

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

La Roche-Posay Laboratoire Dermatologique v. Jixu Nguyen
Case No. D2026-3505

1. The Parties

The Complainant is La Roche-Posay Laboratoire Dermatologique, France, represented by Dreyfus & associés, France.

The Respondent is Jixu Nguyen, Viet-Nam.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <laroche-posay.org> is registered with Porkbun LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 7, 2026. On August 7, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 8, 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 (Whois Privacy, Private by Design, LLC) 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 11, 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 25, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 14, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 15, 2026.

The Center appointed Theda König Horowicz 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.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a French company specialized in dermatological skincare and cosmetic products. Founded in 1975, the Complainant operates worldwide under the LA ROCHE-POSAY brand, including in Viet-Nam through an official local subsidiary La Roche-Posay Viet-Nam.

The Complainant owns several LA ROCHE-POSAY trademark registrations (hereafter “the LA ROCHE-POSAY Trademark” or “the Trademark”), including, but not limited to:

- International Trademark Registration No. 787605 for LA ROCHE-POSAY (word mark), in classes 3 and 5, registered on July 12, 2002, designating, inter alia, Japan, Australia, China, and the Republic of Korea.
- International Trademark Registration No. 1533143 for LA ROCHE-POSAY (word mark), in classes 3 and 5, registered on April 24, 2020, designating, inter alia, Viet-Nam.

The Complainant is also the owner of various domain names comprising LA ROCHE-POSAY including the domain name <laroche-posay.com>, which was registered on October 21, 1996, and is used in connection with the Complainant’s activities. In addition, the Complainant operates in Viet-Nam through its official local subsidiary, La Roche-Posay Viet-Nam.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 4, 2026. At the time of the filing of the Complaint, it redirected to the website of “8KBET”, an online gambling platform promoting sports betting, online casino services, lottery games and fish-shooting games, while also advertising allegedly secure transactions, recurring promotional offers and professional customer support.

In July 2026, the Complainant sent through its legal representatives a notification to the Registrar and the hosting provider requesting, without success, the blocking of the 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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the LA ROCHE-POSAY Trademark, which enjoys a worldwide reputation, as it reproduces the Complainant’s LA ROCHE-POSAY Trademark in its entirety. The structure of the disputed domain name <laroche-posay.org> enhances the false impression that it is related to the Complainant. The generic Top-Level-Domain (“gTLD”) “.org” is not to be taken into consideration. It is likely that the disputed domain name could mislead Internet users into thinking that it is official or, in some way, associated with the Complainant.

Furthermore, the Complainant alleges that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is neither affiliated with the Complainant in any way nor has it been authorized by the Complainant to use and register its LA ROCHE-POSAY Trademark, or to seek registration of any domain name incorporating said Trademark. The Respondent cannot claim prior rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, as the LA ROCHE-POSAY Trademark precedes the registration of

the disputed domain name by years. Furthermore, there is no evidence that the Respondent may be commonly known by the name LA ROCHE-POSAY. Moreover, the disputed domain name is virtually identical to the famous LA ROCHE-POSAY trademark of the Complainant and its official domain name. The disputed domain name redirects Internet users to the same gambling site, titled "8KBET", by continuously changing its redirections which cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods and services.

Finally, the Complainant submits that the Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain name in bad faith. Given the reputation of the LA ROCHE-POSAY Trademark and the fact that its registration significantly predates the registration of the disputed domain name, it is inconceivable that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without actual knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark rights. A quick LA ROCHE POSAY trademark or online search, would have revealed to the Respondent the existence of the Complainant and its Trademark. The absence of license from the Complainant to use its well-known trademark, the fact that its well-known trademark is reproduced in entirety and the redirection of the disputed domain name to a gambling website are factors of bad faith use.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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

- (i) the disputed domain name 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 disputed domain name; and
- (iii) 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 solely 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 the trademark LA ROCHE-POSAY 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. The only minor difference is the absence of a space between "La" and "Roche" in the disputed domain name which reads <laroche-posay.org> while the Complainant's mark is LA ROCHE-POSAY. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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.

There is no evidence that the Respondent has been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted by the Complainant to use the LA ROCHE-POSAY Trademark or to register a domain name incorporating it. Nor is there any indication that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or by the name LA ROCHE-POSAY. Furthermore, the disputed domain name which is identical to the Complainant’s trademark does not appear to have been used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Rather, it was used to resolve to a gambling website. The Respondent who remained silent in the proceedings has not evidenced that its gambling website was official or authorized in any manner. Such use of a domain name identical to a brand which has a high reputation creates a misleading impression of affiliation with or endorsement by the Complainant and cannot confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent. Nor is there any evidence of any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

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’s trademark significantly predates the registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant has shown that its trademark has been continuously used for decades in relation to cosmetic products, including through its official website, and has thus acquired a high reputation. Given the composition of the disputed domain name which is identical to the Complainant’s LA ROCHE-POSAY Trademark, there is no doubt that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its trademark rights when registering the disputed domain name. The Complainant has also established to be present in Viet-Nam where the Respondent is based through an affiliated La Roche-Posay company. It is therefore not conceivable that the Respondent did not know about the Complainant’s trademark when registering the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name is linked to a gambling website. The Respondent thus intentionally attempted to attract through the disputed domain name, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark.

Moreover, the Respondent's failure to submit a Response or otherwise communicate in this proceeding is further indicative of bad faith.

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 <laroche-posay.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Theda König Horowicz/

Theda König Horowicz

Sole Panelist

Date: October 13, 2026