trademark in its entirety. The applicable TLDs ".dog" and ".family" are not taken into account for purposes of the first element assessment.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names are identical to the Complainant's VEEPEE trademark.

The Panel finds that 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.

The Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Complainant has not authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its VEEPEE trademark or to register domain names incorporating that trademark. The record contains no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain names or by the name "Veepee".

Moreover, the disputed domain names which are themselves identical to the Complainant's mark resolve to commercial websites that prominently reproduce the Complainant's VEEPEE trademark and logo and closely replicate the overall look and feel and trade dress of the Complainant's official website, while offering goods of the same nature as those offered by the Complainant. Such use, which falsely suggests an affiliation with or endorsement by the Complainant, cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names.

The Respondent has not submitted a Response and has therefore failed to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case or otherwise demonstrate any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a non-exhaustive list of circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith.

The Panel finds that the Respondent was clearly aware of the Complainant and its VEEPEE trademark when registering the disputed domain names. The Complainant's VEEPEE trademark had been registered and used several years before the registration of the disputed domain names. Moreover, each of the disputed domain names reproduces the VEEPEE trademark in its entirety with no additions or alterations.

Any possibility that the Respondent independently selected the term "veepee" is further dispelled by the manner in which the disputed domain names have been used. The evidence submitted by the Complainant shows that both disputed domain names resolve to the same commercial websites which not only prominently reproduce the Complainant's VEEPEE trademark and logo, but also closely replicate the overall look and feel and trade dress of the Complainant's official website, while purporting to offer goods of the same nature as those offered by the Complainant.

In the Panel's view, the reproduction of the Complainant's trademark, logo, and trade dress leaves no plausible doubt that the Respondent was aware of and specifically targeted the Complainant when registering the disputed domain names. Such use is manifestly intended to impersonate the Complainant and to attract Internet users to the Respondent's websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of that website. The Panel therefore finds that these circumstances constitute evidence of registration and use in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel further notes the registrant information disclosed by the Registrar does not identify any individual registrant. In particular, the Respondent identified itself as "333 3333" and the organization as "Create a glorious future together". The evidence submitted with the amended Complaint indicates that elements of telephone information provided by the Respondent correspond to information associated with the Empire State Building, New York, United States, and the postal address seems incomplete. In the circumstances of this case, the provision of seemingly inaccurate or fictitious contact information constitutes an additional factor supporting the Panel's finding of bad faith.

Taking all of the above circumstances into account, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

The Panel therefore finds that the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 <veepee.dog> and <veepee.family> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Alvaro Loureiro Oliveira/

Alvaro Loureiro Oliveira

Sole Panelist

Date: September 7, 2026