

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Gianni Versace S.r.l. v. Sahil Mehra  
Case No. D2025-4786

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Gianni Versace S.r.l., Italy, represented by Studio Barbero S.p.A., Italy.

The Respondent is Sahil Mehra, India, self-represented.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <versaceprada.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 18, 2025. On November 19, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 21, 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 (Domain Admin, Privacy Protect, LLC (PrivacyProtect.org)) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 24, 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 26, 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 28, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 18, 2025. The Response was filed with the Center on December 17, 2025.

The Center appointed Willem J. H. Leppink as the sole panelist in this matter on December 26, 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 following facts are undisputed.

The Complainant is one of the leading international fashion companies, as well as a symbol of Italian luxury worldwide. It designs, manufactures, distributes and retails fashion and lifestyle products including *haute couture*, *prêt-à-porter*, accessories, jewelry, watches, eyewear, fragrances, and home furnishings, characterized by the VERSACE trademark. The Complainant has been using the trademark VERSACE in Italy for over forty years, and the trademark VERSACE has been also consistently used in most of the countries in the world. The Complainant was founded in 1978 in Milan by the stylist Gianni Versace, who opened the very first boutique in Via della Spiga. The Complainant operated 228 Versace retail stores as of March 29, 2025.

In January 2019, Gianni Versace S.r.l. joined Capri Holdings Limited, forming a new global fashion luxury group together with Michael Kors and Jimmy Choo. On April 10, 2025, Capri Holdings Limited announced that it had entered into an agreement to sell Versace brand to Prada for USD 1.375 billion in cash subject to certain adjustments.

The Complainant is the owner of various trademark registrations for VERSACE worldwide, including the European Union trademark registration no. 001665439 (word mark), filed on May 18, 2000, registered on September 10, 2001, registered for goods and services in classes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41 and 42, and the Indian trademark registration no. 791340 for VERSACE (word mark), applied for on February 13, 1998, registered for goods in class 25.

The Complainant operates the website “www.versace.com” as its primary web portal for global promotion and offer for sale of its VERSACE products online.

The Respondent is an individual residing in India, with no affiliation with the Complainant.

The disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent on April 10, 2025, which is the same day as Capri Holdings and Prada announced their agreement about the sale of the VERSACE brand to Prada. The disputed domain name has been redirected since registration to a registrar parking page.

#### **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 the following:

The disputed domain name entirely reproduces the Complainant's trademark VERSACE in combination with the trademark PRADA, owned by Prada S.A., which has consented to the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

The trademark VERSACE has been advertised and used in several countries of the world, including India. VERSACE products can also be purchased in India both offline and online.

In light of the fact that the trademark VERSACE is well-known and has been used extensively since 1978, it is inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the existence of the Complainant's trademark and its worldwide reputation at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. VERSACE is a trademark with such widespread notoriety that it would be nearly impossible for the Respondent not to have known this.

## **B. Respondent**

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied all three of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Respondent contends the following:

The disputed domain name was freely available for public registration at the time it was registered. The Respondent did not conceal identity for any improper purpose and cooperated with the Registrar and the Center. The disputed domain name has not been used to impersonate the Complainant, sell goods, mislead consumers, or damage the Complainant's reputation.

In particular, there was no bad faith registration or use as the Respondent has never offered the disputed domain name for sale, used it for commercial gain, or attempted to mislead Internet users. Mere registration of an available domain name does not constitute bad faith under the Policy. Moreover, there is no evidence of targeting as the Respondent has never claimed association with the Complainant, nor published any content referencing the Complainant. The Complainant relies on assumptions rather than evidence of abusive conduct. Lastly the Respondent acted in good faith as the Respondent registered the disputed domain name believing the registration to be lawful and permissible, with no intent to harm or exploit the Complainant's goodwill.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **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 or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark VERSACE 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.

Panels held that when the complainant's trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other third-party marks, here PRADA, is insufficient in itself to avoid a finding of confusing similarity to the complainant's mark under the first element. In this case, the Complainant has also provided evidence of the consent given by the owner of the PRADA trademark, that any transfer be issued in favor of the Complainant. [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 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.

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 sufficiently 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.

The Panel notes in particular that the Respondent contends having acted in good faith as the Respondent would have registered the disputed domain name believing the registration to be lawful and permissible, with no intent to harm or exploit the Complainant’s goodwill, but the Respondent has not come forward with evidence e.g. of any use of the disputed domain name (or demonstrable plans for such use), or that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name; or that the Respondent has made legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

## **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

The Complainant makes out a prima facie case that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

However, the Respondent contends that there was no bad faith registration or use as the Respondent has never offered the disputed domain name for sale, used it for commercial gain, or attempted to mislead Internet users and that the Respondent also contends that mere registration of an available domain name does not constitute bad faith under the Policy, as well as that there is no evidence of targeting as the Respondent has never claimed association with the Complainant, nor published any content referencing the Complainant.

The Panel does not accept the Respondent’s unsubstantiated contentions.

Because the VERSACE mark had been widely used and registered by the Complainant before the disputed domain name and enjoyed reputation as repeatedly recognized (e.g. *Gianni Versace S.P.A. v. Nicolino Colonnelli - Europel SRL*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-0570](#); and *Gianni Versace S.r.l. v. Xiulin Wang aka Wangxiulin*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-0539](#)), the Panel finds it more likely than not that Respondent had Complainant’s mark in mind when registering the disputed domain name, taken also into account that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name on the same day as Capri Holdings and Prada announced their agreement about the sale of the VERSACE brand to Prada.

It would have been up to the Respondent to provide evidence, e.g. what the Respondent’s good faith intentions with the disputed domain name would have been.

Panels have consistently found that the non-use of a domain name (including resolving to a registrar parking page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the fame of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of 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 <versaceprada.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Willem J. H. Leppink/*

Willem J. H. Leppink

Sole Panelist

Date: December 26, 2025