

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

L'Oréal v. kaiyuan shi
Case No. D2026-3808

1. The Parties

The Complainant is L'Oréal, France, represented by Dreyfus & associés, France.

The Respondent is kaiyuan shi, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <It-lancomepg.com> is registered with Amazon Registrar, Inc. (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 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 (On behalf of It-lancomepg.com OWNER, c/o whoisproxy.com) 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 August 28, 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 2, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 22, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 23, 2026.

The Center appointed Johan Sjöbeck 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 Complainant, L'Oréal, is a French industrial group specialized in the field of cosmetics and beauty and is one of the first cosmetic groups worldwide. It has a portfolio of 37 brands, employs 86,000 employees, and is present in 150 countries. The Complainant's portfolio of international brands covers all the lines of cosmetics, including hair care, coloring, skin care, make-up and perfume. The Complainant's brands are managed within the group by divisions that each have expertise in their own distribution channel.

Lancôme was founded in 1935. Over the decades, Lancôme spreads its vision of French spirit and elegance combined with major innovations allowing Lancôme to become one of the leading luxury beauty brands in the world. Lancôme is notably number one in anti-ageing skincare.

The Complainant has submitted evidence that it is the owner of trademark registrations for LANCÔME in a number of jurisdictions, including the following:

Brazilian trademark LANCÔME with registration number 790503263 registered on December 17, 1985, duly renewed, and covering goods in class 3.

Chinese trademark LANCÔME with registration number 775926, registered on January 14, 1995, duly renewed and covering services in class 42.

United States of America trademark LANCÔME with registration number 3022836 registered on December 6, 2005, duly renewed, and covering goods and services in classes 3, 35, and 44.

International trademark LANCÔME with registration number 1679731 registered on June 1, 2022, covering goods and services in classes 3, 9, 35 and 41.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name <lt-lancomepg.com> on July 1, 2026. The Respondent uses the disputed domain name to redirect Internet users to an online gambling website where users are invited to create accounts by providing personal information and gamble.

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 <lt-lancomepg.com>.

The Complainant states that, upon becoming aware of the registration and use of the disputed domain name, it contacted the Registrar on several occasions from July 15, 2026, requesting that the disputed domain name should be blocked or suspended. According to the Complainant, although the Registrar acknowledged its reports and forwarded them to the Respondent, it declined to take further action, and subsequent requests for suspension and the application of clientHold status did not result in any substantive action. The Complainant therefore submits that, having exhausted the remedies available through the Registrar, it commenced the present UDRP proceeding seeking transfer of the disputed domain name.

Previous WIPO panels have considered the Complainant's trademark LANCÔME to be "well-known" or "famous". See for example, *Lancôme Parfums Beauté et Cie v. 湖南澳利经贸发展有限公司*, WIPO Case No. [D2015-1071](#); *Lancôme Parfums Et Beauté & Cie v. He peng*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-1944](#); *Lancôme Parfums et Beauté & Cie Snc v. Value-Domain com, Value Domain*, WIPO Case No. [D2013-0518](#); and

L'Oréal and Lancôme Parfums et Beauté et Cie v. Deco Trends & Art, K. Plooyer, WIPO Case No. [D2011 - 0524](#).

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its well-known LANCÔME trademark, as it incorporates the mark in its entirety, with the addition of the elements “It” and “pg”. According to the Complainant, the LANCÔME mark remains the dominant and clearly recognizable element of the disputed domain name. The Complainant further submits that “It” may be understood as referring to Lithuania, while “pg” may convey promotional meanings such as “promo giveaway”, “promotional group”, “prize game”, or “promotion gateway”, thereby reinforcing an impression that the disputed domain name is connected with an official promotional activity of the Complainant.

The Complainant further relies on established UDRP principles that the incorporation of a trademark in its entirety, or where the mark remains recognizable within the disputed domain name, is normally sufficient for a finding of confusing similarity. It also submits that the use of hyphens does not prevent such a finding and that the “.com” generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) is disregarded for purposes of the comparison. The Complainant therefore maintains that the requirement under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy is satisfied.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has not been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted to use the LANCÔME trademark or to register any domain name incorporating it. The Complainant further submits that there is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name or by the name “Lancôme”, and notes that its trademark rights predate the registration of the disputed domain name by many years.

