ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Vente-Privee.Com v. Gertrude Delatourette
Case No. D2026-2845

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Gertrude Delatourette, France.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <veepee-promo-code.com> is registered with CloudFlare, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 30, 2026. On June 30, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 1, 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 (DATA REDACTED) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 3, 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 8, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 July 10, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 30, 2026. The Respondent sent email communications to the Center on July 10 and August 4, 2026.

The Center appointed Christiane Féral-Schuhl as the sole panelist in this matter on August 7, 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 e-commerce company founded in 2001 and is one of the leading online retailers specialising in members-only flash sales across a wide range of sectors, including fashion, homeware, high-tech products, toys, sports equipment and travel.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademarks (the "VEEPEE Trademarks"), including the following:

- the European Union word mark VEEPEE, No. 017442245, registered on March 29, 2018, for goods and services in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43 and 45;

- the French figurative trademark Veepee, No. 4933049, registered on January 31, 2023, for goods and services in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43 and 45; and

- the European Union figurative trademark Veepee, No. 018832582, registered on February 18, 2026, for goods and services in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43 and 45.

The Complainant originally operated under the brand VENTE-PRIVÉE in France and several other European countries. In January 2019, it launched a rebranding strategy, adopting the name VEEPEE across all of its markets. Since then, the VEEPEE Trademarks has been promoted.

In 2024, the Complainant generated a turnover of approximately EUR 3.3 billion.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 1, 2026. At the time the Complaint was filed, it resolved to a website reproducing the VEEPEE Trademarks and impersonating the Complainant in order to deceive Internet users for commercial and financial gain. At the date of the decision, the disputed domain name is not active anymore.

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 confusingly similar to the VEEPEE Trademarks, as it incorporates the VEEPEE Trademarks in its entirety. The mere addition of the descriptive terms "code" and "promo" is insufficient to distinguish the disputed domain name from the Complainant's trademarks. On the contrary, those terms reinforce the likelihood of confusion, as they directly refer to promotional codes intended to be used on the Complainant's website and therefore increase the association with the Complainant and its business.

The Complainant further submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not been authorised, licensed or otherwise permitted to use the VEEPEE Trademarks or to register a domain name incorporating them. Moreover, the disputed domain name is not used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor for any legitimate non-commercial or fair use. To the contrary, the website to which the disputed domain name resolves prominently reproduces the VEEPEE Trademarks and repeatedly refers to the Complainant, thereby falsely suggesting an affiliation with the Complainant. The Respondent is merely using the Complainant's Trademarks to attract Internet users and induce them to generate referral credits for its own commercial benefit.

Finally, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Given the extensive use made of the VEEPEE Trademarks and the numerous references to the Complainant displayed on the associated website, the Respondent could not have been unaware of the Complainant's prior rights when registering the disputed domain name. The Respondent intentionally selected a domain name incorporating the Complainant's trademark in order to create a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the website. By reproducing the VEEPEE Trademarks and directly referring to the Complainant, the Respondent is clearly seeking to take unfair advantage of the reputation attached to the VEEPEE Trademarks by attracting Internet users searching for VEEPEE promotional codes through purported discount codes, before redirecting them to the Complainant’s official website through referral links from which the Respondent derives a financial benefit. The inconsistency between the Respondent’s stated identity and the identity reflected in the contact email address further supports a finding of bad faith, as it suggests an attempt to conceal the Respondent’s true identity and evade accountability.

B. Respondent

The Respondent submitted emails to the Center, stating that the website associated with the disputed domain name had been taken down. However, the Respondent did not otherwise reply to the Complainant's contentions or contest any of the allegations set out in the Complaint.

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 is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, “code” and “promo” may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms 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 Panel notes that there is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name or has been authorised, licensed or otherwise permitted by the Complainant to use the VEEPEE Trademarks.

Nor does the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. The disputed domain name resolved to an unaffiliated website reproducing the VEEPEE Trademarks and purporting to offer promotional codes for use on the Complainant's website. In fact, the website used purported promotional codes to induce Internet users to access the Complainant's official website through the Respondent's referral link, thereby generating referral credits for the Respondent in a manner contrary to the conditions governing the Complainant's referral program.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed as applicable to this case: passing off, or other types of fraud can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1.

Furthermore, the use of the terms "code" and "promo" in the disputed domain name impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.1.

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.

The Panel considers that the disputed domain name wholly incorporates the VEEPEE Trademarks together with the terms "promo" and "code". The Panel considers that, in light of the distinctiveness of the VEEPEE Trademarks, the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its trademark rights when registering the disputed domain name.

This conclusion is reinforced by the content of the website to which the disputed domain name resolved. The website reproduced the Complainant's trademarks, directly referred to the Complainant and its services. These circumstances leave no plausible explanation for the Respondent's choice of the disputed domain name other than an intention to target the Complainant and its business.

The disputed domain name was used in connection with a website purporting to provide VEEPEE promotional codes. Internet users were induced to copy what appeared to be a valid promotional code before being redirected to the Complainant's official website through the Respondent's referral link. Although the purported promotional code was not valid, the redirection generated referral credits for the Respondent. Such use demonstrates an intention to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the website.

The Panel further notes the inconsistency between the Respondent's stated identity and the identity reflected in the contact email address. In the circumstances of this case, this discrepancy further supports an inference of bad faith.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed passing off, or other types of fraud 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 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 <veepee-promo-code.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Christiane Féral-Schuhl/
Christiane Féral-Schuhl
Sole Panelist
Date: August 14, 2026