

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Allevolution S.r.l.s. v. Ayman Lachouche  
Case No. D2025-2428

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Allevolution S.r.l.s., Italy, represented by Safety Brand S.r.l. Società tra Avvocati, Italy.

The Respondent is Ayman Lachouche, Morocco.

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

The disputed domain name <doitrip.com> is registered with DropCatch.com LLC (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 19, 2025. On June 19, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 23, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that 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 July 3, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 23, 2025. The Response was filed with the Center on July 3, 2025.

The Center appointed Steven A. Maier as the sole panelist in this matter on July 17, 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 company registered in Italy. It is a provider of travel services.

The Complainant is the owner of European Union trademark registration number 018276344 for a figurative mark DOITRIP, registered on November 10, 2020 in International Classes 35, 39 and 43. The trademark consists of the name DOITRIP in stylized text, including an elongated and tapered letter “O”.

The Complainant was the registrant of the disputed domain name between approximately August 2020 and March 11, 2025. It operated a website at “www.doitrip.com” during that period.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on May 19, 2025.

The disputed domain name has resolved to a webpage at Atom.com, offering the disputed domain name for sale. The promotional image on the webpage includes the name DOITRIP in a stylized text, including an elongated and tapered letter “O” similar to that utilized by the Complainant.

#### **5. Parties’ Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

The Complainant submits that it failed to renew its own registration of the disputed domain name owing to a credit card issue. It states that the disputed domain name therefore expired on March 11, 2025, and was then registered by the Respondent on May 19, 2025. It contends that the Respondent has made no use of the disputed domain name other than to offer it for sale at a price of USD 12,699.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is identical to the textual element of its DOITRIP trademark.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. It states that it has no affiliation with the Respondent and has never authorized it to use its DOITRIP trademark, that the Respondent has not commonly been known by that name, and that the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with any bona fide offering of goods or services. It asserts that, instead, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name for the purpose of capitalizing on the Complainant’s goodwill in its DOITRIP trademark by offering the disputed domain name for sale at an inflated price.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. It contends, in particular, that the disputed domain name was registered in an opportunistic manner following the Complainant’s own failure to renew, and that the price of USD 12,699, which is grossly disproportionate to any actual costs involved, demonstrates an intention to take unfair advantage of the Complainant’s goodwill. It adds that the Respondent has made no attempt actively to develop the disputed domain name.

##### **B. Respondent**

The Respondent states that it purchased the disputed domain name at a public domain auction, after it had expired, as part of its domain investment activities. It submits that such activities are lawful and do not constitute bad faith.

The Respondent states that it was unaware of the Complainant’s trademark when it registered the disputed domain name, and that the disputed domain name is comprised of “common English words” and is not inherently distinctive.

The Respondent submits that it has never attempted to impersonate the Complainant, and that the Complainant's failure to renew the disputed domain name, while unfortunate, is not a basis to deprive a legitimate purchaser of it.

The Respondent submits that it has listed the disputed domain name for sale at market value, which again does not constitute bad faith.

The Respondent states that it has been the subject of aggressive demands from the Complainant's representatives and that the present proceeding amounts to an attempt at Reverse Domain Name Hijacking.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

In order to succeed in the Complaint, the Complainant is required to show that all three of the elements set out under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are present. Those elements are that:

- (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**

The Complainant has demonstrated that it is the owner of registered trademark rights for a figurative mark incorporating the textual element DOITRIP. The disputed domain name is identical to the textual element of that trademark and contains nothing to distinguish it from the trademark. The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

### **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

The Respondent submits that it registered the disputed domain name, and offered it for sale, as part of its legitimate business of domain name investment.

While domain name investment is not illegitimate per se, a domain name investor (or "domainer") will only be able to establish rights or legitimate interests in respect of a domain name for the purposes of the Policy in certain circumstances. In particular (and as discussed, for example, in section 2.10 of WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), a respondent may have rights or legitimate interests in respect of a domain name comprising a dictionary word or phrase, or an acronym, providing the domain name is used for a purpose connected with the relied-on dictionary or common meaning, and is not being used to take unfair advantage of third-party trademark rights.

In this case, while the Respondent claims that the disputed domain name comprises "common English words", the Panel does not agree. While the terms "do" and "trip" are indeed English words, it is not clear what meaning of the word or letter "I" or "i" is relied on by the Respondent. Moreover, the three elements in conjunction do not represent any dictionary word, phrase, or expression in common usage, but suggest instead a coined and distinctive term identical to the Complainant's mark DOITRIP.

As further discussed below, the Panel also finds that, despite its denial, the Respondent was, or should have been, aware of the Complainant's DOITRIP trademark when it registered the disputed domain name, and that its pricing of the disputed domain name can only sensibly represent its value to the Complainant as opposed to any unconnected party.

The Panel finds in the circumstances that the Respondent most likely registered the disputed domain name in order to take unfair advantage of the Complainant's trademark rights and that, accordingly, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

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

The Respondent claims to have had no knowledge of the Complainant's trademark rights at the time it registered the disputed domain name. However, the Respondent bought the domain name knowing it to be an expired domain name which had previously been registered by another party (an activity commonly known as "drop-catching").

As observed in section 3.2.3 of [WIPO Overview 3.0](#):

"Willful blindness and the duty to search for and avoid trademark-abusive registrations.

Panels have held that especially domainers undertaking bulk purchases or automated registrations have an affirmative obligation to avoid the registration of trademark-abusive domain names. Panelists will look to the facts of the case to determine whether such respondent has undertaken good faith efforts to screen such registrations against readily-available online databases to avoid the registration of trademark-abusive domain names."

(While it is unclear in this case whether the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name on an individual basis, as opposed to by way of a bulk or automated purchase, the above principles are obviously of at least equal application to an individual purchase of a previously-registered domain name.)

In this case, there is no evidence of the Respondent having made any good-faith efforts to screen the disputed domain name against readily-available online databases. Had it conducted a search against, for example, the WIPO Global Brand Database, it would have learned not only that the Complainant was the owner of a 2020 registration for the trademark DOITRIP, but also that it was the only registrant of any trademark corresponding to that name.<sup>1</sup>

Furthermore, despite the Complainant having exhibited the Atom.com webpage offering the disputed domain name for sale, which includes a stylized version of the name DOITRIP with an elongated and tapered letter "O" similar to that utilized in the Complainant's figurative trademark, the Respondent offers no explanation for this presentation.

Finally, as observed above in connection with the second element, the Panel is unable to accept that the Respondent's asking price of USD 12,699 for the disputed domain name represented a realistic open market price wholly unconnected with the Complainant's trademark rights. The Panel finds instead, on the balance of probabilities, that the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name represented an act of opportunistic bad faith, targeting the Complainant's DOITRIP trademark, and intended to take unfair advantage of the Complainant's rights in that trademark.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

---

<sup>1</sup> As discussed in section 4.8 of [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record if it would consider such information useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision.

## **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 <doitrip.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Steven A. Maier/*

**Steven A. Maier**

Sole Panelist

Date: July 31, 2025