

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Louis Dreyfus Trademarks B.V. v. lao xi
Case No. D2026-3456

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Louis Dreyfus Trademarks B.V., Netherlands (Kingdom of the), represented by Inlex IP Expertise, France.

The Respondent is lao xi, Hong Kong, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ldc2.it.com> is registered with Gname.COMPTE Ltd. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 4, 2026. On August 12, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 13, 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 (Private Person) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 13, 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 13, 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 19, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 8, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 9, 2026.

The Center appointed Áron László as the sole panelist in this matter on September 21, 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.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name is a third-level domain name falling under the .it.com Dispute Resolution Policy which provides that the registrants agree to abide by the results of a UDRP proceeding if informal resolution in coordination with IT.com Domains is unsuccessful. The Complainant has provided evidence that it filed an abuse complaint with IT.com Domains, and the Panel has received no confirmation that any settlement had taken place under the it.com Dispute Resolution Procedure. The Panel will accordingly proceed to a decision under the UDRP.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a Dutch company belonging to the Louis Dreyfus group, a longstanding global merchant and processor of agricultural commodities founded in 1851. The group operates in over 100 countries within the global agricultural trade sector and has a significant commercial presence in multiple jurisdictions.

The Complainant owns and manages the intellectual property rights associated with the Louis Dreyfus group, including the trademark LDC, which is claimed to represent the abbreviation of "Louis Dreyfus Company". The record reflects that the Complainant holds an extensive portfolio of trademark registrations for LDC across numerous jurisdictions and classes of goods and services. Representative registrations include:

- Benelux trademark No. 1476212 for LDC, registered on March 22, 2023;
- International Registration No. 1729911 for LDC, registered on April 7, 2023, and designating, inter alia, China;
- Brazilian trademark No. 501729911 for LDC, registered on October 29, 2024.

The Complainant operates an extensive domain name portfolio incorporating the LDC mark, including <ldc.com>, <ldcorp.com> and <ldcommodities.com>, which are used in connection with its global commercial operations and corporate communications.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 16, 2026. The Registrar's verification response disclosed the registrant as "lao xi", with a contact address in Hong Kong, China.

The evidence submitted by the Complainant demonstrates that the disputed domain name was used in connection with a fraudulent investment platform. In particular, the website at the disputed domain name reproduced the Complainant's LDC name, logo, and corporate presentation. It displayed "App", "Top up", "Withdrawal", and "Customer" functions, promoted "Higher Recharge, Higher Returns", encouraged users to build teams and claim salaries, and advertised a purported investment product described as "PO NO.1" with a 180-day period, a minimum subscription of Philippine Pesos ("PHP") 1,200, a daily profit of PHP 200.4, and a purported 16.7% daily return.

A member of the public contacted the Complainant on July 11, 2026, to ask whether the investment website was part of the company. Separately, a LinkedIn user reported that persons claiming to represent the Complainant had encouraged investment with promises of high returns. The Complainant has published an official warning entitled "Beware of Fake Payment Platforms", explaining that unaffiliated actors have used LDC's name and trademarks on fake payment and earning platforms.

Following the Complainant's abuse report filed on July 26, 2026, IT.com Domains confirmed that the disputed domain name had been placed on ServerHold, thereby disabling resolution at registry level. As of the date of this Decision, no content is available at the disputed domain name.

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.

With respect to the first element, the Complainant submits that it owns a substantial international portfolio of registered trademarks incorporating or consisting of “LDC”, including Benelux and International registrations that predate the registration of the disputed domain name by several years. The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name <ldc2.it.com> incorporates the LDC mark in its entirety. The addition of the numeral “2” is said to be a minor element that may be understood as denoting a second platform, version, or iteration, and therefore may reinforce, rather than dispel, an assumption of affiliation with the Complainant. The Complainant further submits that the third level domain “.it.com” is a technical registration component and does not prevent the mark from remaining immediately recognisable.

With respect to the second element, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant submits that it has never licensed, authorised, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the LDC trademarks or to register any domain name incorporating “LDC”, and that no business or other relationship exists between the parties. The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was used to host a fraudulent investment platform that reproduced LDC’s name, logo, and corporate imagery, and that such use — involving impersonation and deceptive solicitation of investment funds — cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. The Complainant relies on [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) (as mistakenly referenced by the Complainant), section 2.13.1, and prior decisions.

With respect to the third element, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant submits that the Respondent’s knowledge of the Complainant and its rights is established by the content of the website itself, which reproduced the Complainant’s trademark, logo, corporate presentation, and imagery. The Complainant argues that the composition of the disputed domain name, placing the LDC trademark at the beginning of the registrable label followed only by the numeral “2”, suggests an additional or updated official LDC platform, and that the concealment of registrant information through a privacy service further supports the inference of bad-faith targeting. The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was actively used to attract Internet users to a fraudulent investment platform for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s LDC trademarks as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement, falling within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The Complainant further relies on [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) (as mistakenly referenced by the Complainant), section 3.4, noting that the use of a domain name for impersonation, phishing, or other fraudulent activity is manifestly indicative of bad faith. The Complainant submits that the subsequent placement of the disputed domain name on ServerHold does not cure the Respondent’s prior fraudulent conduct, and that the Respondent remains the holder of a domain name capable of reactivation or further abuse.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to “decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable”.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that a complainant must prove each of the following three elements to obtain an order that a domain name should be cancelled or transferred:

- i. the domain name registered by the respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or

- service mark in which the complainant has rights; and
- ii. the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and
- iii. the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

In view of the Respondent's failure to submit a Response, the Panel shall decide this dispute on the basis of the Complainant's undisputed representations pursuant to paragraphs 5(f), 14(a) and 15(a) of the Rules and draw such inferences as it considers appropriate pursuant to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules.

The Panel is entitled to accept all reasonable allegations set forth in a complaint. However, the Panel may deny remedy where a complaint contains mere conclusory or unsubstantiated arguments. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.3.

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 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 the numeral "2", 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 third level domain ".it.com", like a TLD, is a technical requirement and shall be disregarded, by analogy with [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

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.

The Complainant has asserted that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant has submitted that it had never licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the LDC trademarks or to register any domain name incorporating "LDC", and that no business or other relationship existed between the parties. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here claimed as fraud, impersonation, and passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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, on the balance of probabilities, the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its trademarks, since the website available at the disputed domain name reproduced the Complainant's name, logo, corporate presentation, and imagery. The Complainant's trademark registrations predate the registration of the disputed domain name by several years.

The composition of the disputed domain name, consisting of the Complainant's LDC trademark with the addition of the numeral "2" falsely suggests an affiliation with the Complainant. The numeral "2" in the disputed domain name can be falsely understood to represent an updated, newer version of the Complainant's services.

According to the Complainant, the website operating under the disputed domain name was misrepresenting the Complainant. Thus, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was actively used to attract Internet users to a fraudulent investment platform for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's LDC trademarks as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement, falling within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here claimed as fraud, impersonation, and passing off, constitutes 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 <ldc2.it.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

Áron László

Sole Panelist

Date: October 5, 2026