

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Alvazzi Holding SA v. Jefferey Stone, Enhance On Demand Labors Supply LLC

Case No. D2025-4661

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Alvazzi Holding SA, Switzerland, represented by INSCRIPTA, France.

The Respondent is Jefferey Stone, Enhance On Demand Labors Supply LLC, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <alvazzigroup.com> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on November 10, 2025. On November 11, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 13, 2025, 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, Privacy Service Provided by Hostinger) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 13, 2025, 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 amendment to the Complaint on November 17, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 November 18, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 8, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on December 16, 2025.

The Center appointed Masato Dogauchi as the sole panelist in this matter on December 19, 2025. 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 Swiss public limited company. Alvazzi Groupe, a wholly owned subsidiary of the Complainant, is doing business in the field of heating and cooling systems, ventilation and air conditioning systems and others. The Complainant operates the domain name <alvazzigroupe.com>, which is registered by the Complainant's parent company.

The Complainant has registered its ALVAZZI SA GROUPE trademark in Switzerland as follows:

- Swiss Registration for ALVAZZI SA GROUPE No. 575012, registered on July 31, 2008.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 4, 2025. Although currently the disputed domain name does not resolve to any page, the disputed domain name was used to create email addresses with the composition [...]@alvazzigroupe.com, and some emails were sent from such addresses to request, for instance, customers or commercial associates of the Complainant to remit money to a new bank account.

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.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 15(a), a panel shall decide a case on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable. Since the Respondent has not made any substantive arguments in this case, the following decision is rendered on the basis of the Complainant's contentions and other evidence submitted by the Complainant.

In accordance with the Policy, paragraph 4(a), in order to qualify for a remedy, the Complainant must prove each of the following:

- (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.

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 trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The last part of the disputed domain name, ".com", represents one of the generic Top-Level Domains, which is irrelevant in the determination of the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the ALVAZZI SA GROUPE trademark.

The word "groupe" is found in the second part of the disputed domain name, which is same as the third part of the Complainant's trademark. The first part of the disputed domain name, "alvazzi", is different from the first part of the Complainant's trademark in that just an additional "z" is added in the disputed domain name. Since the relevant part of the Complainant's trademark is sufficiently recognizable in the disputed domain name, this is a typical example of typosquatting. The Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9.

Accordingly, 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 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.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has made a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and the Respondent did not come forward with relevant evidence rebutting the prima facie case. Therefore, there is no evidence showing that the disputed domain name has been used for a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

Accordingly, 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, in consideration of the fact that the Complainant has been doing business under the ALVAZZI SA GROUPE trademark since 2008, it is unlikely that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name on October 4, 2025. In addition, the typosquatting indicates that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademark. The

Panel's finding is reinforced by the facts that the disputed domain name is almost identical to the Complainant's domain name <alvazzigroupe.com>, and that the disputed domain name has been used to send fraudulent emails impersonating the Complainant. Therefore, it is found that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith.

On the other hand, with regard to the requirement that the disputed domain name is being used in bad faith, the following facts in the present case matter: First, a phishing scheme is found in emails sent from addresses created using the disputed domain name; and second, the typosquatting is likely to mislead or cause confusion among Internet users. The Panel finds that the disputed domain name was used in bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 3.1 and 3.4.

Accordingly, 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 <alvazzigroupe.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Masato Dogauchi/

Masato Dogauchi

Sole Panelist

Date: December 23, 2025