ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Groupe Lucien Barrière v. SANDRA LONSAKOVA
Case No. D2026-4075

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Groupe Lucien Barrière, France, represented by SELAS Lexington Avocats, France.

The Respondent is SANDRA LONSAKOVA, Latvia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <casino-barrieree.com> is registered with Devexpanse Ltd d/b/a Regery.com (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 10, 2026. On September 10, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 10, 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 (The RDAP server redacted the value) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 15, 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 amendment to the Complaint on September 23, 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 25, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 15, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 16, 2026.

The Center appointed Alistair Payne as the sole panelist in this matter on October 26, 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 based in France, operates 21 hotels, more than 200 restaurants and 33 casinos worldwide. It owns European Union trademark no. 008563462 for BARRIERE which was registered on June 9, 2010 and also European Union trademark no. 006760433 for BARRIERE CASINO, registered on January 7, 2009. The Complainant also owns the domain name <casinos-barriere.com> which was registered on November 8, 2001 and which resolves to a website to promote its hotel, restaurant and casino activities.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 16, 2026. At the date of filing of this Complaint the disputed domain name resolved to a website featuring the banner "Casino Barrière Toulouse" and at the foot of the page the legend "Casino Barrière Avis, Bonus & Programme Le Carré VIP 2026". The Complainant states that Internet users who were directed to this website were then redirected to websites for various online games.

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 it owns registered trade marks for BARRIERE and for BARRIERE CASINO as set out above and that the disputed domain name reproduces the BARRIERE mark with the addition of another letter "e" at the end of the word. It submits that this is a typical example of typosquatting and that the addition of the word "casino" and the hyphen between the terms "casino" and "barriere" does not distinguish the disputed domain name and accordingly that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the BARRIERE registered trade mark.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has neither used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services nor demonstrated any preparations to do so. It has instead, according to the Complainant, used the disputed domain name to resolve to a website for a casino that purports to be one of the Complainant's casinos and then redirects Internet users to online gambling services. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent is doing this in order to circumvent restrictions on online casinos in France. As a result, the Complainant says that the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Rather, it says that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion and misleadingly diverting Internet users. Furthermore, says the Complainant, it has never granted the Respondent any authorisation, licence, or consent to register or use a domain name incorporating its BARRIERE trade mark.

In terms of bad faith, the Complainant submits that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith. It says that the Complainant's BARRIERE trade mark predates the registration of the disputed domain name by many years and that in light of the Complainant's established reputation in the hotel and casino industry, the Respondent could not have been unaware of the Complainant's trade marks at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant, this is only reinforced by the fact that the layout of the website at the disputed domain name is very visually similar to the Complainant's official website featuring similar visuals, black background, similar distinctive signs and an explicit reference to Barrière Casinos. The Complainant asserts that this conduct demonstrates that the Respondent had knowledge of the Complainant and of the BARRIERE trade marks when it registered the disputed domain name and sought to profit from the reputation of the Complainant's trade marks.

In terms of use of the disputed domain name in bad faith, the Complainant submits that the Respondent's conduct amounts to intentional use of the disputed domain name for commercial gain by confusing Internet users who are looking for the Complainant's website and directing them to its own website at which Internet users were then redirected to various online games. This says the Respondent amounts to targeting the Complainant's business and marks and fulfills the requirements of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy which is evidence of registration and use in bad faith.

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 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 Panel finds the BARRIERE mark is recognisable within the disputed domain name. Although it includes an additional letter "e" at the end of "barriere" this does not impede the recognition of the Complainant's mark in the disputed domain name. The Panel notes that the BARRIERE CASINO mark is also recognisable in the disputed domain name, even though the words of the mark are inverted. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, the word "casino" and the inclusion of a hyphen, 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.

The Complainant has submitted that the Respondent has neither used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services nor demonstrated any preparations to do so. It has instead, according to the Complainant, caused the disputed domain name to resolve to a website for a casino that purports to be one of the Complainant's casinos and that then redirects Internet users to other online gambling services. The Complainant has asserted that the Respondent is doing this in order to circumvent restrictions to online casinos in France. The Complainant has submitted as a result that the Respondent is not making a legitimate, noncommercial, or fair use of the disputed domain name but has rather used the disputed domain name for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion and misleadingly diverting Internet users. The Complainant has also submitted that it has never granted the Respondent any authorisation, licence, or consent to register or use a domain name incorporating its BARRIERE trade mark.

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

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name was registered long after the Complainant's BARRIERE trade mark or the BARRIERE CASINO trade mark. Considering that the disputed domain name resolved at the date of filing to a website that masqueraded as if it was the Complainant's, or had been authorised by it, the Panel finds that it is more likely than not that the Respondent was well aware of the Complainant's business and BARRIERE trade mark and of the BARRIERE CASINO trade mark at the date of registration of the disputed domain name.

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.

Under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy there is evidence of registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith where a Respondent has used the disputed domain name to intentionally attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trade marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the website.

At the time of filing of this Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website under the banner "Casino Barrière Toulouse" and featuring a note at the foot of page which references a "Casino Barrière Avis, Bonus & Programme Le Carré VIP 2026". According to the uncontested allegations of the Complainant, the website then promotes links to a range of online games.

It appears in this case that the Respondent has targeted the Complainant's business and mark for its own commercial gain. It has used the disputed domain name containing the Complainant's BARRIERE or BARRIERE CASINO mark to intentionally attract Internet users to its own website by confusing them into assuming that they would be diverted to the Complainant's website. Once there, Internet users may well have thought that they were on the Complainant's website as described above but they were also shown links to third-party sites featuring a range of online games. Although there is no evidence by way of screenshot of the exact nature of these third-party links, the Panel accepts the uncontested, written, and certified submission of the Complainant's counsel in this regard.

It is apparent, even from the screenshot of the webpage at the disputed domain name included in the Complainant's submissions, that the Respondent has sought to confuse and direct Internet users for its own commercial purposes and has purported to be or to have the endorsement of the Complainant when this is not the case. The Panel finds that the Respondent's conduct fulfills the requirements of paragraph 4(b)(iv) and is therefore evidence of registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith.

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 <casino-barrieree.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Alistair Payne/
Alistair Payne
Sole Panelist
Date: November 9, 2026