

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

PRL USA Holdings, Inc., The Polo/Lauren Company L.P. v. Ighor Matheus
Case No. D2026-3797

1. The Parties

The Complainants are PRL USA Holdings, Inc. and The Polo/Lauren Company L.P., both of the United States of America ("United States"), represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Ighor Matheus, Brazil.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ralphlauren.site> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 25, 2026. On August 26, 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 disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (Unnamed) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on August 27, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainants to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainants filed an amendment to the Complaint on September 1, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 25, 2026.

The Center appointed Daniel Peña as the sole panelist in this matter on September 30, 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 Complainants are members of the Ralph Lauren corporate group, whose business originated in 1967 and encompasses apparel, accessories, home products, fragrances, and hospitality. According to the Complaint, the group conducts an extensive international business and has made longstanding use of the RALPH LAUREN mark.

The Complainants have provided evidence of, inter alia, the following trademark registrations for RALPH LAUREN:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 1412059, registered on October 7, 1986, owned by PRL USA Holdings, Inc.;
- Brazilian Trademark Registration No. 817027416 (word mark), registered on May 16, 1995, owned by The Polo/Lauren Company L.P.; and
- International Trademark Registration No. 1712073, registered on August 16, 2022, owned by The Polo/Lauren Company L.P.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 3, 2025. At the time of the Complaint, the disputed domain name did not resolve to an active website, returning an error message indicating that the server IP address could not be found.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainants

The Complainants contend that they have satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

In particular, the Complainants contend that the disputed domain name is identical to their RALPH LAUREN trademark, as it reproduces the mark in its entirety, omitting only the space between the two words, with the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".site".

The Complainants further contend that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is neither affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainants, is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and has not used it in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or for a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

As to bad faith, the Complainants contend that the Respondent must have known of their longstanding and internationally recognized mark when registering the disputed domain name. They rely on the exact reproduction of the mark, the absence of active use, and the Respondent's failure to respond to their pre-Complaint correspondence. The Complainants request the transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainants' contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainants must establish each of the following:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainants have rights;
- (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 Panel shall decide the Complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, the Rules, and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable (paragraph 15(a) of the Rules). The applicable standard of proof is the balance of probabilities. The Respondent's default does not automatically result in a decision in favor of the Complainants; the Panel must nonetheless assess the evidence and may draw such inferences as it considers appropriate (paragraph 14(b) of the Rules). See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), sections 4.2 and 4.3.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainants have shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy, namely the RALPH LAUREN mark, by virtue of the registrations described above. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainants' trademark and the disputed domain name. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7. The disputed domain name reproduces the RALPH LAUREN mark in its entirety, omitting only the space between its two words, which is not technically possible to include in a domain name and does not affect the recognizability of the mark.

The generic Top-Level Domain ".site" is a standard registration requirement and is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1. The Panel finds that the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainants' mark for the purposes of the Policy.

The first element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Although the overall burden of proof rests with the Complainants, 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. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that the Complainants have established a prima facie case. The Complainants have not authorized the Respondent to use the RALPH LAUREN mark, and nothing in the record suggests that the Respondent, identified by the Registrar as "Ighor Matheus", is commonly known by the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website, and there is no evidence of use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor of any legitimate noncommercial or fair use within the meaning of paragraph 4(c) of the Policy.

Moreover, the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainants' mark and therefore carries a high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainants. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainants' prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The second element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The disputed domain name was registered on December 3, 2025, long after the Complainants' earliest trademark registrations. The record shows longstanding international use of the RALPH LAUREN mark, which is also protected in Brazil, where the Respondent is located. The Respondent registered a domain name that reproduces the mark exactly and has offered no explanation for doing so.

In view of the reputation of the mark, the composition of the disputed domain name, and the absence of any plausible explanation for its selection, the Panel finds that, on the balance of probabilities, the Respondent was aware of and targeted the Complainants' mark when registering the disputed domain name. This finding rests on the record as a whole, rather than on the Respondent's default alone. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. In applying this doctrine, the Panel considers the totality of the circumstances. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel notes the following relevant circumstances:

- the longstanding reputation and distinctiveness of the RALPH LAUREN mark;
- the exact reproduction of that mark in the disputed domain name;
- the absence of evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use; and
- the Respondent's failure to submit a response or to explain the registration or intended use of the disputed domain name.

On this record, the Panel cannot conceive of any plausible actual or contemplated active use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent that would be legitimate, given that it consists solely of the Complainants' well-known mark. This conclusion rests on the particular circumstances of this case, not on inactivity alone.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The third element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been established.

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 <ralphlauren.site> be transferred to the Complainants.

/Daniel Peña/

Daniel Peña

Sole Panelist

Date: October 14, 2026