

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Interparfums v. Stephen Devey
Case No. D2026-3455

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Interparfums, France, internally represented.

The Respondent is Stephen Devey, United Arab Emirates.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <solferinoparis.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 August 4, 2026. On August 5, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 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 (Non-Communicated, Dynadot Privacy Service, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 11, 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 August 13, 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 August 14, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 3, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 4, 2026.

The Center appointed Emre Kerim Yardimci as the sole panelist in this matter on September 11, 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 in this administrative proceeding is the French company Interparfums, operating in the global fragrance business since 1982. It produces and distributes fragrance and fragrance-related products under license agreements with brand owners. The Complainant's parent company, Interparfums Inc., manages its business in two operating segments: European based operations, through its 72% owned subsidiary, the Complainant and United States based operations.

The Complainant is the owner of trademark rights on SOLFERINO and SOLFERINO PARIS, for perfume products, as follows:

- French Trademark SOLFERINO n° 4909177 in classes 3 and 4 registered on February 17, 2023;
- European Union Trademark SOLFERINO PARIS n° 019114034 in classes 3 and 4, applied for on December 2, 2024, and registered on April 17, 2025;
- International Trademark SOLFERINO n° 1740908 in classes 3 and 4 registered on March 10, 2023;
- United States of America Trademark SOLFERINO n° 7452320 in classes 3 and 4 registered on July 23, 2024;

The Complainant operates a website at <solferino-paris.com>.

On November 13, 2024, the Complainant issued a press release entitled "2025 outlook", announcing its forthcoming proprietary SOLFERINO brand and a collection of ten premium fragrances. The release also announced plans for a dedicated boutique and an e-commerce site. and the records also includes reports in Le Figaro on November 13, BFM Business and Basenotes on November 14, and Global Cosmetics News on November 19.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 2, 2024. The Registrar identified the Respondent as the registrant. The publicly available registration information used a privacy service.

The evidence includes a screenshot showing a premium domain purchase price of EUR 2,612.34 for the disputed domain name. The record does not show an active website operated by the Respondent at the disputed domain name.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's SOLFERINO and SOLFERINO PARIS trademarks in which it has rights.

The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar, and at the same time, incorporating the Complainant's well-known trademark SOLFERINO, and that the addition of the geographical term "Paris" reinforces the association between the domain name and the Complainant's trademark.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. It has not been authorized or licensed by the Complainant to use the SOLFERINO or SOLFERINO PARIS trademark.

The Complainant claims that the Respondent cannot assert that he has made or is currently making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The Complainant contends that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The Complainant claims that the Respondent must have known the Complainant's trademark when registering the disputed domain name and that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name for selling at the price of EUR 2,612.34. The Respondent also has hidden their identity by using privacy shield.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, 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;
- (ii) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) The disputed domain name has been registered in bad faith 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 registered rights in the SOLFERINO and SOLFERINO PARIS marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name wholly incorporates the Complainant's trademark SOLFERINO PARIS.

As regards the generic Top-Level Domain, it is typically disregarded under the confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.

For the reasons mentioned above, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's SOLFERINO PARIS trademark.

The Complainant has thus fulfilled paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The onus is upon the Complainant to make out a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and it is then for the Respondent to rebut this case.

The Panel accepts the Complainant's submissions that the Respondent does not appear to have been known by the disputed domain name, has not made demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name, and the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial use of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent has not filed a Response. It has no consent from the Complainant to register any domain name incorporating the Complainant's trademark, it has not used the disputed domain name for a bona fide offering of goods or services, and the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor is it making a noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Therefore, the Respondent has not come forward with any evidence or argument to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case. The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the second element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

In the circumstances of this case, and in view of the Panel's discussion above, the Panel finds that 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 disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant's SOLFERINO trademark predates the registration of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name reproduces the SOLFERINO PARIS mark in its entirety

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name was registered on the same day that the Complainant applied for its trademark SOLFERINO PARIS, a circumstance that supports a finding that the Respondent was targeting the Complainant and its mark.

The Panel furthermore accepts the claim of the Complainant that its official announcement of the launch of the SOLFERINO brand expressly identified Paris as its headquarters location. This creates a clear inference that the Respondent chose the geographical reference "Paris" directly associated with the Complainant and its newly launched SOLFERINO brand. The Respondent, who is in default, has failed to rebut this claim.

The record also shows that the disputed domain name was offered for sale through a third-party platform with a purchase price of EUR 2,612.34. In the circumstances of this case, the offer for sale of the disputed domain name for a price seemingly exceeding the out-of-pocket expenses clearly corroborates a finding of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy.

The Panel observed that the Respondent used a privacy shield. While the Respondent's use of a privacy service may not in itself constitute bad faith under the Policy, the Panel may still take it into account and draw adverse inferences. The use of the privacy shield in this case gives rise to the suspicion that the privacy shield was used to mask the identity of the true registrant and therefore reinforces the Panel's finding of bad faith..

From the above behavior of the Respondent and the targeting of the Complainant in light of the composition of the disputed domain name, its lack of participation in this proceeding and the lack of any claim to a credible good faith use to which the identical disputed domain name could be put The Panel concludes that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the disputed domain name to the Complainant or to a competitor of the Complainant.

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 <solferinoparis.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Emre Kerim Yardimci/

Emre Kerim Yardimci

Sole Panelist

Date: September 30, 2026