

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Anima Corp v. Hamza Assou

Case No. D2023-1318

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Anima Corp, France, represented by Coblence Avocats, France.

The Respondent is Hamza Assou, Morocco.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <muaddiamina.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 27, 2023. On March 28, 2023, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 28, 2023, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that the 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 April 17, 2023. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 7, 2023. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 9, 2023.

The Center appointed Edoardo Fano as the sole panelist in this matter on May 23, 2023. 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.

The Panel has not received any requests from the Complainant or the Respondent regarding further submissions, waivers or extensions of deadlines, and the Panel has not found it necessary to request any further information from the Parties.

Having reviewed the communication records in the case file provided by the Center, the Panel finds that the Center has discharged its responsibility under the Rules, paragraph 2(a), “to employ reasonably available means calculated to achieve actual notice to the Respondent”. Therefore, the Panel shall issue its Decision based upon the Complaint, the Policy, the Rules and the Supplemental Rules and without the benefit of a response from the Respondent.

The language of the proceeding is English, being the language of the Registration Agreement, as per paragraph 11(a) of the Rules.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is Anima Corp, a French company operating in field of shoes and accessories for women, owning several trademark registrations for AMINA MUADDI, among which:

- International Trademark Registration No. 1371021 for AMINA MUADDI, registered on July 27, 2017;
- United Kingdom Trade mark Registration No. UK00801371021 for AMINA MUADDI, registered on March 21, 2018.

The Complainant also operates on the Internet, its website being “www.aminamuaddi.com”.

The Complainant provided evidence in support of the above.

According to the Whois records, the disputed domain name was registered on February 3, 2023, and it resolves to an error page. However, when the Complaint was filed the disputed domain name redirected to a website where the Complainant’s trademark and copyright-protected materials, taken from the Complainant’s official website, were reproduced, and unauthorized and purportedly counterfeit Complainant’s products were offered for sale.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark AMINA MUADDI, as the disputed domain name wholly incorporates the Complainant’s trademark by reversing the verbal elements.

Moreover, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name since it has not been authorized by the Complainant to register the disputed domain name or to use its trademark within the disputed domain name, it is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and it is not making either a *bona fide* offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name redirects to a website where the Complainant’s trademark and copyright-protected materials, taken from the Complainant’s official website, are reproduced, and unauthorized and purportedly counterfeit Complainant’s products are offered for sale.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in bad faith, since the Complainant’s trademark AMINA MUADDI is distinctive and internationally known in the women shoes and accessories field. Therefore, the Respondent targeted the Complainant’s trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name and the Complainant contends that the use of the disputed domain name with the purpose of selling unauthorized and potentially counterfeit goods by using the Complainant’s trademark and pirated product photos and text from the Complainant’s official website, creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark and trading upon the Complainant’s reputation, qualifies as bad faith registration and use.

B. Respondent

The Respondent has made no reply to the Complainant's contentions and is in default. In reference to paragraphs 5(f) and 14 of the Rules, no exceptional circumstances explaining the default have been put forward or are apparent from the record.

A respondent is not obliged to participate in a proceeding under the Policy, but if it fails to do so, reasonable facts asserted by a complainant may be taken as true, and appropriate inferences, in accordance with paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, may be drawn. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.3.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists three elements, which the Complainant must satisfy in order to succeed:

- (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 in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Panel finds that the Complainant is the owner of the trademark AMINA MUADDI both by registration and acquired reputation and that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark AMINA MUADDI, as it incorporates the Complainant's trademark with the two names reversed.

It is also well accepted that a generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD"), in this case ".com", is typically ignored when assessing the similarity between a trademark and a domain name. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has therefore met its burden of proving that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark, pursuant to the Policy, paragraph 4(a)(i).

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy requires the Complainant to prove that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Respondent may establish rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name by demonstrating in accordance with paragraph 4(c) of the Policy any of the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation:

- "(i) before any notice to you [the respondent] of the dispute, [the respondent's] 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) [the respondent] 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) [the respondent] 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."

