

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Association des Centres Distributeurs E. Leclerc – A.C.D. Lec v. E-LECLERC
scalandes.leclerc

Case No. D2026-3772

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Association des Centres Distributeurs E. Leclerc – A.C.D. Lec, France, represented by MIIP MADE IN IP, France.

The Respondent is E-LECLERC scalandes.leclerc, France.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <scalandes-leclerc.com> is registered with Wild West Domains, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 24, 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 26, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 26, 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 27, 2026. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on August 27, 2026. On August 31, 2026, the Center confirmed to the Parties that it will proceed with the proceedings. The Respondent sent no further communications.

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 7, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 27, 2026.

The Center appointed Vincent Denoyelle as the sole panelist in this matter on October 5, 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 large supermarket chain headquartered in France.

The Complainant is the owner of several trade marks for LECLERC, including the following:

- European Union Trade Mark LECLERC No. 002700656, registered on February 26, 2004.

The Complainant owns several domain names reflecting its LECLERC trade mark and is the registry operator for the Top Level Domain <.leclerc>.

“scalandes” corresponds to the French company SCA Landes Centrale D'approvisionnement Des Landes (SCA Landes), incorporated in 1991, which is part of the Complainant's group of companies. SCA Landes operates a central purchasing facility and storage platform for the Complainant associated with the website at “www.scalandes.leclerc”.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 4, 2026. The disputed domain name does not point to an active website and has active MX (mail exchange) records.

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.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the LECLERC trade mark in which the Complainant has rights since the disputed domain name incorporates the entire LECLERC trade mark with the mere addition of a name corresponding to a company owned by the Complainant.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant states that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and that it has not authorized or licensed the Respondent to use any of its trade marks. The Complainant also points to the fact that the disputed domain name points to an inactive page to conclude that this cannot be considered as use in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or/and services or a legitimate noncommercial fair use. Finally, the Complainant highlights the fact that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name by providing incorrect registration data impersonating the Complainant and its company SCA Landes.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trade mark and the Respondent could not have ignored the reputation of the Complainant's trade mark LECLERC, as it is well-known. The Complainant contends that this is further evidenced by the fact that (i) the disputed domain name also includes the name SCA Landes which corresponds to a company owned by the Complainant and (ii) the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name by providing incorrect registration data impersonating the Complainant and its company SCA Landes. The Complainant also alleges that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Complainant points to the use of the disputed domain name, which redirects to an inactive page which under the present circumstances would constitute bad faith use on the part of the Respondent. The Complainant also highlights the fact that MX servers have been set up for disputed domain name (and

deactivated by the Registrar further to a complaint by the Complainant) and that there is a risk that the disputed domain name could be used to facilitate fraudulent activities such as phishing.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not make any substantive allegations or otherwise reply to the Complainant's contentions.

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 trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the LECLERC trade mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the LECLERC trade mark for the purpose of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, "scalandes", 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 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 Complainant has stated that it does not know the Respondent and that it has not licensed or otherwise authorized the Respondent to make any use of its trade mark LECLERC. There is no indication that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The current use of the disputed domain name to resolve to an inactive website combined with the fact that the registration data provided by the Respondent indicates its intention to fraudulently impersonate the Complainant cannot be considered bona fide, legitimate or fair.

Furthermore, the nature of the disputed domain name, comprising the Complainant's LECLERC trade mark in its entirety and an additional term "scalandes" referring to a company owned by the Complainant, carries a risk of implied affiliation. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

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.

The disputed domain name reproduces the exact LECLERC trade mark of the Complainant and this cannot be a coincidence given the overall circumstances of the present case including (i) the renown of the Complainant's LECLERC trade mark, as substantiated by the Complainant and acknowledged by several previous UDRP panels, (ii) the fact that the disputed domain name was registered relatively recently and many years after the registration of the trade mark LECLERC, (iii) the targeted choice of terms added to the LECLERC trade mark, the name "scalandes" which corresponds to a company owned by the Complainant and the fact that (iv) the disputed domain name was registered by providing incorrect registration data impersonating the Complainant and its company SCA Landes.

Thus, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

Turning to use in bad faith, panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's trade mark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of 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 <scalandes-leclerc.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Vincent Denoyelle/

Vincent Denoyelle

Sole Panelist

Date: October 15, 2026