

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Association des Centres Distributeurs E. Leclerc – A.C.D. Lec v. Name
Redacted

Case No. D2023-5138

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Association des Centres Distributeurs E. Leclerc – A.C.D. Lec, France, represented by MIIP MADE IN IP, France.

The Respondent is Name Redacted, United States of America.¹

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <galec-leclerc.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 December 8, 2023. On December 11, 2023, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 11, 2023, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 13, 2023, 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 December 14, 2023.

¹ The Respondent appears to have used the name of a third party when registering the disputed domain name. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted the Respondent’s name from this decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this decision an instruction to the Registrar regarding transfer of the disputed domain name, which includes the name of the Respondent. The Panel has authorised the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in this proceeding and has indicated that Annex 1 to this decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST-12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1788](#).

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 December 18, 2023. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 7, 2024. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 8, 2024.

The Center appointed Adam Taylor as the sole panelist in this matter on January 31, 2024. 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 operates a supermarket chain known as E. LECLERC, with over 700 stores in France. In 2022, the Complainant’s turnover in France was some EUR 55.6 billion, and it employed approximately 140,000 people.

A company in the Complainant’s group, Societe Cooperative Groupements d’Achats des Centres Leclerc (“SC Galec”), handles contracts with the Complainant’s suppliers.

The Complainant owns French trade mark No. 1307790 for LECLERC, filed on May 2, 1985, in classes 1-29;

SC Galec owns French trade mark No. 3644736 for GALEC, registered on September 18, 2009, in class 35.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 14, 2023.

As of November 20, 2023, the disputed domain name resolved to a Registrar parking page with pay-per-click (“PPC”) links, most of which related to shopping. Also, mail exchange records (“MX records”) had been configured enabling use of the disputed domain name for email. At the time of filing, and presently, the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive website.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove on the balance of probabilities that:

- the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trade mark in which the Complainant has rights;

- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), 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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, "galec") 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 3.0](#), section 1.8. Nor does it make any difference that the additional term is another trade mark, particularly bearing in mind that this trade mark is also owned within the Complainant's group. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.12.

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 recognised 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 3.0](#), 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.

As to paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, the disputed domain name has been used for a parking page with PPC links relating to the Complainant's industry, namely shopping. Use of a domain name to host PPC links that compete with or capitalise on the reputation and goodwill of the complainant's mark or otherwise mislead Internet users does not represent a bona fide offering. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.9.

Nor is there any evidence that paragraphs 4(c)(ii) or (iii) of the Policy are relevant in the circumstances of this case.

Furthermore, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, claimed phishing) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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.

In the Panel's view, by using the disputed domain name that comprises two highly distinctive trade marks owned within the Complainant's group in connection with a parking page with PPC links relating to the Complainant's industry, the Respondent has intentionally created a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trade mark in accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Respondents cannot disclaim responsibility for "automatically" generated pay-per-click links on their websites and neither the fact that such links are generated by a third party such as a registrar, nor the fact that the respondent itself may not have directly profited, would by itself prevent a finding of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.5.

Furthermore, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, claimed phishing) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. The Panel notes that the Respondent has not appeared in this proceeding to contest the Complainant's allegation of fraud.

The current non-use of the disputed domain name for a website does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 <galec-leclerc.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Adam Taylor/

Adam Taylor

Sole Panelist

Date: February 14, 2024