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant has the burden of proving the three elements of the Policy. However, satisfying the burden of proving a lack of the Respondent's rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name according to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy is potentially quite difficult, since proving a negative circumstance is generally more complicated than establishing a positive one. As such, it is well accepted that it is sufficient for the Complainant to make a *prima facie* case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name in order to shift the burden of production to the Respondent. If the Respondent fails to demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name in accordance with paragraph 4(c) of the Policy or on any other basis, the Complainant is deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

The Complainant in its Complaint, and as set out above, has established a *prima facie* case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. It asserts that the Respondent, who is not currently associated with the Complainant in any way, is not using the disputed domain name for a legitimate noncommercial or fair use or in connection with a *bona fide* offering of goods or services. When the Complaint was filed, the disputed domain name redirected to a website where the Complainant's trademark and copyright-protected materials, taken from the Complainant's official website, were reproduced, and unauthorized and purportedly counterfeit Complainant's products were offered for sale.

The *prima facie* case presented by the Complainant is enough to shift the burden of production to the Respondent to demonstrate that it has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. However, the Respondent has not presented any evidence of any rights or legitimate interests it may have in the disputed domain name.

Should the Complainant's products sold on the website to which the disputed domain name is directing Internet users be genuine products, legitimately acquired by the Respondent, the question that would arise is whether the Respondent would therefore have a legitimate interest in using the disputed domain name that is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark in circumstances that are likely to give rise to confusion.

According to the current state of UDRP decisions in relation to the issue of resellers as summarized in the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.8.1:

"[...] resellers, distributors, or service providers using a domain name containing the complainant's trademark to undertake sales or repairs related to the complainant's goods or services may be making a *bona fide* offering of goods and services and thus have a legitimate interest in such domain name. Outlined in the "Oki Data test", the following cumulative requirements will be applied in the specific conditions of a UDRP case:

- (i) the respondent must actually be offering the goods or services at issue;
- (ii) the respondent must use the site to sell only the trademarked goods or services;
- (iii) the site must accurately and prominently disclose the registrant's relationship with the trademark holder; and
- (iv) the respondent must not try to "corner the market" in domain names that reflect the trademark."

This summary is based on the UDRP decision in *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#).

Even if the products sold by the Respondent were the Complainant's genuine products, from inspection of the Respondent's website, the Panel finds that the use of the Complainant's trademark and products advertising material, taken from the Complainant's official website, and the lack of any disclaimer would not make, under the Oki Data principles (see above), a *bona fide* offering of goods and services and thus a legitimate interest of the Respondent in the disputed domain name.

The Panel therefore concludes that the disputed domain name is not being used in connection with a *bona fide* offering of goods or services.

Moreover, the Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain names carries a risk of implied affiliation as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

The Panel therefore finds that paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy has been satisfied.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides that “[f]or the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith:

- (i) circumstances indicating that [the respondent has] registered or [has] acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of the complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of [its] documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or
- (ii) [the respondent has] registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that [the respondent has] engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) [the respondent has] registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) by using the domain name, [the respondent has] intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [the respondent's] website or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of [the respondent's] web site or location or of a product or service on [the respondent's] web site or location”.

Regarding the registration in bad faith of the disputed domain name, the reputation of the Complainant's trademark AMINA MUADDI in the women shoes and accessories field is clearly established and the Panel finds that the Respondent likely knew of the Complainant, and deliberately registered the disputed domain name in bad faith, especially because the disputed domain name resolved to a website offering for the sale the same products as the Complainant and in which the Complainant's trademark as well as Complainant's official advertising materials were reproduced.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name is also being used in bad faith since the Respondent was trying to attract Internet users to its website by creating likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark in order to sell the same products as the Complainant, an activity clearly detrimental to the Complainant's business.

As regards the current use in bad faith of the disputed domain name, which resolves to an error page, the Panel considers that bad faith may exist even in cases of so-called “passive holding”, as found in the landmark UDRP decision *Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0003](#). In the circumstances of this case, the Panel finds that such passive holding does not prevent a finding of bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. In support thereof, the Panel considers as relevant the notoriety of the Complainant's trademark, the previous use of the disputed domain name, and the Respondent's failure to formally participate.

The above suggests to the Panel that the Respondent intentionally registered and is using the disputed domain name in order both to disrupt the Complainant's business, and to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website in accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Furthermore, the Panel considers that the nature of the inherently misleading disputed domain name, which includes the Complainant's trademark in its entirety with the two names reversed, further supports a finding of bad faith. See, [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has presented evidence to satisfy its burden of proof with respect to the issue of whether the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The Panel therefore finds that paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy has been satisfied.

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, <muaddiamina.com>, be transferred to the Complainant.

/Edoardo Fano/

Edoardo Fano

Sole Panelist

Date: June 1, 2023