

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

LRC Products Limited v. Mr. Mojtaba Lang Shirazi  
Case No. DIR2025-0013

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is LRC Products Limited, United Kingdom (“UK”), represented Studio Barbero S.p.A., Italy.

The Respondent is Mr. Mojtaba Lang Shirazi, Iran (Islamic Republic of).

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <durexland.ir> is registered with IRNIC.

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 10, 2025. On December 10, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to IRNIC a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 12, 2025, IRNIC transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details. Hard copies of the Complaint were received by the Center on December 17, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the .ir Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “irDRP”), the Rules for .ir Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for .ir Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2(a) and 4(a), the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on December 18, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5(a), the due date for Response was January 7, 2026. On January 9, 2026, the Center notified the Respondent’s default. On January 26, 2026, the proceeding was suspended by the Center. On January 30, 2026, the Center reinstated the proceeding.

The Center appointed Mehmet Polat Kalafatoğlu as the sole panelist in this matter on February 4, 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 a corporation founded in 1915 and based in the UK. The Complainant's business incorporates the sale and supply of condoms, lubricants, sex toys, and related products in the field of intimate health and wellness. The Complainant has been making and commercializing its products under the well-known DUREX trademark. It is also noted that DUREX products are sold in almost 200 countries worldwide.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademark registrations in different jurisdictions worldwide, including in Iran (Islamic Republic of), where the Respondent is located, for DUREX (or variations thereof), including the following:

- the European Union trademark registration for DUREX, No. 000200923, registered on December 8, 1999, in cases 5 and 10;
- the International trademark registration for DUREX, No. 1684485, registered on June 10, 2022, in class 10; and
- the Iranian trademark registration for DUREX, No. 3520, registered on November 12, 1946, in class 10.

The Complainant uses numerous domain names incorporating the DUREX trademark, including <durex.com>, registered on October 11, 1995.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 20, 2022. At the time of filing of the Complaint and this Decision, it resolves to a website in Persian that purportedly offers to sell products under the DUREX trademark and other third-party brands.

#### **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. The Complainant's contentions are summarized below.

First, the Complainant affirms that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademarks in which the Complainant has rights.

Second, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. In this regard, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent is not a licensee, authorized agent of the Complainant, or in any other way authorized to use the DUREX trademarks. Specifically, the Respondent is not an authorized reseller of the Complainant and has not been authorized to register and use the disputed domain name. The Complainant also indicates that the disputed domain name is redirected to a commercial website featuring the DUREX trademark and offering for sale purported DUREX products, along with third-party products, without publishing any disclaimer of non-affiliation with the Complainant.

Third, the Complainant contends that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademark rights at the time of registering the disputed domain name and the Respondent is using the disputed domain name for its commercial gain and by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website and the goods offered on the said website.

##### **B. Respondent**

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

## 6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove that:

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

Considering the similarities between the Policy and the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “UDRP”), the Panel will refer to cases decided under the UDRP and the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), if relevant to this proceeding.

### 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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Complainant’s DUREX trademark 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, “land”, may bear on the 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 the 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 3.1](#), 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. In this regard, the Panel notes the Complainant’s assertions that the Respondent is not a licensee, authorized agent, or authorized reseller of the Complainant. Furthermore, the Respondent has not been authorized to use the DUREX trademark and to register and use the disputed domain name. In particular, the Panel finds that the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name does not meet the cumulative requirements outlined in the “Ok! Data test”, since the said website is offering for sale purported DUREX products along with third-party products. See, [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.8. Such use of the disputed domain name cannot be

accepted as a bona fide offering of goods or services or as a fair use. Lastly, the Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

By failing to submit a Response, 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.

Accordingly, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

### **C. Registered or Used in Bad Faith**

Although under the Policy, it is sufficient for the complainant to prove either the bad faith registration or use of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and used in bad faith in the present case based on the grounds stated below.

First, as is the case here, panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is confusingly similar to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

Second, the Panel considers the dates of registration of the DUREX trademark and the disputed domain name, the well-known and distinctive nature of the DUREX trademark, and the composition and use of the disputed domain name. As a result, the Panel finds it inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's prior trademark rights at the time of registering the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, considering the use of the disputed domain name described above, the Panel finds it clear that the Respondent, by using the disputed domain name, has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the DUREX trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website.

Based on the available record, 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 <durexland.ir> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Mehmet Polat Kalafatoglu/*

**Mehmet Polat Kalafatoglu**

Sole Panelist

Date: February 18, 2026