

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Caroll International v. 谢青亦 (Pergr kellss)  
Case No. D2024-1912

### 1. The Parties

The Complainant is Caroll International, France, represented by MIIP MADE IN IP, France.

The Respondent is 谢青亦 (Pergr kellss), United States of America (“United States”) and China.

### 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <carollfr.com> is registered with West263 International Limited (the “Registrar”).

### 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 7, 2024. On the same day, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 8, 2024, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 9, 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 in English on May 10, 2024.

On May 9, 2024, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. On May 10, 2024, the Complainant requested English to 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 May 15, 2024. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 4, 2024. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 5, 2024.

The Center appointed Karen Fong as the sole panelist in this matter on June 13, 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 is a French clothing brand for women created in 1963. The products sold under the CAROLL trade mark are sold in more than 500 stores in France and abroad as well as the Complainant's website at "www.caroll.com." The website is multilingual and available in the French, Spanish, German, Italian, English and Portuguese languages. The Complainant uses various celebrities as its "Muses". These have included the actress, Sienna Miller and Miss France 2015, Camille Cerf. The Complainant has about 118,000 followers on its Facebook account and 136,000 on its Instagram account.

The Complainant has trade mark registrations for CAROLL in many countries around the world including the following:

- French Trade Mark Registration No. 1233265 for CAROLL registered on April 15, 1983;
- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 9892431 for CAROLL registered on September 16, 2011; and
- International Trade Mark Registration No. 1208979 for CAROLL designating inter alia China, registered on February 25, 2014.

(together, individually and collectively referred to as the "Trade Mark").

The Respondent appears to be based in both China and the United States, according to the registrant information provided by the Registrar. However, the address provided does not exist in either China or the United States. The disputed domain name was registered on April 27, 2024. The disputed domain name was connected to a website which displays the Trade Mark prominently, mimics the Complainant's own website including using its images and purportedly offers for sale merchandise that bears the Trade Mark at discounted or "sale" prices and purports to be the Complainant's products (the "Website"). The "About Us" section of the Website does not provide any contact details. The Website is currently inactive.

#### **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 is confusingly similar to the Trade Mark, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name, and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

##### **B. Respondent**

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

## 6. Discussion and Findings

### 6.1 Preliminary Issue: Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain names 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 the following main reasons:

- English is the business language;
- the “.com” generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) targets consumers from all over the world who are familiar with the English language;
- the disputed domain name is composed of Latin characters rather than Chinese script and includes the international country code “fr” in Latin characters;
- there are other UDRP cases in which panel decided English to be the language of the proceeding involving the Registrar;
- the Complainant is based in France, and has no knowledge of the Chinese language; and
- for the Complainant to translate the Complaint into Chinese would unfairly disadvantage and burden the Complainant in terms of costs and delay the proceeding and adjudication of this matter.

The Respondent has not challenged the Complainant’s language request and in fact has failed to file a response in either English or Chinese despite being duly notified by the Center in both English and Chinese of the language of the proceeding and of the commencement 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 Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), 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.

### 6.2 Substantive Issues

#### 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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 Panel finds the entirety of the Trade Mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trade Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

While the addition of the other term here, “fr” after the Trade Mark in the disputed domain name 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 Trade Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Based on the available record, 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.

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.

Having reviewed the 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 nature of the disputed domain name is inherently misleading as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

Based on the available record, 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 present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent must have been aware of the Trade Mark when he/she registered the disputed domain name given the Trade Mark was registered prior to registration of the disputed domain name and the use of the Trade Mark on the Website. It is therefore implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant when he/she registered the disputed domain name.

In the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2 states as follows:

“Noting the near instantaneous and global reach of the Internet and search engines, and particularly in circumstances where the complainant’s mark is widely known (including in its sector) or highly specific and a respondent cannot credibly claim to have been unaware of the mark (particularly in the case of domainers), panels have been prepared to infer that the respondent knew, or have found that the respondent should have known, that its registration would be identical or confusingly similar to a complainant’s mark. Further factors including the nature of the domain name, the chosen top-level domain, any use of the domain name, or any respondent pattern, may obviate a respondent’s claim not to have been aware of the complainant’s mark.”

The fact that there is a clear absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with the Respondent’s choice of the disputed domain name without any explanation is also a significant factor to consider (as stated in [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1). The disputed domain name falls into the category stated above and the Panel finds that registration is in bad faith. The addition of the term “fr” after the Trade Mark further reflects that the Respondent had the Complainant in mind when registering the disputed domain name given the fact that the Complainant is French.

The disputed domain name is also being used in bad faith. The products offered for sale on the Website are likely to be counterfeit and/or unauthorised CAROLL products considering the products sold on the Website are heavily discounted and the fact that there is no relationship between the Parties.

The Website has prominently displayed the Trade Mark, without any disclaimer disclosing (the lack of) relationship between the Parties. The content of the Website is calculated to give the impression it has been authorized by or connected to the Complainant when this is not the case. The Website was set up to deliberately mislead Internet users into believing that it is connected to, authorised by or affiliated with the Complainant. From the above, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, by misleading Internet users into believing that the Website was, and the products sold on it are those of or authorised or endorsed by the Complainant.

It is highly likely that Internet users when typing the disputed domain name into their browser or finding it through a search engine would have been looking for a site operated by the Complainant rather than the Respondent. The disputed domain name is likely to confuse Internet users trying to find the Complainant's official website. Such confusion will inevitably result due to the fact that the disputed domain name comprises the Trade Mark in its entirety.

The fact that the disputed domain name is now inactive does not prevent a finding of bad faith given that the distinctiveness and reputation of the Trade Mark, the composition of the disputed domain name, the lack of a response from the Respondent and the fact that the address of the Respondent lists two different countries and does not exist.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Based on the available record, 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 <carollfr.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Karen Fong/*

**Karen Fong**

Sole Panelist

Date: June 27, 2024