

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Guccio Gucci S.p.A. v. ming song  
Case No. D2026-0768

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Guccio Gucci S.p.A., Italy, represented by Studio Barbero S.p.A., Italy.

The Respondent is ming song, Malaysia.

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

The disputed domain name <gucci.game> is registered with Gname.com Pte. Ltd. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 23, 2026. On February 24, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 26, 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 (Redacted for privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 26, 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 March 2, 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 March 3, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 23, 2026. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on February 27, 2026. The Center notified the Parties of the commencement of panel appointment process on March 25, 2026.

The Center appointed Pascal Böhner as the sole panelist in this matter on March 30, 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 Guccio Gucci S.p.A., an Italian luxury fashion house founded in 1921 by Guccio Gucci. The Complainant belongs to the international conglomerate Kering and is one of the leading companies worldwide in the manufacture and commercialization of apparel and accessories. The Complainant was ranked 31st in the 2020 Forbes “World’s Most Valuable Brands” list, with a brand value of USD 22.6 billion, and was ranked 69th according to the Interbrand “Best Global Brands” ranking in 2025.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations for GUCCI worldwide, including the following:

- International Trademark Registration No. 429833 for GUCCI (word mark), registered on March 30, 1977, in Classes 3, 14, 18, and 25;
- International Trademark Registration No. 457952 for GUCCI (word mark), registered on December 16, 1980, in all Classes;
- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 000121988 for GUCCI (word mark), registered on November 24, 1998, in all Classes.

The Complainant also holds trademark registrations in Malaysia, where the Respondent is reportedly located, including:

- Malaysian Trademark Registration No. 88000122 for GUCCI in Class 14 (registered August 17, 1990);
- Malaysian Trademark Registration No. 89005297 for GUCCI in Class 9 (registered May 2, 2001); and
- Malaysian Trademark Registration No. 89006509 for GUCCI in Class 28 covering “games” (registered July 19, 1994).

The Complainant operates its official website at the domain name <gucci.com>, registered on June 5, 1996, and maintains five retail stores in Malaysia.

The Complainant has extensively entered the gaming industry through virtual fashion, branded in-game experiences, and collaborations to connect with younger consumers. Key initiatives include “Gucci Town” on Roblox, a branded “Gucci Garden” experience, a limited-edition “Xbox Series X” console, partnerships with e-sports teams “Fnatic” and “100 Thieves”, and the “Gucci Gaming Academy”, established in 2022 in collaboration with “Faceit”. The Complainant also launched the “Gucci Good Game” capsule collection celebrating the bridge between the fashion house and the world of gaming.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 13, 2025. It has not been pointed to any active website since its registration.

On December 22, 2025, the Complainant’s representative sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent via the Registrar, demanding the transfer of the disputed domain name. A reminder was sent on January 15, 2026. Neither communication received a response.

#### **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 identical to its GUCCI trademark, as it reproduces the mark in its entirety with the mere addition of the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.game”, which is to be disregarded for the purposes of the first element. The Complainant refers to section 1.7 and section 1.11 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”) and cites prior decisions in which the “.game” gTLD was similarly disregarded.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. It submits that the Respondent is not a licensee or authorized agent of the Complainant, is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and has not used the disputed domain name in connection with any bona fide offering of goods or services. The Complainant further argues that the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not constitute legitimate non-commercial or fair use. The Complainant also highlights that the disputed domain name, being identical to the well-known GUCCI trademark, carries a high risk of implied affiliation, particularly given the Complainant's documented activities in the gaming industry, and that “gucci” corresponds to the surname of the Complainant's founder with no meaning in any foreign language.

The Complainant further contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Given the worldwide fame of the GUCCI trademark, the Complainant argues it is inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's rights at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant invokes the passive holding doctrine and argues that, considering the distinctiveness and reputation of the GUCCI mark, the lack of any plausible good faith use, and the Respondent's failure to respond to cease-and-desist letters, the passive holding constitutes bad faith use under the Policy.

## **B. Respondent**

The Respondent did not file a formal Response to the Complaint. On February 27, 2026, the Respondent sent an informal email communication to the Center stating: “We have no complaints. Thank you.”

## **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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the GUCCI trademark 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. The gTLD “.game” is disregarded under the first element as a standard registration requirement ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1). Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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.

The Respondent is not a licensee or authorized agent of, or otherwise connected with the Complainant and is not authorized to use the Complainant's GUCCI trademark. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. There is no record of any trademark application or registration for GUCCI in the name of the Respondent. The term “gucci” corresponds to the surname of the Complainant's founder and family and has no independent meaning in any language, and as such is not one that traders would legitimately choose unless seeking to create an impression of association with the Complainant (see *Guccio Gucci S.p.A. v. Liuqing Wu, Feiji Lu*, WIPO Case No. [D2011-1506](#); *Guccio Gucci S.p.A. v. 杨涛 杨涛 (Tao Yang)*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2747](#)).

The disputed domain name has not been pointed to any active website since its registration. Passive holding of a domain name does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or legitimate non-commercial or fair use.

Furthermore, the disputed domain name, being identical to the Complainant's well-known trademark, carries a high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1). This risk is particularly pronounced given the Complainant's documented activities in the gaming industry, making the combination of the GUCCI trademark with the “.game” gTLD especially apt to suggest sponsorship by or affiliation with the Complainant.

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.

#### **Bad faith registration:**

The GUCCI trademark is a globally famous mark that has been in continuous use for over 100 years and is the subject of a vast number of trademark registrations worldwide, including multiple registrations in Malaysia, where the Respondent is reportedly located. The Complainant maintains five retail stores in Malaysia. Prior UDRP panels have consistently recognized the worldwide fame of the GUCCI trademark (see, e.g., *Guccio Gucci S.p.A. v. Bravia Stoli*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1170](#); *Guccio Gucci S.p.A. v. D T*, WIPO Case No. [DTV2011-0006](#); *Guccio Gucci S.p.A. v. 杨涛 杨涛 (Tao Yang)*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2747](#)). Where a trademark is widely known, as is the case here, panels have held that the respondent's registration of an identical domain name by itself can create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

The Panel finds it inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's GUCCI trademark when registering the disputed domain name on November 13, 2025. The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

**Bad faith use:**

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 following circumstances:

First, the GUCCI trademark is highly distinctive and enjoys worldwide fame and reputation, including in the Respondent's jurisdiction Malaysia.

Second, given the composition of the disputed domain name, consisting exclusively of the globally famous GUCCI trademark under the “.game” gTLD, there is no plausible good faith use to which the disputed domain name could be put. Any use of the disputed domain name would inevitably suggest an affiliation with the Complainant. This conclusion is reinforced by the Complainant's extensive and documented activities in the gaming industry. In this regard, the Panel notes that while the applicable gTLD is typically disregarded under the first element of the Policy, it may be considered in assessing bad faith under the third element ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.11.2 and 3.2.1). The Respondent's choice of the “.game” gTLD in combination with the GUCCI mark indicates targeted registration directed at the Complainant and its gaming-related activities, and further reduces any plausible claim to good faith use.

Third, the Respondent has failed to submit a formal Response or provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good faith use. The Respondent's sole communication (“We have no complaints. Thank you.”) does not address the substance of the Complaint or offer any justification for the registration of the disputed domain name and could even be seen as an acknowledgment.

In light of the above, 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 <gucci.game> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Pascal Böhner/*

**Pascal Böhner**

Sole Panelist

Date: April 10, 2026