The Complainant also argues that the Respondent has not used, or made demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Instead, the disputed domain name resolves to an online gambling website on which users could place bets. According to the Complainant, such use seeks to attract Internet users by taking advantage of the Complainant’s trademark for the Respondent’s own commercial purposes and may misleadingly suggest an association with the Complainant. The Complainant therefore submits that none of the circumstances capable of establishing rights or legitimate interests is present and that the requirement under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy is satisfied.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. As to registration, the Complainant submits that the Respondent could not plausibly have been unaware of the LANCÔME trademark, given its longstanding and worldwide reputation and the fact that the Complainant’s trademark registrations substantially predate the registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant further argues that the disputed domain name reproduces the trademark in its entirety, together with the additional elements “It” and “pg”, making it unlikely that the Respondent selected the disputed domain name without the Complainant and its trademark in mind. According to the Complainant, even a basic trademark or Internet search would have revealed the Complainant’s older rights.

As to use, the Complainant submits that the Respondent has intentionally sought to take advantage of the reputation and goodwill associated with the well-known LANCÔME mark by creating a likelihood of confusion and diverting Internet users to an unrelated online gambling website. The Complainant further states that the website displayed its trademark and included a login page for online gaming, which, in its view, demonstrates an intention to attract users for commercial gain through a false association with the Complainant and potentially to collect users’ sensitive information. The Complainant therefore maintains that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove each of the following:

- (i) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The 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.

According to the submitted evidence, the Complainant is the owner of the registered trademark LANCÔME. The disputed domain name <lt-lancomepg.com> incorporates the trademark in its entirety with the addition of a hyphen and the letters "lt" and "pg".

The Complainant's trademark is readily recognizable in the disputed domain name, despite the additional letters and hyphen, which do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. It is standard practice to disregard the gTLD under the confusing similarity test.

Having the above in mind, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark and that the Complainant has proven the requirement under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant must show that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name. The Respondent may establish rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name by demonstrating in accordance with paragraph 4(c) of the Policy any of the following:

- (i) that the Respondent uses or has made preparations to use the disputed domain name or a name corresponding to the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services prior to the dispute; or
- (ii) that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, even if the Respondent has not acquired any trademark rights; or
- (iii) that the Respondent is making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving 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. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#),

section 2.1.

From the submitted material in the Complaint and its annexes, it is clear that the Complainant's trademark registrations for LANCÔME predate the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name. Furthermore, it is clear that the Complainant has not licensed, approved, or in any way consented to the Respondent's registration and use of the trademark in the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name, which is confusingly similar to the Complainant's LANCÔME trademark, redirects Internet users to an online gambling website on which users can register and place bets. Given the reputation of the LANCÔME trademark, which previous UDRP panels have recognized as well-known or famous, the Panel considers that such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Although given the opportunity, the Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie case. The Respondent has not submitted any evidence to demonstrate that the Respondent is the owner of any trademark rights similar to the disputed domain name or that the Respondent is or has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

By not submitting a response, the Respondent has failed to invoke any circumstances which could demonstrate, pursuant to paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. Thus, there is no evidence in the case that refutes the Complainant's submissions, and the Panel concludes that the Complainant has also proved the requirement under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Under paragraph 4(b) of the Policy, evidence of bad faith registration and use include without limitation:

- (i) circumstances indicating the disputed domain name was registered or acquired primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the disputed domain name registration to the owner of a trademark or to a competitor of the trademark owner, for valuable consideration in excess of the documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name; or
- (ii) circumstances indicating that the disputed domain name was registered in order to prevent the owner of a trademark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided there is a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) circumstances indicating that the disputed domain name was registered primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) circumstances indicating that the disputed domain name has intentionally been used in an attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website or location or of a product or service on that website or location.

As noted above, the Complainant's trademark registrations predate the registration of the disputed domain name. The Panel also notes that previous UDRP panels have recognized the LANCÔME trademark as well-known or famous. This, together with the incorporation of the trademark in its entirety in the disputed domain name, supports the finding that the Respondent was, or at the very least should have been, aware of the Complainant and its trademark when registering the disputed domain name.

The evidence on the record further shows that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to redirect Internet users to an online gambling website where users may register and place bets. The Panel considers that this conduct does not reflect any bona fide or legitimate purpose. Rather, it indicates that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name with the Complainant and its trademark in mind,

seeking to take unfair advantage of the trademark's reputation to attract Internet users to the Respondent's website. In the absence of any evidence to the contrary, the Panel finds, on the balance of probabilities, that these circumstances support a finding that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

In light of the above, the Panel finds that the Respondent has intentionally used the disputed domain name to attract Internet users, for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website or the services offered thereon. Internet users may therefore be misled into believing that the disputed domain name or the website to which it resolves is associated with or endorsed by the Complainant. These circumstances further support the Panel's finding that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

There is no evidence on the record that refutes the Complainant's submissions. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(iii) 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 <lt-lancomepg.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Johan Sjöbeck/

Johan Sjöbeck

Sole Panelist

Date: October 6, 2026