

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

La Roche-Posay Laboratoire Dermatologique v. Antonio Bonderas,
La Roche Posay
Case No. D2026-2896

1. The Parties

The Complainant is La Roche-Posay Laboratoire Dermatologique, France, represented by Dreyfus & associés, France.

The Respondent is Antonio Bonderas, La Roche Posay, France.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <eu-laroche-posay.com> is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 2, 2026. On July 2, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On the same day, 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 (Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0178513146) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 10, 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 15, 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 16, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 5, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Christiane Féral-Schuhl as the sole panelist in this matter on August 17, 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 company established in 1975 and specialized in the cosmetics and beauty sector.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademarks for LA ROCHE-POSAY (the “LA ROCHE-POSAY Trademarks”), including:

- International Trademark LA ROCHE-POSAY No. 787605, registered on July 12, 2002, in Classes 3 and 5, and designating, inter alia, Australia, Germany, Portugal, Denmark, Croatia, Ukraine, and Morocco;
- International Trademark LA ROCHE-POSAY No. 1533143, registered on April 24, 2020, in Classes 3 and 5, and designating, inter alia, Brazil, Australia, China, the Republic of Korea, Thailand, and Viet Nam; and
- European Union Trademark LA ROCHE-POSAY No. 018616412, registered on April 12, 2022, in Classes 3, 9, 35, and 41.

The Complainant also owns the domain name <laroche-posay.com>, registered on October 21, 1996.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 4, 2026. At the time of the Complainant’s preliminary investigations, the disputed domain name resolved to a website purporting to operate as an online store, reproducing the Complainant’s name and visual elements and offering cosmetic products at discounted prices under the Complainant’s name.

The Complainant first contacted the Registrar to request that the disputed domain name be blocked and subsequently contacted the hosting provider to request that the website be taken down. The hosting provider complied with this request. As of the date of this Decision, the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive page displaying the message “This store is unavailable”.

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 LA ROCHE-POSAY Trademarks, as it incorporates the LA ROCHE-POSAY Trademarks in their entirety. According to the Complainant, the addition of the prefix “eu”, corresponding to the abbreviation for the European Union, does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity and may instead suggest an association with a European affiliate of the Complainant. The Complainant further submits that the omission of the hyphen is insufficient to distinguish the disputed domain name from the LA ROCHE-POSAY Trademarks, which remain clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name, while the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.com” should be disregarded for the purpose of assessing confusing similarity.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not been licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted to use the LA ROCHE-POSAY Trademarks, and no relationship exists between the Parties. The Complainant also

submits that there is no evidence that the Respondent is, or has ever been, commonly known by the disputed domain name, and that no objective evidence supports the existence of an entity genuinely named “La Roche Posay” at the address disclosed by the Respondent. According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name was used to direct Internet users to a website reproducing the LA ROCHE-POSAY Trademarks, the Complainant’s logo and visual elements, and offering for sale cosmetic products at discounted prices under the Complainant’s name, thereby creating a false impression of affiliation with the Complainant. The Complainant submits that such use cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or otherwise give rise to rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Finally, the Complainant argues that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant submits that it is implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant and the LA ROCHE-POSAY Trademarks when registering the disputed domain name, particularly given that the Complainant’s trademark rights significantly predate its registration and that the disputed domain name reproduces the LA ROCHE-POSAY Trademarks. The Complainant further notes that the Respondent appears to have used the Complainant’s trademark as part of its purported registrant identity while providing an address at which the Complainant’s research revealed no corresponding entity named “La Roche Posay”, thereby creating the misleading appearance of a connection with the Complainant. According to the Complainant, the Respondent used the disputed domain name to operate a fake online store impersonating the Complainant, offering purported LA ROCHE-POSAY products for sale, reproducing the Complainant’s trademarks, logo and visual elements, and collecting personal information from Internet users, thereby intentionally attracting Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the LA ROCHE-POSAY Trademarks. The Complainant further submits that consumers have actually been deceived by the website, including at least one consumer who placed and paid for an order without receiving either an order confirmation or the products purchased. According to the Complainant, these circumstances demonstrate that the disputed domain name was registered and used in bad faith.

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 LA ROCHE-POSAY Trademarks 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, the prefix “eu” 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.

Indeed, the disputed domain name incorporates the LA ROCHE-POSAY Trademarks in their entirety, preceded only by the geographical prefix “eu”, a common acronym referring to the European Union. The LA ROCHE-POSAY Trademarks therefore remain clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name. The omission of the hyphen does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. Furthermore, as is well

established, the gTLD (".com") is disregarded for the purpose of the confusing similarity analysis. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's LA ROCHE-POSAY Trademarks.

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.

In particular, there is no evidence that the Respondent has been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted by the Complainant to use the LA ROCHE-POSAY Trademarks or to register a domain name incorporating them. Nor is there any indication that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or by the name "La Roche Posay". In this respect, while the Respondent appears to have used the name "La Roche Posay" as part of its purported registrant identity, there appears to be no evidence in the record that any entity genuinely operating under that name exists at the address provided by the Respondent. Furthermore, the disputed domain name does not appear to have been used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Rather, it was used to resolve to a website reproducing the LA ROCHE-POSAY Trademarks, the Complainant's logo and visual elements, and purporting to offer LA ROCHE-POSAY cosmetic products at discounted prices under the Complainant's name. Such use, which creates a misleading impression of affiliation with or endorsement by the Complainant, cannot confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent. Nor is there any evidence of any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed as applicable to this case: copycat sites, 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.

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 Complainant's Trademarks significantly predate the registration of the disputed domain name. Given the composition of the disputed domain name, which incorporates the LA ROCHE-POSAY Trademarks in their entirety, preceded only by the geographical prefix "eu", a common acronym referring to the European Union, and its subsequent use for a website reproducing the Complainant's trademarks, logo and visual elements and purporting to offer LA ROCHE-POSAY products for sale, the Panel finds that the Respondent was clearly aware of the Complainant and its trademark rights when registering the disputed domain name. The Respondent's apparent use of misleading registrant details further supports this conclusion.

As regards use in bad faith, prior to its deactivation, the disputed domain name resolved to an online store reproducing the LA ROCHE-POSAY Trademarks, the Complainant's logo and visual elements, and purporting to offer LA ROCHE-POSAY cosmetic products for sale at discounted prices, thereby creating the false impression that the website was operated, authorized, or endorsed by the Complainant. The evidence further indicates that the website collected personal information from Internet users and that at least one consumer was deceived into placing and paying for an order without receiving an order confirmation or the products ordered. The Panel considers that such use constitutes an intentional attempt to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks. The fact that the disputed domain name currently resolves to an inactive page following the deactivation of the website does not alter the above findings.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed as applicable to this case: copycat sites, 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 <eu-laroche-posay.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Christiane Féral-Schuhl/

Christiane Féral-Schuhl

Sole Panelist

Date: August 24, 2026