

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

PILEJE v. Qingqing Ren
Case No. DCO2025-0098

1. The Parties

The Complainant is PILEJE, France, represented by Domgate, France.

The Respondent is Qingqing Ren, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lactibiane.co> is registered with Dominet (HK) Limited (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 3, 2025. On December 3, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 4, 2025, 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 (anonymized) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 4, 2025, 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 December 10, 2025.

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 December 11, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 31, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 7, 2026.

The Center appointed Kateryna Oliinyk as the sole panelist in this matter on January 12, 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 was founded in 1991 by French Doctor Christian Leclerc. The Complainant specializes in the development, manufacture, and sale of food supplements, dietetic products, and healthcare solutions. As of 2023, the Complainant employs approximately 700 people, offers 318 product references, and reported a turnover of EUR 126.686 million.

The Complainant holds a leading position in the French pharmacy dietary supplement market and operates internationally, with a presence in 43 countries, including subsidiaries in Spain, Germany, Italy, Belgium, and Switzerland. The Complainant also maintains a strong visibility through its social media channels, including Instagram, Facebook, and LinkedIn. One of the Complainant's flagship product lines, "Lactibiane", was launched in 1992, only one year after the Complainant's establishment. It was among the first probiotic supplements on the market and continues to be commercialized to this day.

The Complainant's LACTIBIANE trademark is protected by multiple trademark registrations, including, inter alia, the following:

- European Union Trademark Registration No. 000515700 for LACTIBIANE, registered on June 4, 1999, for goods in International Classes 5, 29, and 30;
- International Trademark Registration No. 603604 for LACTIBIANE, registered on July 5, 1993, for goods in International Classes 5, 29, 30, and 32, designating among others China.

The products under the LACTIBIANE trademark are ranked among the top 10 products in the French market segment dominated by vitamins, multivitamins, and tonics, according to IQVIA CH Customized Insights (sell-out public prices, last moving March 2023), and was presented at the 7th International Nutraceutical Congress on dietary supplements and innovation. The product range is commercially available in 33 countries worldwide, including the French overseas territories, through subsidiaries or exclusive partners, and is also marketed internationally via multiple online platforms, as evidenced by publicly accessible online searches.

The Complainant operates several commercial websites under the domain names <lactibiane.com>, <lactibiane.fr>, <lactibiane.ch>, and <lactibiane.be>.

The disputed domain name was created on July 2, 2025, and redirects to a GoDaddy's page offering it for sale at a Buy now price of USD 1,450.

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.

Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant asserts rights in the LACTIBIANE trademark, supported by respective trademark registrations in multiple jurisdictions. It alleges that the disputed domain name is identical to the LACTIBIANE trademark.

No Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant in any way. The Complainant has not granted any authorization for the Respondent to make use of its LACTIBIANE trademark, in a domain name or otherwise.

The Complainant alleges that the Respondent offered the disputed domain name for sale via GoDaddy's landing page, listed at a "Buy-It-Now" price of USD 1,450.

The Complainant contends that, due to the disputed domain name's composition, the Respondent's use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services under paragraph 4(c)(i) of the UDRP.

The Complainant also claims that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Complainant submits that the Respondent's listing of the disputed domain name for sale supports the inference that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name, with knowledge of the Complainant's LACTIBIANE trademark, primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs the Panel as to the principles the Panel is to use in determining the dispute: "[a] Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable."

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that 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 respect of the disputed domain name; and
- iii. that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Considering that the Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions, in order to determine whether the Complainant has met its burden as stated in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Panel bases its decision on the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy and the Rules.

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 Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Panel disregards the country code Top-Level Domain ("ccTLD") ".co" featured in the disputed domain name under the first element as it is the standard registration requirement. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.

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 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 3.0](#), 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.

The Respondent may establish a right or legitimate interest in a domain name by demonstrating, in accordance with paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, any of the following:

- i. before any notice to you of the dispute, your use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the domain name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or
- ii. you (as an individual, business, or other organization) have been commonly known by the domain name, even if you have acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or
- iii. you are making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

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’s listing of the disputed domain name for sale on GoDaddy’s website does not establish any legitimate claim of a bona fide offering of goods or service, nor does it create any independent reputation in the disputed domain name apart from the Complainant’s trademark rights. Considering the distinctiveness and long-standing registration and use of the Complainant’s mark, including in China, where the Respondent is reportedly located, and the lack of any substantive Response putting forward a legitimate non-infringing purpose, in the Panel’s view, it is reasonable to infer that by offering the disputed domain name for sale the Respondent has intended to capitalize on the reputation and goodwill inherent in the Complainant’s trademark.

Respectively, the Panel considers that the record of this case reflects that:

- before any notice to the Respondent of the dispute, the Respondent did not use, nor has it made demonstrable 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. See paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.2;

- the Respondent (as an individual, business, or other organization) has not been commonly known by the disputed domain name. See paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.3;

- the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue. See paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.4; and
- the record contains no other factors demonstrating rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in the disputed domain name.

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.

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 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

In addition to the specific circumstances outlined in UDRP, paragraph 4(b), particular circumstances panels may take into account in assessing whether the respondent's registration of a domain name is in bad faith include: (i) the nature of the domain name; (ii) the chosen top-level domain (e.g., particularly where corresponding to the complainant's area of business activity or natural zone of expansion); (iii) the content of any website to which the domain name directs, including any changes in such content and the timing thereof; (iv) the timing and circumstances of the registration; (v) any respondent pattern of targeting marks along a range of factors, such as a common area of commerce, intended consumers, or geographic location; (vi) a clear absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with no credible explanation for the respondent's choice of the domain name; or (vii) other indicia generally suggesting that the respondent had somehow targeted the complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has provided ample evidence showing that the registration and use of its LACTIBIANE trademark long predate the registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant is well established and widely recognized, with its LACTIBIANE trademark and related products enjoying significant reputation. The Complainant is prominent in the international markets. Therefore, the Respondent was likely aware that the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration. The Panel concludes that the Respondent's awareness of the Complainant's trademark rights at the time of registration indicates bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2.

Moreover, the Respondent offered the disputed domain name for sale at USD 1,450, being a price likely exceeding out-of-pocket costs, as discussed above, reflecting its value derived from the LACTIBIANE trademark. Such conduct constitutes evidence of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy.

Finally, the Panel notes the Respondent's failure to submit a Response or provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith.

Therefore, the Panel finds the third element 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 <lactibiane.co> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Kateryna Oliinyk/

Kateryna Oliinyk

Sole Panelist

Date: January 26, 2026