

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Skorpio Limited v. Rzhepko Leonid
Case No. D2026-1167

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Skorpio Limited, Switzerland, represented by Keltie LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Rzhepko Leonid, Ukraine.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <rickowenhoodie.com>, <rickowensclothes.com>, <rickowensclothing.com>, <rickowensdesigner.com>, <rickowensfashion.com>, <rickowensgimphoodie.com>, <rick-owens-hoodie.com>, <rickowenshoodie.com>, <rickowenshoodies.com>, <rickowensmountainhoodie.com>, <rickowenspants.com>, <rickowenspants.org>, <rickowenssale.net>, <rickowensshirt.com>, <rickowens-shorts.com>, <rickowensshorts.com>, <rickowens-store.com>, <rickowensstore.com>, <rickowens-store.net>, and <rickowens-t-shirt.com> (collectively referred to as the “Domain Names”) are registered with Hosting Ukraine LLC (ua.ukraine) (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 18, 2026. On March 18, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Names. On March 19, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response, disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Names which differed from the named Respondent (Unknown / Privacy Protection, Hosting Ukraine LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 20, 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 amended Complaint on March 20, 2026.

On March 20, 2026, the Center informed the parties in Russian and English, that the language of the registration agreement for the Domain Names is Russian. On March 20, 2026, the Complainant confirmed its request that English be the language of the proceedings. 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 Russian and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 27, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 16, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 23, 2026.

The Center appointed Piotr Nowaczyk as the sole panelist in this matter on April 28, 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 a company which manages the intellectual property rights of the United States of America (“United States”) fashion designer Rick Owens.

Rick Owens founded his fashion business in Los Angeles, United States, in 1994. In 2001, he moved production to Italy and started international distribution. His brand has received industry recognition and is worn by public figures.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous RICK OWENS trademark registrations, including:

- the European Union Trade Mark Registration for RICK OWENS (word trademark) No. 018510789, registered on March 2, 2022;
- the International Trademark Registration for RICK OWENS (word trademark) No. 1667333, registered on December 10, 2021; and
- the International Trademark Registration for RICK OWENS (figurative trademark) No. 1026597, registered on December 30, 2009.

The Complainant further claims to be the owner of the domain name <rickowens.eu>, which incorporates the RICK OWENS trademark and is used in connection with the sale of goods under that mark.

The Domain Names were registered on November 19, 2025.

At the time of filing of the Complaint as well as at the date of this Decision, the Domain Names resolve to online retail websites that prominently display the Complainant’s RICK OWENS trademark and purport to offer for sale clothing items, including pants, shorts, hoodies, t-shirts, and other apparel. The websites indicate that they are purportedly operated by “fashion designers” and “fashion editors” and purport to offer “verified” RICK OWEN items with “detailed measurements”, indicating e.g. “Each item is authenticated by dual review: documentation audit and physical inspection. We record proof of origin, then confirm all make details that define Rick Owens fashion”.

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 Domain Names.

First, the Complainant contends that the Domain Names are confusingly similar to the trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

Second, the Complainant argues that the Respondent has neither rights nor legitimate interests in the Domain Names.

Third, the Complainant submits that the Domain Names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Procedural Issues

A. Location of the Respondent

Under paragraph 10 of the Rules, the Panel is required to ensure that the Parties are treated with equality and that each Party is given a fair opportunity to present its case, and also that the administrative proceedings take place with due expedition.

The location of the Respondent disclosed by the Registrar appears to be in Ukraine, which is subject to an international conflict at the date of this Decision that may impact case notification. It is therefore appropriate for the Panel to consider, in accordance with its discretion under paragraph 10 of the Rules, whether the proceedings should continue.

Having considered all the circumstances of the case, the Panel is of the view that they should continue.

First, the Panel notes that the Notification of Complaint was done in accordance with the Rules, employing reasonably available means calculated to achieve actual notice to the Respondent.

Second, the Panel observes that the Domain Names were registered on November 19, 2025, during an ongoing international conflict. This indicates that the Respondent had access to the Internet at the relevant time and was able to register and exercise control over the Domain Names. In these circumstances, the Panel considers it reasonable to infer that the Respondent is capable of receiving electronic communications and therefore should have received, at a minimum, Notification of Complaint by email in the present proceedings. There is also no evidence on record that the Notification of Complaint email has not been successfully delivered at the Respondent's email address disclosed by the Registrar. The record also shows that the Written Notice has been delivered to the Respondent's postal address disclosed by the Registrar.

Third, the Panel notes that, for the reasons set out later in this Decision, it has no serious doubt that the Respondent registered and used the Domain Names in bad faith, with the intention of unfairly targeting the Complainant's trademark and its goods.

Having considered all the circumstances of the case, the Panel is of the view that the proceedings should continue. The Panel will therefore proceed to render its Decision.

