

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Société Louis Delhaize Financière et de Participation (DELFIPAR) v. KOFFI HILLARY

Case No. D2024-0856

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Société Louis Delhaize Financière et de Participation (DELFIPAR), Belgium, represented by MIIP MADE IN IP, France.

The Respondent is KOFFI HILLARY, France.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <louisdelhaizegroup.com> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 27, 2024. On February 28, 2024, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On February 28, 2024, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 29, 2024, 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 March 1, 2024.

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 March 5, 2024. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 25, 2024. The Respondent did not submit any response.

Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 26, 2024. The Center appointed Mathias Lilleengen as the sole panelist in this matter on March 28, 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 to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a Belgian company that runs supermarkets, hyper markets, convenience stores and other distribution in France, Belgium, Luxembourg, and Romania.

The Complainant owns and uses several trademarks containing the words LOUIS DELHAIZE, such as the Benelux trademark No. 956197 (registered on July 17, 2014) and No. 715883 (registered on February 1, 2003). The Complainant owns the domain name <louisdelaize.be> (registered on March 13, 2001).

The Domain Name was registered on November 3, 2023. The Domain Name resolves to a coming soon page that invites Internet users to leave their email address. The Domain Name has also been used to send fraudulent emails to the Complainant's clients (Annexes 11 and 12 to the Complaint).

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant argues that it is a well-known company, and it provides evidence of trademark registrations. It contends that the Domain Name is strongly confusingly similar - almost identical - to the Complainant's trademark. The only difference is the addition of the term "group" in the Domain Name.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has not been granted any authorization to use the Complainant's trademark. The Respondent has registered the Domain Name under anonymity which may be considered as a lack of rights or legitimate interests.

The Complainant believes that the Respondent knew or should have known of the Complainant's trademark. The registration of the Domain Name cannot be a coincidence. The Complainant argues that the Domain Name was registered to create a confusion with the Complainant. The Respondent has used a privacy service, and the Respondent has configured mail servers and created email addresses most likely with fraudulent intent. Alternatively, the Respondent has registered the Domain Name for the purpose of preventing the Complainant from reserving it.

The Complainant requests the transfer of the Domain Name to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

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

The Complainant has established that it has rights in the trademark LOUIS DELHAIZE. The Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's trademark with the addition of "group". The addition does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8. When assessing identity or confusing similarity under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Panel may ignore the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD"). [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

The Panel finds that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which a respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name. While the overall burden of proof in UDRP 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 often impossible 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 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Based on the evidence, the Respondent is not affiliated or related to the Complainant in any way. There is no evidence that the Respondent has registered the Domain Name as a trademark or acquired trademark rights. There is no evidence of the Respondent's 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. Finally, the Panel finds that the composition of the Domain Name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

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.

The Respondent most likely knew of the Complainant when he registered the Domain Name. It follows from the composition and use of the Domain Name. The Respondent's use of the Domain Name – to collect Internet users email addresses, set up e-mail addresses from the Domain Name and send emails from those impersonating one of the Complainant's employees - indicates fraudulent intent. Moreover, the Respondent has not offered any explanation as to why it registered the Domain Name, nor provided any evidence of actual or contemplated good faith use of the Domain Name. It is implausible that the Respondent may put the Domain Name into any good faith use. In the context of this case, the Respondent use of a privacy service further points to bad faith.

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 the Domain Name <louisdelhaizegroup.com> to be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mathias Lilleengen/

Mathias Lilleengen

Sole Panelist

Date: April 8, 2024