

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Decathlon v. Nosheen Rizwan

Case No. D2026-2936

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Decathlon, France, represented by AARPI Scan Avocats, France.

The Respondent is Nosheen Rizwan, Pakistan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <theforclaz.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 3, 2026. On July 6, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 7, 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 July 7, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint.

The Center verified that 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 14, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 3, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 12, 2026.

The Center appointed Masato Dogauchi 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 limited company registered in 1984, specialized in the conception and retailing of sporting and leisure goods. Its origin dates back to 1976, when a self-service supermarket dedicated to sport and leisure products on France was open. It employs 101,000 employees in 1751 stores worldwide with annual sales of 15,6 billion EUR.

The trademark FORCLAZ was created in order to develop a new product line specializing in trekking and hiking activities. The Complainant has registered FORCLAZ trademarks, such as:

- French Trademark Registration No. 3181308 for FORCLAZ, registered on August 30, 2002;
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 007593726 for FORCLAZ, registered February 1, 2010; and
- International Trademark Registration No. 800425 for FORCLAZ, registered on February 28, 2003.

The Complainant also registered and is using the domain name <forclaz.fr> registered on June 29, 2017.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 22, 2025. The disputed domain name is currently used to redirect to the website "www.theforclaz.com" selling products under the name "The Forclaz" that are purportedly copies of the Complainant's products.

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.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 15(a), a panel shall decide a case on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable. Since the Respondent has not made any substantive arguments in this case, the following decision is rendered on the basis of the Complainant's contentions and other evidence submitted by the Complainant.

In accordance with the Policy, paragraph 4(a), in order to qualify for a remedy, the Complainant must prove each of the following:

- (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 of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name includes the entirety of the trademark FORCLAZ owned by the Complainant and is clearly recognizable in the disputed domain name. The additional term "the" and the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD"), ".com" in the disputed domain may be disregarded in determining the first element as the latter is a standard registration requirement. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.8 and 1.11.1.

Although the addition of other terms here, "the", may bear on the 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 names and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

Taken together, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark in which the Complainant has rights. Accordingly, 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 with 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 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 has been doing business in goods and products related to trekking and hiking activities since 2002 under its FORCLAZ trademark.

The Panel finds it unlikely that the disputed domain name was registered without knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark, given the longstanding reputation of both the Complainant and the trademark, and also considering the subsequent use of the disputed domain name. The Respondent's aim in registering and using the disputed domain name appears to be to attract Internet users to an online location for potential gain by taking unfair advantage of and creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's well-known trademark.

With regard to the requirement that the disputed domain name is being used in bad faith, the Panel notes that, according to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the disputed domain name resolves to the website "www.theforclaz.com" selling products under the name "The Forclaz" that are purportedly copies of the Complainant's products. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for such illegitimate activity by impersonating the Complainant constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

Accordingly, the Panel finds 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 name <theforclaz.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Masato Dogauchi/

Masato Dogauchi

Sole Panelist

Date: August 18, 2026