ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

# ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
SWEET PANTS SAS v. George Chandler
Case No. D2026-4207

## 1. The Parties

The Complainant is SWEET PANTS SAS, France, represented by MWS Avocats, France.

The Respondent is George Chandler, United States of America ("United States").

## 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <sweetpantsstudio.shop> is registered with Dynadot Inc.

## 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was originally filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 18, 2026, concerning two disputed domain names. On September 21, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the registrars for the disputed domain names (the "Registrars") requests for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On September 22 and 24, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (NOT IDENTIFIED) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 28, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaints for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on October 1, 2026, requesting the removal of one disputed domain name. Following the partial withdrawal on October 5, 2026, the proceeding continued solely in relation to the disputed domain name <sweetpantsstudio.shop>.

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 proceeding commenced on October 6, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 26, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 30, 2026.

The Center appointed Sebastian M.W. Hughes as the sole panelist in this matter on November 3, 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

### A. Complainant

The Complainant is a French company founded in 2014 and carrying on business in respect of the sale of clothing and related products under the trade mark SWEET PANTS (the "Trade Mark"), including via its website at "www.sweet-pants.com".

The company is the owner of the following registrations for, or comprising, the Trade Mark (collectively, the "Trade Marks"):

(i) European Union registration No. 018135000, with a registration date of May 22, 2020;

(ii) International registration No. 1375358, with a registration date of July 17, 2017, for the mark:




(iii) International registration No. 1535063, with a registration date of April 7, 2020, for the mark:




### B. Respondent

According to the Registrar's verification, the Respondent is an individual located in the United States.

### C. The Disputed Domain Name

The disputed domain name was registered on July 21, 2026.

### D. Use of the Disputed Domain Name

The disputed domain name has previously been used in respect of an English and French language website, prominently featuring the Trade Marks, the Complainant's corporate livery and the Complainant's product images; and purportedly offering the Complainant's apparel products at discounted prices (the "Respondent's Website").

## 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 Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith in respect of the Respondent's Website.

### 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 trade mark 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 mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. 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 "studio") 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (as applicable to this case, copycat sites, passing off, or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1.

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (as applicable to this case, copycat sites, passing off, or other types of fraud) constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4. 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 <sweetpantsstudio.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Sebastian M.W. Hughes/*
**Sebastian M.W. Hughes**
Sole Panelist
Date: November 13, 2026