

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

MICROMANIA GROUP v. Farouk Sani

Case No. D2026-3764

1. The Parties

The Complainant is MICROMANIA GROUP, France, represented by AARPI Scan Avocats, France.

The Respondent is Farouk Sani, Nigeria.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <micrmania.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 21, 2026. On August 24, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 25, 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 27, 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 September 2, 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 September 9, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 29, 2026. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on September 7, 2026.

The Center appointed Willem J. H. Leppink as the sole panelist in this matter on October 8, 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 following facts are undisputed.

The Complainant is a French company specialized in the sale of video games, game consoles in retail shops and online as well. It was founded in 1983.

The Complainant employs more than 1,500 people in France and has an over EUR 500 million turnover and has nearly 2.9 million customers.

The Complainant operates also on the Internet at the main website "www.micromania.fr", and owns several domain name registrations for MICROMANIA, including <micromania.com>, <micromania.eu> and <micromania.net>.

The Complainant owns several trademark registrations for MICROMANIA, among which:

- French Trademark Registration No. 3452198 for MICROMANIA, registered on September 25, 2006, for services in classes 9, 35 and 41;
- French Trademark Registration No. 3453569 for MICROMANIA, registered on September 29, 2006, for goods and services in classes 16, 25, 28, 38 and 42;
- International Trademark Registration No. 933880 for MICROMANIA, registered on March 16, 2007, for goods and services in classes 9, 16, 25, 28, 35, 38, 41 and 42, and designating the Benelux, Switzerland, Germany, Italy, Poland, Portugal, and the Russian Federation.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 1, 2026 and at the time of filing the Complaint and rendering this decision, it resolved to a GoDaddy page mentioning that the disputed domain name was for sale at a price of USD 4,968.

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 the following.

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's "MICROMANIA" prior rights as it wholly incorporates it, with omission of one letter "o" which will be considered as a minor alteration.

The Complainant has never given any authorization or permission to the Respondent to register or to use its trademarks, company name or domain names including "MICROMANIA". The Respondent is not in any way related to the Complainant's business, is not one of its distributors and does not carry out any activity for or has any business with it. The Respondent is also not commonly known under the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name is not used to promote a bona fide offering of goods or services, not to support a noncommercial legitimate use.

The disputed domain name resolves to a webpage offering it for sale at a price exceeding its market value.

The MICROMANIA trademarks and company name were registered long before the disputed domain name was registered. The mere absence of right or legitimate interest of the Respondent should point out that the disputed domain name has not been registered in good faith. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith. The intended purpose has to be commercial gain and speculation, through the resale of the disputed domain name at a price that significantly exceeds the costs associated with its registration.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not substantively reply to the Complainant's contentions. It only replied to an email sent by the Center through the Registrar. In this reply email, sent to the Center on September 7, 2026, the Respondent asked what the next step was.

6. Discussion and Findings

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.

A domain name which consists of a variation of a trademark (typically a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling, referred to as typosquatting), is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9. The Panel finds that this is the case here. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy.

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 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.

Generally speaking, panels have found that the practice as such of registering a domain name for subsequent resale (including for a profit) would not by itself support a claim that the respondent registered the domain name in bad faith with the primary purpose of selling it to a trademark owner (or its competitor). However, circumstances may indicate that a domain name was registered for the bad-faith purpose of selling it to a trademark owner, such as a typo of a well-known mark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.1.

The Panel finds that this is the case. The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions, in particular on the notoriety of its MICROMANIA mark and on the typo nature of the disputed domain name. Although a respondent is not obliged to participate in a proceeding under the Policy, but if it fails to do so, reasonable facts asserted by a complainant may be taken as true, and appropriate inferences, may be drawn.

The Panel thus finds that the Respondent has been in bad faith when registering and using the disputed domain name.

As a result, 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 <micrmania.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Willem J. H. Leppink/

Willem J. H. Leppink

Sole Panelist

Date: October 8, 2026