ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

PANEL DECISION
GROUPE LA CENTRALE v. All in Biz Club Spolka z Ograniczona Odpowiedzialnoscia, Anna Pazyna
Case No. DEU2025-0030

1. The Parties

The Complainant is GROUPE LA CENTRALE, France, represented by MIIP MADE IN IP, France.

The Respondent is All in Biz Club Spolka z Ograniczona Odpowiedzialnoscia, Anna Pazyna, Poland.

2. The Domain Name, Registry and Registrar

The Registry of the disputed domain name <drivenmedia.eu> is the European Registry for Internet Domains ("EURid" or the "Registry"). The Registrar of the disputed domain name is Spaceship, Inc.

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on October 31, 2025. On November 3, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registry a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 6, 2025, the Registry transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details. In response to a notification by the Center that the Complaint was administratively deficient, the Complainant filed an amended Complaint on November 10, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the .eu Alternative Dispute Resolution Rules (the "ADR Rules") and the World Intellectual Property Organization Supplemental Rules for .eu Alternative Dispute Resolution Rules (the "Supplemental Rules").

In accordance with the ADR Rules, Paragraph B(2), the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on November 11, 2025. In accordance with the ADR Rules, Paragraph B(3), the due date for Response was December 1, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on December 5, 2025.

The Center appointed Steven A. Maier as the sole panelist in this matter on December 10, 2025. 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 ADR Rules, Paragraph B(5).

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a company registered in France. It operates an online marketplace under the name and trademark DRIVE MEDIA, which is focused on the automotive sector.

The Complainant is the owner of France trademark registration number 4394415 for a combined trademark DRIVE MEDIA, registered on January 26, 2018, in International Classes 35, 38, 41 and 42.

The Complainant is the owner of the domain names <drivemedia.fr> and <drivemedia.eu> which redirect to its website at “www.drivemedia.fr”.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 27, 2025. It has resolved to a webpage at Sedo.com indicating that it is for sale and indicating a “Buy now” price of USD 1,450.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant provides no information concerning its trading history or profile under the DRIVE MEDIA mark, although it asserts that it is well known in France for automotive classified advertisements. Its website at “www.drivemedia.fr” claims to receive 35 million visits per month.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its DRIVE MEDIA trademark, differing only by the inclusion of the letter “n” between the words “drive” and “media” in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. It states that it has never authorized the Respondent to use its DRIVE MEDIA mark, that the Respondent has no independent trademark rights in that respect, and that the Respondent has made no use of the disputed domain name other than to offer it for sale.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent registered or has used the disputed domain name in bad faith. It states that the Respondent was, or should have been, aware of its DRIVE MEDIA trademark when it registered the disputed domain name, and that it can only have registered it in order to take advantage of the Complainant’s established trademark, or to damage the Complainant’s reputation, by causing confusion with that trademark. The Complainant further speculates that the disputed domain name could be used for the purposes of email fraud.

The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In order to succeed in the Complaint, it is necessary for the Complainant to establish that the elements required by the ADR Rules are present, namely:

(i) the domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a name in respect of which a right is recognised or established by the national law of a Member State and/or European Union law; and either
(ii) the domain name has been registered by the Respondent without rights or legitimate interest in the name; or
(iii) the domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar to a name in respect of which a right or rights are recognized or established by national law of a Member State and/or European Union law

The Complainant has demonstrated that it is the owner of a France registered trademark for the mark DRIVE MEDIA. The disputed domain name differs from that trademark only by the inclusion of the letter "n" between the words "drive" and "media". While this addition may result in the term "driven media" as opposed to "drive media", the difference does not prevent the Complainant's trademark from being recognizable within the disputed domain name. The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a name in respect of which a right or rights are recognized or established by national law of a Member State and/or European Union law.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

In the view of the Panel, the Complainant's submissions set out above give rise to a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. However, the Respondent has failed to file a Response in this proceeding and has not submitted any explanation for its registration and use of the disputed domain name, or evidence of rights or legitimate interests on its part in the disputed domain name, whether in the circumstances contemplated by paragraph B(11)(e) of the ADR Rules or otherwise.

The Respondent appears to have used the disputed domain name solely for the purpose of offering it for sale. In the view of the Panel, such use is insufficient of itself to give rise to rights or legitimate interests, even in a case where the disputed domain name may (arguably) be comprised of dictionary terms. While a domain name registrant may be able to establish rights or legitimate interests in a domain name that does not target any third party trademark rights, the Respondent makes no submission in the proceeding that those circumstances are applicable in this case. For completeness, the Panel notes that an Internet search for the Respondent's name appears to return, as the first results, an accounting and legal services website although it is unclear to the Panel whether this business is currently active. In this regard, the Panel is unable to determine why such a business, if it indeed registered the disputed domain name, would have registered a domain name that does not correspond to its name and subsequently offered it for sale.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name has been registered by the Respondent without rights or legitimate interests in the name.

C. Registered or Used in Bad Faith

While the Panel's finding in respect of the second element, above, is sufficient to determine the proceeding in the Complainant's favour, the Panel will also briefly consider the issue of bad faith.

The Panel accepts that the Complainant operates an established and recognized online brand under the name and mark DRIVE MEDIA and appears to have done so since approximately 2018. The Complainant also operates the domain name <drivemedia.eu>. The disputed domain name is highly similar to both the trademark and the domain name, save that it corresponds to the term "driven media" as opposed to "drive media". In the view of the Panel, even though both the phrases "drive media and "driven media" may be

comprised of dictionary words, neither phrase could be regarded as being commonplace or in general usage. In the circumstances, such a close resemblance requires, at least, some explanation on the part of the Respondent for its choice of the disputed domain name and of any legitimate use to which it claims it has been, or could be, put. The Respondent having chosen not to answer the Complainant's submissions, the Panel infers on balance that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the Complainant's trademark in mind, and with the intention of taking unfair advantage of the commercial goodwill attaching to that trademark.

Specifically, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting or otherwise transferring the domain name to the holder of a name in respect of which a right is recognized or established by national and/or European Union law (paragraph 11(f)(i) of the ADR Rules) and/or that the domain name was intentionally used to attract Internet users, for commercial gain to the Respondent's website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with a name in respect of which a right is recognized or established by national and/or European Union law, with such likelihood arising as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the website or location or of a product or service on the website or location of the Respondent (paragraph 11(f)(iv) of the ADR Rules).

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with Paragraph B(11) of the ADR Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name, <drivenmedia.eu>, be transferred to the Complainant. [1]

The Panel is satisfied in this regard that the Complainant meets the general eligibility criteria for registration set out in Article 3 of Regulation (EU) 2019/517.

/Steven A. Maier/
Steven A. Maier
Sole Panelist
Date: December 15, 2025

[1] (i) The decision shall be implemented by the Registry within thirty (30) days after the notification of the decision to the Parties, unless the Respondent initiates court proceedings in a Mutual Jurisdiction, as defined in Paragraph A(1) of the ADR Rules.
(ii) If the remedy granted is "transfer", the Panel shall briefly discuss that the Complainant satisfies the general eligibility criteria for registration set out in Article 3 of Regulation (EU) 2019/517.