

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Creations Henry Jacques v. Theophile Luron
Case No. D2026-3157

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Creations Henry Jacques, France, represented by MIIP MADE IN IP, France.

The Respondent is Theophile Luron, France.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <maisonhenryjacques.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 17, 2026. On July 17, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 20, 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 July 22, 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 27, 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 28, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 17, 2026. The Respondent sent email communications to the Center on July 20, 2026, and July 22, 2026. The Center sent an email to the parties to explore settlement options on July 22, 2026.

The Center appointed Vincent Denoyelle as the sole panelist in this matter on August 25, 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 luxury perfume house established in France in 1975 and its perfumes are available in several countries and sold in exclusive department stores including Harrods in London.

The Complainant is the owner of several trade marks including HENRY JACQUES (the HENRY JACQUES trade mark) including the following:

- French trade mark HJ HENRY JACQUES, registered under number 1361067, filed on May 31, 1985;
- French trade mark HENRY JACQUES, registered under number 3817208 on July 15, 2011; and
- International trade mark registration HENRY JACQUES registered on September 22, 2011, under number 1097994.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 30, 2026.

The disputed domain name used to point to a parking page with pay-per-click ("PPC") links relating to perfumes. The disputed domain name points to a Registrar webpage offering the disputed domain name for sale for a price of EUR 1,277 and at the time of the filing of the Complaint, for a price of EUR 25,000.

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 HENRY JACQUES trade mark.

The Complainant has carried out a trade mark search for the term "Maison Henry Jacques" and did not find any corresponding trade mark in the name of the Respondent. The Complainant points to the previous and current use of the disputed domain name to conclude that neither type of use can be regarded as a legitimate or fair use. In addition, the Complainant states that it found no evidence of any use or intention to use the disputed domain name by the Respondent in connection with the offering of goods or services that might have demonstrated any legitimacy on the part of the Respondent.

Turning to bad faith, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name has never been used in connection with an active and legitimate website, because from the moment it was registered, it redirected to a parking page with no actual activity and it then redirected to a page offering the disputed domain name for sale at an exorbitant price. The Complainant contends that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name to intentionally seek to attract Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion as to its origin or affiliation.

B. Respondent

The Respondent sent email communications to the Center on July 20, 2026, and July 22, 2026, essentially arguing that:

- The names Henry and Jacques are very common names in France;
- There is no trade mark registration in the term “Maison Henry Jacques”;
- The Respondent is free to keep the disputed domain name for a future project;
- As the Respondent was not sure that he would secure funds for his project, he decided to sell the disputed domain name.

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

The entirety of the HENRY JACQUES trade 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, “maison”, 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.

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 the disputed domain name used to point to a parking page with PPC links targeting the Complainant's core product to then point to a Registrar page offering the disputed domain name for sale for an amount of EUR 25,000, far in excess of possible out-of-pocket costs.

The Panel also notes that the HENRY JACQUES trade mark is reproduced identically in the disputed domain name, preceded by the term "Maison" which is commonly used in the Complainant's industry and in the luxury sector more generally.

The past and current uses of the disputed domain name as well as the composition of the disputed domain name leave no doubt as to the Respondent's intent to target the Complainant and to free-ride the Complainant's trade mark and goodwill.

The Panel considers that the nature of the disputed domain name creates a risk of implied affiliation.

[WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1

The informal communications sent by the Respondent confirm the Panel's findings as they are merely self-serving and offer no credible explanation as to how the Respondent could possibly justify having used or intending to use the disputed domain name in a legitimate manner. The Panel further notes that the Respondent did not provide evidence of its alleged use.

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 finds that the Respondent must have registered the disputed domain name in bad faith with full knowledge of the Complainant's HENRY JACQUES trade mark given (i) that the HENRY JACQUES trade mark significantly predates the registration of the disputed domain name, (ii) the disputed domain name reproduces the HENRY JACQUES trade mark of the Complainant identically, (iii) the targeted choice of term, here "maison", added to the Complainant's trade mark in the disputed domain name, (iv) the fact that a Google search for the terms "Maison Henry Jacques" or "Henry Jacques" generates results predominantly referring to the Complainant and (v) the use, very shortly after registration, of the disputed domain name to point to a webpage containing PPC links targeting the Complainant's business sector.

As for use of the disputed domain name in bad faith, given the circumstances of the present case, including the composition of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that the past and current use of the disputed domain name are precisely the types of uses that the Policy is designed to tackle.

The current use of the disputed domain name (on sale for EUR 1,277 and previously for EUR 25,000) falls squarely within paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy as it indicates that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of selling the disputed domain name to the Complainant who is the owner of the HENRY JACQUES trade mark or to a competitor of the Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name.

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 <maisonhenryjacques.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Vincent Denoyelle/

Vincent Denoyelle

Sole Panelist

Date: September 8, 2026