

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

CASE FOR YOU, Mr. Cédric Holtzer v. JAMES H PARK, JIN-1

Case No. D2026-3780

1. The Parties

The Complainants are CASE FOR YOU, France and Mr. Cédric Holtzer, France, represented by Cabinet Bouchara - Avocats, France.

The Respondent is JAMES H PARK, JIN-1, Republic of Korea.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <caseforyou.com> is registered with DropCatch.com 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 25, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 27, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that 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 September 3, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 23, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 29, 2026.

The Center appointed W. Scott Blackmer as the sole panelist in this matter on October 2, 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 CASE FOR YOU is a limited company established under French law in 2013 and headquartered in Bordeaux, France. CASE FOR YOU sells accessories for mobile phones and other connected devices through websites and social media accounts, including its principal French-language website at “www.c4u.com” (registered in August 2002), as well as through a franchise network of retail stores. The Complainant Cédric Holtzer is the founder and CEO of CASE FOR YOU and holds the trademarks used by the company to market its products. These include the following:

Mark	Jurisdiction	Reg. Number	Reg. Date	Nice Class(es)
CASE FOR YOU (word)	France	3935733	November 9, 2012	9, 18, 25, 38
CASE FOR YOU (word)	European Union	018972751	September 3, 2024	9, 35

Given their common interests in the business and the trademarks at issue, the Panel considers it appropriate for this proceeding to continue with both CASE FOR YOU and Cédric Holtzer as Parties and refers to them hereafter collectively as the “Complainant” unless otherwise indicated.

The Registrar shows that the disputed domain name was created on June 6, 2026, and is registered to the Respondent James H Park, JIN-1, showing a postal address in the Republic of Korea and a <naver.com> contact email address (the Panel notes that <naver.com> is a popular South Korean Internet portal, search engine, social media, and shopping platform). There are no communications from the Respondent in connection with this proceeding, and the significance of “JIN-1” is unknown. As the Complainant observes, the Respondent appears to be the same person named as respondent in numerous UDRP proceedings finding bad-faith registration of domain names imitating the trademarks of others, including *The Citco Group Limited v. James H Park, JIN-1*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-4838](#); *Luigi Lavazza S.p.A. v. James H Park, JIN-1*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-1829](#); *Tonzon Holding B.V. v. James H Park*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-0180](#); *Robert Bosch GmbH v. James H Park*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-0127](#); and *Bayer Intellectual Property GmbH v. James H Park*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-0431](#). The panel in the *Robert Bosch GmbH v. James H Park* (supra) proceeding noted that, at that time, the Respondent held “over 7,000 domain names, including domain names that incorporate the trademarks of well-known brands and businesses which suggests a pattern of abusive registration and use”.

The Complainant shows that the disputed domain name resolved to a “blocked website” security warning due to suspected “phishing”. The Panel found at the time of this Decision, using different Internet security software, that the disputed domain name resolved to a landing page with pay-per-click (“PPC”) advertising links (including advertising by companies directly competing with the Complainant in the sale of protective cases for mobile phones) and a notice that the disputed domain name may be available for sale.

The Complainant recounts that the Complainant previously owned the disputed domain name and used it as the main website for its franchise network activity, supporting this statement with copies of domain registration renewal invoices and archived screenshots of its former website associated with the disputed domain name. The Panel notes that the Internet Archive’s Wayback Machine has such screenshots dated as early as 2013.¹ However, the disputed domain name registration expired on April 1, 2026, and the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name immediately on its release on June 6, 2026. The Complainant suggests that this was effected through an automated “drop catch” service facilitating the rapid registration of expired domain names (see Wikipedia, “Domain drop catching”).

¹ Noting the general powers of a panel articulated in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, it is commonly accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record, as the Panel has done in these proceedings. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), section 4.8.

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 identical to its registered CASE FOR YOU mark, which it incorporates in its entirety. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no permission to use its mark and no other grounds for claiming rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, which the Respondent has not used for a website making a bona fide offering of goods or services or for a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

The Complainant argues for a finding of bad faith in the registration and use of the disputed domain name, contending that the Respondent "clearly engaged in systematic and repeated registration of domain names reproducing third-party trademarks, for commercial gain disproportionate to any legitimate interest". The Complainant asserts that the Respondent's history of bulk, trademark-abusive registrations supports the inference of bad faith registration for commercial gain by creating a false association with the trademark holder, which is further reflected in the suspicious use of the disputed domain name for possible phishing.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not 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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark (the registered word mark CASE FOR YOU) 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, save for the spaces between words that cannot be displayed in domain names for technical reasons. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7. This finding is unremarkable, of course, given that the Complainant itself formerly held the disputed domain name and used it in its business for many years.

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 no permission from the Complainant, and there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by a corresponding name. The Respondent has not published a website associated with the disputed domain name, which has been used only for third-party PPC advertising and has been marked as suspicious by at least some security software. 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

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. These include paragraph 4(b)(iv), intentionally attempting to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating confusion with a complainant's mark. Here, allowing the identical disputed domain name to be parked at a landing page with PPC advertising meets this example of bad faith, as it reflects illegitimate commercial exploitation of the Complainant's mark regardless of whether or to what extent the Respondent itself profits from it.

The question arises whether bad faith should be inferred when a domain owner such as the Respondent makes bulk purchases of recently expired domain names, perhaps using drop-catching services. Can it fairly be concluded that the Respondent had the Complainant's mark in contemplation when registering the disputed domain name through such automated means? The [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.3, notes that Panels have held that domainers undertaking "bulk purchases or automated registrations have an affirmative obligation to avoid the registration of trademark-abusive domain names", taking into account whether respondents have undertaken good-faith efforts to screen such registrations against readily-available online databases. See, for example, *Citigroup Inc. v. Andrew Robert Wilson, Andrew Robert Wilson*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-1058](#) ("Honest practice in the choice of a name to be used in trade must imply reasonable diligence in ascertaining that the name chosen does not conflict with, inter alia, an existing trade mark, and thus in verifying the existence of any such mark"). The Panel is of the view that this observation is particularly apt in the context of acquiring recently expired domain names. It is not difficult to determine if they have been in use until then for an active business, which is particularly likely to have associated trademark claims. Failing to conduct any such "reasonable diligence" suggests an indifference toward the legal rights of others that is fundamentally incompatible with both the registrant's obligations under the registration agreement and the Policy's concept of bad faith. The circumstances of this case impel the Panel to find bad faith, as previous panels have done with respect to the same Respondent registering trademark-abusive domain names in its bulk-registration practices and offering no defense such as a practice of conducting reasonable efforts to screen for potential trademark rights.

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 <caseforyou.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/W. Scott Blackmer/

W. Scott Blackmer

Sole Panelist

Date: October 12, 2026