

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Television Francaise 1 v. TEN SOPHA
Case No. DTV2026-0006

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Television Francaise 1, France, represented by In Concreto, France.

The Respondent is TEN SOPHA, Cambodia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <tf1international.tv> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 9, 2026. On July 9, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 10, 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 (Anonymized / The RDAP server redacted the value) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 12, 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 on July 16, 2026.

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 July 22, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 11, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 17, 2026.

The Center appointed Mihaela Maravela as the sole panelist in this matter on August 21, 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

According to information in the Complaint, the Complainant was founded in 1974, and it is part of TF1 Group, a leading French media company, present in linear television, streaming, and audiovisual production. The Complainant's group made EUR 2,297 million of revenue in 2025 and includes more than 3,000 employees in 12 countries. Every month, 60 million French viewers tune in to watch the Complainant's programs on its free-to-air channels, and 42 million watch via streaming on TF1+.

The Complainant is the exclusive owner of several registered trademarks consisting of or including TF1, including the following:

- French trademark No. 1290436 for TF1 (word), filed on November 22, 1984 and duly renewed, in classes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41 and 42; and
- International trademark No. 556537 for TF1 (figurative), registered on July 30, 1990 and duly renewed, in classes 9, 16, 25, 28, 35, 38 and 41.

Also, the Complainant, with its subsidiaries, hold more than 830 domain names, including <tf1.tv> registered since August 9, 2013.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 20, 2026 and it redirects to a Vietnamese-language online gaming/casino 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 disputed domain name reproduces its prior trademark TF1 in its entirety, followed by the term "international", which will not alter the fact that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. The country-code Top Level Domain ("ccTLD") ".tv" for Tuvalu may also be taken into account, as it suggests that the disputed domain name is related to television and thus increases the chances for confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark, that operates in the media industry.

As regards the second element, the Complainant argues that it has not licensed or authorized the Respondent, to use its trademarks or domain names, nor has it allowed the Respondent to reserve or use a domain name incorporating the Complainant's rights or a variation thereof. Further, the disputed domain name redirects to a Vietnamese online gaming/casino site called KEOVIP and therefore the Respondent is not making a bona fide offering of goods or services.

With respect to the third element, the Complainant submits that through substantial financial, material, and human investments, it developed a large customer base through its TF1 brands, which have achieved a reputation and notoriety in its field of activity and beyond. The Complainant's TF1 brand was the highest-ranked French brand in the 2019 BAV TOP 50 awards for France's most powerful and connected brands. Further, TF1 is not a descriptive term, a commonly used expression, or a word that would be instantly understood in the field of industry, being therefore highly distinctive. As such, the Respondent could not

have ignored the existence of the Complainant's trademarks, at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name, with which it is confusingly similar. The disputed domain name redirects Internet users to a website displaying links to an online casino, indicating an intention by the Respondent to derive undue commercial benefit from the Complainant's reputation while simultaneously tarnishing its trademarks.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to "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". Likewise, paragraph 10(d) of the Rules, provides that "the Panel shall determine the admissibility, relevance, materiality and weight of the evidence".

No response has been received from the Respondent in this case. Even if the Respondent has not replied to the Complainant's contentions, the Complainant still bears the burden of proving that all requirements are fulfilled. To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied: (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights, (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, and (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The applicable standard of proof in UDRP cases is the "balance of probabilities" or "preponderance of the evidence", and the Panel can draw certain inferences in light of the particular facts and circumstances of the case. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.2. Concerning the uncontested information provided by the Complainant, the Panel may, where relevant, accept the reasonable factual allegations in the Complaint as true. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.3.

The Panel has taken note of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), and, where appropriate, will decide consistently with the consensus views stated therein.

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 the trademark TF1 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, "international") 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.

It is the settled view of panels applying the Policy that the ccTLD (here ".tv") may be disregarded under the first element test. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 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.

The Panel notes that the Respondent is not a licensee or an affiliate of the Complainant. The Complainant did not grant an authorization to the Respondent to make use of its TF1 trademarks in any manner, including as part of the disputed domain name. Also, there is no evidence that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor does the Respondent appear to engage in any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraphs 4(c)(i) and (iii) of the Policy. Rather, according to the unrebutted evidence put forward by the Complainant, the disputed domain name is used to redirect to a gambling website in Vietnamese, which shows in the Panel’s view, the Respondent’s intention to divert consumers for commercial gain to such website, by taking unfair advantage of the goodwill and reputation of the Complainant’s trademarks. The Panel considers that such use does not confer rights or legitimate interests to the Respondent.

The Respondent is named “TEN SOPHA”, as was disclosed by the Registrar, and there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant’s prima facie showing and has not come forward with any evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

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 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

According to the unrebutted assertions of the Complainant, its TF1 trademarks were widely used in commerce well before the registration of the disputed domain name and are reputed. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademarks. Under these circumstances, the Panel

considers that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark and that it targeted that trademark. This finding is further supported by the fact that the disputed domain name is registered in the “.tv” ccTLD – a domain that is generally associated with “television”, which makes it a popular and attractive domain for any businesses active in making of broadcasting video and television programs, a field in which the Complainant operates.

As regards the use of the disputed domain name, from the evidence in the case file and not rebutted by the Respondent, it results that the disputed domain name redirects Internet traffic to a gambling website in Vietnamese. Given the confusing similarity between the Complainant’s TF1 trademark and the disputed domain name, and that the websites appear to be used for commercial gain of the Respondent or of the operators of those linked websites, or both, the Panel considers that the disputed domain name is intended to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s TF1 trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent’s websites or other online location or of a service offered on such other online location within the terms of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. Furthermore, as contended by the Complainant, the TF1 trademark has gained strong reputation in relation to television as a result of the efforts of the Complainant. Given also that the disputed domain name was registered under the “.tv” ccTLD, which is itself strongly associated with television – the very service for which the TF1 trademark has gained wide recognition, the registration of the disputed domain name in this ccTLD is highly likely to cause confusion among Internet users looking for the Complainant or for its services.

Moreover, the Respondent has not formally participated in this proceeding and has failed to rebut the Complainant’s contentions and to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good faith use.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, and 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 <tf1international.tv> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mihaela Maravela/

Mihaela Maravela

Sole Panelist

Date: September 1, 2026