ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

France Televisions v. Affaire conclue, Elton Mask
Case No. D2026-2928

1. The Parties

The Complainant is France Televisions, France, represented by Cabinet Lavoix, France.

The Respondent is Affaire conclue, Elton Mask, France.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <affaireconclue-francetv.com> is registered with Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 3, 2026. On July 3, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 4, 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 (Unknown third party) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 6, 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 7, 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 8, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 28, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 30, 2026.

The Center appointed William Lobelson 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

The Complainant is the French national public television broadcaster France Television, also trading as FRANCE TV.

Among its various entertainment programs, the Complainant has been broadcasting since 2017 a show named “Affaire Conclue”, where members of the public bring in an item to be appraised by an auctioneer before it is sold to professional buyers in the auction room.

The Complainant has documented the success and notoriousness of the show, which is on air daily and promoted on social media.

The Complainant’s trademark FRANCE TV is registered, through:

- French trademark No. 3827939 registered on August 26, 2011
- International trademark No.1 109 946 registered on Nov 2, 2011

The disputed domain name <affaireconclue-francetv.com> was registered on April 24, 2026.

It is directed to a web page where a photograph featuring several of the protagonists of the Complainant’s television show “Affaire Conclue”, presenting itself as the program’s official website, and invites members of the public to apply for selection to participate in the show. A submission form prompts users to provide their personal contact details, together with photographs of items they wish to sell for appraisal. Furthermore, email records have been set up and an email address is provided the website.

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 its earlier trademark, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and that the disputed domain name has been registered and used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Notwithstanding the default of the Respondent, it remains incumbent on the Complainant to make out its case in all respects under the Rules set out in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy. Namely, the Complainant must prove that:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights (paragraph 4(a)(i));
(ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name (paragraph 4(a)(ii)); and
(iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith (paragraph (a)(iii)).

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, namely FRANCE TV, for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Complainant's 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.

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 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 particularly by asserting that the Respondent is not affiliated with it in any way and that it never authorized the Respondent to use its trademark as part of the disputed domain name. The Complainant contends that the Respondent does not make any bona fide or legitimate non-commercial fair use of the disputed domain name.

In addition, the evidence filed in support of the Complaint show the disputed domain name has been used to impersonate the Complainant. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here impersonation, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1.

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 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 disputed domain name reproduces an earlier mark of the Complainant;
- It is directed to a website dedicated to the TV program that the Complainant broadcasts under its trademarks;
- The Respondent uses on its web page the title of the TV program, a photograph of the crew of the said show and invites internet users to enter their contact details with a view to being selected to participate in the show; and
- The Respondent has created an email address composed with the disputed domain name, thus revealing an intention to further impersonate the Complainant and/or for phishing purposes.

It is clear from the composition and use of the disputed domain name that the Respondent was aware of and targeting the Complainant and its trademark when it registered the disputed domain name. Moreover, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here, claimed impersonation, supports a finding of 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 <affaireconclue-francetv.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/William Lobelson/
William Lobelson
Sole Panelist
Date: August 7, 2026