B. Language of Proceedings

The language of the Registration Agreement for the Domain Names is Russian. 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 proceedings shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint and the amended Complaint were filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceedings be English for several reasons.

First, the Complainant states that it is established in Switzerland and is represented by counsel in the United Kingdom. It submits that neither it nor its representatives have proficiency in Russian and that they conduct their business in English.

Second, the Complainant contends that requiring translation of the Complaint and supporting materials into Russian would impose a significant and unfair burden, resulting in additional costs and delay.

Third, the Complainant submits that English is widely used in international commercial and intellectual property disputes, including proceedings under the UDRP.

Fourth, the Complainant notes that the Domain Names are composed in Latin script and include English descriptive terms. It argues that this indicates that the Respondent is familiar with English.

Fifth, the Complainant submits that the websites associated with the Domain Names are in English and display products bearing the Complainant's trademark. It argues that this demonstrates the Respondent's ability to understand or target English-speaking users.

Sixth, the Complainant states that the Respondent has been, or will be, notified of the proceeding in both English and Russian, thereby ensuring that the Respondent has a fair opportunity to participate in the present proceeding.

Finally, the Complainant submits that conducting the proceeding in English would ensure equality of treatment and provide both Parties with a fair opportunity to present their respective cases, while promoting procedural efficiency and avoiding unnecessary costs and delay.

Noting the aim of conducting the proceedings with due expedition, paragraph 10 of the Rules vests a panel with authority to conduct the proceedings in a manner it considers appropriate while also ensuring both that the parties are treated with equality, and that each party is given a fair opportunity to present its case. The credibility of any submissions by the parties and in particular those of the respondent (or lack of reaction after having been given a fair chance to comment) are particularly relevant. See section 4.5.1 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)").

In the present case the Panel agrees that substantial additional expense and delay would likely be incurred if the Complaint had to be translated into Russian. Moreover, the Panel notes that the Respondent did not comment or let alone object to the Complainant's request concerning the language of the proceedings.

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceedings shall be English.

6.2. Substantive Issues – Three Elements

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy places a burden on the Complainant to prove the presence of three separate elements, which can be summarized as follows:

- (i) the Domain Names are 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 the Domain Names; and
- (iii) the Domain Names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

The applicable standard of proof in UDRP cases is the “balance of probabilities” or “preponderance of the evidence”; some panels have also expressed this as an “on balance” standard. Under this standard, a party should demonstrate to a panel’s satisfaction that it is more likely than not that a claimed fact is true. See section 4.2 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Under the first element, the Complainant must establish that the Domain Names are identical or confusingly similar to the trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

As noted above, the Complainant holds valid registrations for the RICK OWENS trademark. The Domain Names incorporate this trademark in its entirety. As numerous UDRP panels have held, in cases where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark. See section 1.7 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

The addition of the such terms as “hoodie”, “clothes”, “clothing”, “designer”, “fashion”, “gimphoodie”, “hoodies”, “mountainhoodie”, “pants”, “sale”, “shirt”, “-shorts”, “shorts”, “-store”, “store”, or “-t-shirt” in the Domain Names does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Names and the Complainant’s RICK OWENS trademark. Panels have consistently held that where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. See section 1.8 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

One of the Domain Names, namely <rick-owens-hoodie.com>, differs from the Complainant’s RICK OWENS trademark also by the addition of a hyphen between the elements “rick” and “owens”. The addition of such punctuation does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between this disputed domain name and the Complainant’s trademark. UDRP panels have consistently held that the presence or absence of punctuation marks, such as hyphens, does not alter the fact that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the trademark at issue. See *Chernow Communications, Inc. v. Jonathon D. Kimball*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0119](#).

Moreover, the disputed domain name <rickowenhoodie.com> consists of a misspelling of the Complainant’s RICK OWENS trademark, omitting the letter “s” from the “owens” element. It is well established that a domain name which consists of a variation of a trademark (typically a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling, referred to as typosquatting) is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element. This stems from the fact that the domain name contains sufficiently recognizable aspects of the relevant mark. See section 1.9 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

The Top-Level Domains (“TLDs”) “.com”, “.org”, and “.net” in the Domain Names are viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such are typically disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. See section 1.11.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

Given the above, the Panel finds that the Domain Names are confusingly similar to the Complainant’s RICK OWENS trademark. Thus, the Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Under the second element, the Complainant must prove that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names.

A right or legitimate interest in the Domain Names may be established, in accordance with paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, if the Panel finds any of the following circumstances:

- (i) that the Respondent has used or made preparations to use the Domain Names or a name corresponding to the Domain Names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services prior to the dispute; or
- (ii) that the Respondent is commonly known by the Domain Names, even if the Respondent has not acquired any trademark rights; or
- (iii) that the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Names without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark.

