

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Melvita (International) v. Ping An Shun, Yu Lin Ji Gong Shang Hang
Case No. D2026-3699

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Melvita (International), France, represented by IP Twins SAS, France.

The Respondent is Ping An Shun, Yu Lin Ji Gong Shang Hang, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <meivlta.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 18, 2026. On August 18, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 18, 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 (Registration Private / Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 19, 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 19, 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 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 Douglas Clark as the sole panelist in this matter on September 9, 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 part of the L'Occitane Group. The L'Occitane Group is a global, natural and organic ingredient-based cosmetics and well-being products manufacturer and retailer. One of its brands is MELVITA.

The MELVITA brand was created more than 40 years ago. In 2000, the first Melvita store opened in France. In 2009, the first Melvita store outside France was opened. Since then, Melvita has opened more than 50 stores around the world.

The Complainant holds numerous trademarks in the term MELVITA. In particular, the Complainant is the owner of the following trademarks:

- International trademark MELVITA No. 1783182 registered on October 4, 2023, covering goods in international classes 03, 04 and 05, which designates, inter alia, China;
- International trademark MELVITA No. 1209131 registered on January 14, 2014, covering goods in international classes 03, 05 and 30, which designates, inter alia, China; and
- French trademark MELVITA No. 4953428 registered on October 27, 2023, designating goods in international classes 03, 04 and 05.

The Respondent is reportedly an individual with an address in China.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 24, 2026. At the time of filing the Complaint, it resolved to a Chinese-language website displaying the Complainant's MELVITA trademark and purportedly providing “Melvita 官方产品防伪验证系统” (“Melvita Official Anti-Counterfeiting Verification System for Authentic Products” in English), at the bottom of the Respondent's webpage, the Complainant's official MELVITA logo was used, accompanied by a statement “欧舒丹旗下 精华油品牌” (“A skincare oil brand of the L'Occitane Group” in English). At the time of this Decision, it resolves to a parking page hosted by the Registrar where there are pay-per-click links to products such as “Melvita Eye Oil” and “Melvita Skin Care”.

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.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable 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. It is a clear misspelling of MELVITA by transposing the letters “i” and “l”. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9.

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 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 finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

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.

The Panel has no hesitation in finding that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith and is being used in bad faith. It is clear the Respondent knew of the Complainant when it registered the disputed domain name, as it comprises clear typo squatting of the Complainant’s trademark.

As set out in Section 4 above, at the time of filing the Complaint, the website associated with the disputed domain name prominently displayed the Complainant’s MELVITA trademark and logo, and purported to offer an official anti-counterfeiting verification service for the Complainant’s products.

By using the disputed domain name, 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 MELVITA trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and the services purportedly offered there. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute bad faith under the Policy.

In addition, the current “pay-per-click” advertisements for the products under the name “Melvita” also suggest the Respondent is making a commercial gain from the site. The fact that such links or content may be generated by a third party such as a registrar, or the fact that the Respondent itself may not have directly

profited, is a relevant consideration but would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 3.2.1 and 3.5.

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 <meivlta.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Douglas Clark/

Douglas Clark

Sole Panelist

Date: September 9, 2026