

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

YANTEC SAS v. Wilma Young
Case No. D2026-3401

1. The Parties

The Complainant is YANTEC SAS, France, represented by MWS Avocats, France.

The Respondent is Wilma Young, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <xanlite-stores.com> is registered with Gname.com Pte. Ltd. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 31, 2026. On August 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 5, 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 August 7, 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 amendment to the Complaint on August 11, 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 August 12, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 1, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 3, 2026.

The Center appointed Alissia Shchichka as the sole panelist in this matter on September 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 company incorporated under the laws of France, with its registered office in Clichy, France. The Complainant markets lighting products under the trademark XANLITE.

The Complainant has provided evidence demonstrating that it is the registered owner of several trademarks, including, but not limited to the following:

- French Trademark Registration No. 98764371, registered on December 15, 1998, for the figurative trademark XANLITE, in classes 11 and 35;
- French Trademark Registration No. 3903103, registered on March 7, 2012, for the word trademark XANLITE, in classes 9 and 11;
- International Trademark Registration No. 891146, registered on May 12, 2006, for the figurative trademark XANLITE, in classes 8, 9, 11, and 20; and
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 010109891, registered on December 9, 2011, for the figurative trademark XANLITE, in classes 8, 9 and 11.

The Complainant also holds the domain names <xanlite-store.fr> and <xanlite-store.com>, both registered on September 14, 2017, which are used in connection with its official website.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 27, 2026.

The disputed domain name resolves to a French-language website displaying the Complainant's trademarks and offering for sale lighting products purportedly marketed under the Complainant's XANLITE trademark. The website also reproduces photographs of products from the Complainant's official collections.

The Respondent, according to the disclosed Whois information for the disputed domain name, is purportedly located in the United States of America.

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 its XANLITE trademark is highly distinctive.

According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name reproduces its XANLITE trademark in its entirety.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. In particular, the Complainant submits that the Respondent has no prior rights in the XANLITE sign as the XANLITE mark has been registered and used by the Complainant for decades, and the Respondent had no authorization to register and use the disputed domain name. The Complainant also asserts that the disputed domain name is used in connection with a website reproduces its trademarks and offers lighting products, thereby imitating the Complainant's activities and online presence without authorization.

Finally, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. In particular, the Complainant relies on the Respondent's unauthorized use of its XANLITE trademark and the deliberate registration of a domain name that differs from the Complainant's own domain name only by the addition of the letter "s". The Complainant further submits that the associated website reproduces photographs from its official product collections, as well as its trademarks, in order to attract Internet users

for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website or of the products offered on that website.

The Complainant also contends that the contact information displayed on the associated website is incomplete and false, which, in its view, further supports a finding of bad faith. The Complainant asserts that such conduct harms and disrupts its business.

Accordingly, the Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Substantive Issues

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant carries the burden of proving:

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

The Respondent's default in the case at hand does not automatically result in a decision in favor of the Complainant, however, paragraph 5(f) of the Rules provides that if the Respondent does not submit a response, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel shall decide the dispute based upon the Complaint.

Further, according to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, the Panel may draw such inferences from the Respondent's failure to submit a response as it considers appropriate.

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, "stores", 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 Complainant has confirmed that the Respondent was not authorized to use the XANLITE trademark or to seek registration of any domain name incorporating the trademark. There is no evidence showing that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.3. On the contrary, the Respondent is identified in the Registrar’s Whois database by the name which does not resemble the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name resolved to a website displaying the Complainant’s trademark, color scheme, and uses a similar favicon. The Panel further notes that the website contained no disclaimer indicating the absence of any relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent. These elements support a finding that the Respondent sought to impersonate the Complainant.

Panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, copycat sites, and 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 further finds that the Respondent’s website was deliberately designed to create confusion as to its association with the Complainant and its trademarks, in order to divert traffic, exploit the Complainant’s reputation for commercial gain. Such conduct can never be regarded as a bona fide offering of goods or services under the Policy.

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.

Therefore, the Panel concludes that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and the Complainant has met its burden under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

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 observes that the Complainant's XANLITE trademark registrations predate the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark in its entirety, together with a hyphen and the term "stores". The Panel considers that the composition of the disputed domain name may lead Internet users to believe that the disputed domain name refers to an official online store of the Complainant, particularly given that, the disputed domain name is almost identical to the Complainant's domain name <xanlite-store.com>, differing only by the addition of the letter "s". In these circumstances, and in light of the content of the website to which the disputed domain name resolves, the Panel finds that the Respondent was likely aware of the Complainant's business and trademark at the time of registration. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name resolves to a website displaying the Complainant's trademark, visual identity, and product imagery without authorization, and offering purported XANLITE products. Such use creates the misleading impression that the website is affiliated with or operated by the Complainant. The overall presentation of the website supports a finding of impersonation or passing off. Panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, impersonation or passing off, or other types of fraud constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

In the Panel's view, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website, for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks regarding the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website or the products offered on it. Pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, this constitutes evidence of registration and use of a disputed domain name in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

Based on the available record, 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 <xanlite-stores.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Alissia Shchichka/

Alissia Shchichka

Sole Panelist

Date: September 12, 2026