In the present case, the Complainant's RICK OWENS trademark registrations predate the Respondent's registration of the Domain Names. There is no evidence in the case record that the Complainant has licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the RICK OWENS trademark or to register the Domain Names incorporating this trademark.

Moreover, it results from the evidence on record that the Respondent does not make use of the Domain Names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor does it make a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name. On the contrary, at the time of filing of the Complaint as well as at the date of this Decision, the Domain Names resolve to online shops that prominently display the Complainant's RICK OWENS trademark and purport to offer for sale "measured" and "authenticated" clothing items branded with the RICK OWENS trademark.

Prior UDRP panels have recognized that resellers, distributors, or service providers using a domain name containing the complainant's trademark to undertake sales or repairs related to the complainant's goods or services may be making a bona fide offering of goods and services and thus have a legitimate interest in such domain name. Outlined in the "Ok! Data test", the following cumulative requirements will be applied in the specific conditions of a UDRP case:

- (i) the respondent must actually be offering the goods or services at issue;
- (ii) the respondent must use the site to sell only the trademarked goods or services;
- (iii) the site must accurately and prominently disclose the registrant's relationship with the trademark holder; and
- (iv) the respondent must not try to "corner the market" in domain names that reflect the trademark.

In the present case, the above referred requirements are not met. The Domain Names themselves, incorporating the Complainant's RICK OWENS trademark together with such terms as "hoodie", "clothes", "clothing", "designer", "fashion", "gimphoodie", "pants", "sale", "shirt", "shorts", "store", or "-t-shirt" (all referring to products associated with the Complainant's business), together with the content of the corresponding websites, affirm the Respondent's intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the Domain Names and the Complainant as to the origin or affiliation of these websites.

While most of the websites indicate in small font that they are purportedly operated by a "fashion editor" or "fashion designer", the Panel believes that the websites do not indicate sufficiently clear and prominently their lack of relationship with the Complainant. Moreover, noting the prominent use of the Complainant's trademark on the associated websites, purported offer of the "measured" and "authenticated" RICK OWENS-branded products and the overall websites design, coupled with the composition of the Domain Names, Internet users may falsely believe that the websites are those of the Complainant or an entity associated with the Complainant.

Given the above, there are no circumstances in evidence which could demonstrate, pursuant to paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, any rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in respect of the Domain Names. Thus, there is no evidence in the case record that refutes the Complainant's prima facie case. In sum, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Under the third element, the Complainant must prove that the Domain Names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

Bad faith under the UDRP is broadly understood to occur where a respondent takes unfair advantage of or otherwise abuses a complainant's mark. See section 3.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

Under paragraph 4(b) of the Policy, evidence of bad faith registration and use includes, without limitation:

- (i) circumstances indicating the domain name was registered or acquired primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the owner of a trademark or to a competitor of the trademark owner, for valuable consideration in excess of the documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or
- (ii) circumstances indicating that the domain name was registered in order to prevent the owner of a trademark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided it is a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) circumstances indicating that the domain name was registered primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) circumstances indicating that the domain name has intentionally been used in an attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to a website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with a trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website or location or of a product or service on a website or location.

As indicated above, the Complainant's rights in the RICK OWENS trademark predate the registration of the Domain Names. This Panel finds that the Respondent was or should have been aware of the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration. This finding is supported by the use of the RICK OWENS trademark in the Domain Names and on the associated websites, and the promotion of the goods bearing this trademark.

Moreover, it has been proven to the Panel's satisfaction that the Complainant's RICK OWENS trademark is well known, at least in the field of clothing industry. Thus, the Respondent should have been aware of this trademark, while offering goods bearing the RICK OWENS trademark. In sum, the Respondent, more likely than not, registered the Domain Names with the intention of taking unfair advantage of the reputation of the Complainant's RICK OWENS trademark.

The Panel thus finds, on the balance of probabilities, that the Domain Names have been registered and are used in bad faith by the Respondent to attract Internet users to the associated online shops. The Panel finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the associated websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the websites.

For the reasons discussed above, 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 Domain Names <rickowenhoodie.com>, <rickowensclothes.com>, <rickowensclothing.com>, <rickowensdesigner.com>, <rickowensfashion.com>, <rickowensgimphoodie.com>, <rick-owens-hoodie.com>, <rickowenshoodie.com>, <rickowenshoodies.com>, <rickowensmountainhoodie.com>, <rickowenspants.com>, <rickowenspants.org>, <rickowenssale.net>, <rickowensshirt.com>, <rickowens-shorts.com>, <rickowensshorts.com>, <rickowens-store.com>, <rickowensstore.com>, <rickowens-store.net>, and <rickowens-t-shirt.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Piotr Nowaczyk/

Piotr Nowaczyk

Sole Panelist

Date: May 8, 2026