

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Société Anonyme des Galeries Lafayette v. 张争良 (zhang zheng liang)
Case No. DPW2026-0001

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Société Anonyme des Galeries Lafayette, France, represented by Dreyfus & associés, France.

The Respondent is 张争良 (zhang zheng liang), China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <galerieslafayette.pw> is registered with Alibaba Cloud Computing Ltd. d/b/a HiChina (www.net.cn) (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 23, 2026. On February 23, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 24, 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 (Not disclosed) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 24, 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 amended Complaint in English on February 26, 2026.

On February 24, 2026, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. On February 26, 2026, the Complainant confirmed its request that English be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant's submission.

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 in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on February 27, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 19, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 22, 2026.

The Center appointed Francine Tan as the sole panelist in this matter on March 27, 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 French company operating a well-known department store and retail business under the name and mark GALERIES LAFAYETTE. It is specialized in city-center fashion retailing and positions itself, in France and overseas, as a benchmark in omni-channel retailing. The Complainant states that the Galeries Lafayette group receives more than 60 million visitors every year in its 290 stores and e-commerce websites, and that it employs nearly 8,500 people. The Complainant's main website is operated from the domain name <galerieslafayette.com>, which was registered on August 1, 1997.

The Complainant owns trade mark registrations for GALERIES LAFAYETTE, including the following:

- International Registration No. 1523937 for a figurative GALERIES LAFAYETTE mark, registered on January 10, 2020, designations of which include China;
- International Registration No. 553543 for GALERIES LAFAYETTE, registered on April 12, 1990, designations of which include China; and
- European Union trade mark Registration No. 003798147 for GALERIES LAFAYETTE, registered on May 19, 2006.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 24, 2025. At the time the Complaint was filed, the disputed domain name resolved to an error page.

The Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent via the Registrar and online form. Despite several reminders, the Respondent did not respond to the Complainant's communications.

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:

- (i) the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's GALERIES LAFAYETTE trade mark in which it has rights, as it reproduces the mark in its entirety, with only the ".pw" country code Top-Level Domain ("ccTLD");
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use its GALERIES LAFAYETTE mark or to register any domain name incorporating that mark. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, and the disputed domain name has not been used for a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use; and

(iii) the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The disputed domain name is identical to the GALERIES LAFAYETTE mark (apart from the ccTLD), which is well-known, including in China where the Respondent is located. The Respondent must have known of the Complainant when registering the disputed domain name. The Complainant's trade mark registrations for GALERIES LAFAYETTE long predate the registration date of the disputed domain name. A simple Internet search would have surfaced results relating to the Complainant and its products under its GALERIES LAFAYETTE trade mark. The passive holding of the disputed domain name does not preclude a finding of bad faith in this case as the Complainant's GALERIES LAFAYETTE trade mark is well-known.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including the fact that the Complainant is located in France and has no knowledge of Chinese; the disputed domain name is composed entirely of Latin characters; English is the primary language for international relations; and requiring translation of the Complaint into Chinese would cause undue burden in costs and delay.

The Respondent did not make any submissions with respect to the language of the proceeding. In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see [WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions \("WIPO Overview 3.1"\)](#), section 4.5.1).

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English. The Panel does not find any reason in this case for delaying the proceeding or burdening the Complainant with the costs stemming from an order for the Complaint to be translated into Chinese.

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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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

The entirety of the GALERIES LAFAYETTE mark is reproduced and recognizable within the disputed domain name. The only difference is the addition of the ".pw" ccTLD, which is generally disregarded for the purpose of assessing confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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. 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.

Moreover, the composition of the disputed domain name, which consists solely of the Complainant's distinctive mark, falsely suggests that the disputed domain name is the Complainant's official domain name or is otherwise operated or authorized by the Complainant. In these circumstances, the disputed domain name effectively impersonates the Complainant at the domain-name level. Domain names which are identical to a complainant's trade mark carry a high risk of implied affiliation. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The disputed domain name incorporates the entirety of the Complainant's distinctive and well-established GALERIES LAFAYETTE mark. The GALERIES LAFAYETTE trade mark has been used and registered for many years by the Complainant.

The evidence shows that the disputed domain name resolved only to an error page, or access-denied message. Panels have consistently found that passive holding of a domain name does not necessarily prevent a finding of bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy. Panels must examine all the circumstances of the case, including the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant's mark; and the failure of the respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3.

Here, those circumstances support a finding of bad faith registration and use. The Complainant's GALERIES LAFAYETTE trade mark is distinctive and well established. The Respondent has not explained its registration of a domain name identical to that mark. The Respondent ignored the Complainant's pre-Complaint correspondence and failed to file any Response in this proceeding. On the present record, the Panel cannot conceive of any plausible good-faith use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent.

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 <gallerieslafayette.pw> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Francine Tan/

Francine Tan

Sole Panelist

Date: April 10, 2026