

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Compagnia Assicuratrice Linear S.p.A. v. Astro Nova  
Case No. D2026-0216

### 1. The Parties

The Complainant is Compagnia Assicuratrice Linear S.p.A., Italy, represented by Bugnion S.p.A., Italy.

The Respondent is Astro Nova, Indonesia.

### 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <linearassicurazioni.blog> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 20, 2026. On January 20, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 21, 2026, 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 (*The RDAP server redacted the value, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf*) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 29, 2026, 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 January 29, 2026.

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 February 4, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 24, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 26, 2026.

The Center appointed Andrea Jaeger-Lenz as the sole panelist in this matter on March 9, 2026. 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 an insurance company specializing in motor vehicle insurance. Founded in 1995, it is part of Unipol Assicurazione S.p.A, an Italian insurance group. The Complainant operates mainly in Italy, offering vehicle, home and family insurance products through online platforms and call centers.

The Complainant holds trademark rights in the term “Linear” including the following (as per Annexes 10 and 11 to the Complaint):

- Italian trademark No. 1181078 “LINEAR” (word), registered on April 2, 2009 for insurance and financial services in Class 36;
- European Union Trade Mark No. 013019179 “LINEAR” (word), registered on July 31, 2015 for goods and services in Classes 9, 16, and 36.

The Complainant’s online services are available through its official website operates under the domain name <linear.it>, which was registered on May 13, 1996. Under the URL “www.blog.linear.it” the Complainant provides an official communication channel for updates and information on its services. Besides that, the Complainant owns other domain names incorporating the term “Linear”, such as <linear.biz>, <linear.eu>, <linear.agency>, or <linear.business>, to name only a few.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 24, 2025. At and before the time of filing the present Complaint, the disputed domain name did not resolve to an active webpage or other online presence.

#### **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 it owns rights in the trademark LINEAR. Followed by the Italian word “assicurazioni” which translates into “insurances”, this strengthens the explicit connection to the “Linear” brand of the Complainant. The Complainant claims that through this particular composition the disputed domain name creates a misleading impression of an official affiliation and that consumers encountering it are likely to believe the disputed domain name to be on authorized platform of the Complainant. Moreover, according to the Complainant, its LINEAR brand has gained, through continuous and consistent use gained renown and repute for insurance in Italy, for which the Complainant puts forth a market survey (as per Annex 5 to the Complaint), brand awareness figures (as per Annex 4 to the Complaint), Google Analytics Reports on website traffic (as per Annexes 6, 7, and 8 to the Complaint) and market shares (as per Annex 9 to the Complaint).

On the second element, the Complainant states that it has never licensed, authorized or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its trademark or to register any domain name incorporating its LINEAR trademark. The Complainant finds that there is no conceivable use for the disputed domain name that would confer any legitimate interest upon the Respondent. Also, the disputed domain name is not currently used for any bona fide offering of goods or services, nor is the Respondent presently making any legitimate or fair use of it, as it

is not used at all for the time being. According to the Complainant, the Respondent lacks any plausible or legitimate justification for registering or using the disputed domain name.

On the third element, the Complainant contends that “Linear” is not a descriptive word in relation to the relevant services. Insurance traders would not legitimately choose this term unless they wished to create an impression of association with the Complainant. Further, the combination of “Linear” with “assicurazioni” cannot be coincidental, as this term explicitly pertains to the Complainant. On the contrary, so the Complainant claims, the combination of the two terms dispels any credible argument of unintentional similarity or ignorance of the Complainant’s trademark upon registration of the disputed domain name. Although the disputed domain name does not currently resolve to an active website, this does not preclude a finding of bad faith use, so the Complainant argues, given the high degree of distinctiveness of the Complainant’s trademark, the Respondent’s deliberate concealment of its identity upon registration and the implausibility of any good faith use, to which the disputed domain name could be put.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **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 Select UDRP Questions ([“WIPO Overview 3.1”](#)), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name, and it is also recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, “assicurazioni”, which translated from the Italian language means “insurances”, 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 3.1](#), section 1.8.

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 that 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 3.1](#), 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. Moreover, the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. 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 has registered the disputed domain name which consists of the Complainant's distinctive "Linear" trademark plus a generic addition reflecting exactly the Complainant's area of business in connection with the top-level domain .blog, bearing in mind that the Complainant operates a communication website at the URL "www.blog.linear.it". To the Panel, it is unconceivable that this is purely coincidental, but that the disputed domain name has been registered purposefully to target the Complainant.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name, including a blank or "coming soon" page, would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name in light of the Complainant's field of business being insurance and the fact that the Complainant operates an online blog at the URL "www.blog.linear.it", and the Respondent's failure to submit a response. In the overall assessment, it is implausible that the disputed domain name could be put to any non-infringing good faith use, so 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 <linearassicurazioni.blog> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Andrea Jaeger-Lenz/*

**Andrea Jaeger-Lenz**

Sole Panelist

Date: March 23, 2026