

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Skorpio Limited v. ren wei
Case No. D2025-3230

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is ren wei, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <rickowens-outlet.shop> is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 12, 2025. On August 12, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 14, 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 August 22, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 11, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 12, 2025.

The Center appointed Martin Švorčík as the sole panelist in this matter on September 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 Swiss company that manages the intellectual property rights of American fashion designer Rick Owens - born in 1962, recognized for his luxury label launched in Los Angeles in 1994. His brand has an international presence in fashion and furniture design.

The Complainant is owner of numerous RICK OWENS trademarks, such as:

- European Union ("EU") registration No. 8209736 for the word mark RICK OWENS, registered on November 2, 2009;
- European Union ("EU") registration No. 17325275 for the word mark RICK OWENS, registered on March 6, 2018;
- International registration No. 1747468 for the word mark RICK OWENS registered on June 26, 2023;

The Complainant operates its official website under the domain name <rickowens.eu> in Europe.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 25, 2025. The disputed domain name is currently not in use. The Complainant has submitted evidence that the disputed domain name resolved previously to a website that sold a range of goods, including jewellery, clothing, footwear and headgear goods, imitating the look and feel of the Complainant's official website.

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 is the IP holding company for the trademarks, designs and creations of the world-famous fashion designer, Rick Owens. Launched in 1994, the Rick Owens brand has established itself as a leading force in avant-garde luxury fashion, renowned for its distinctive dark aesthetic, architectural silhouettes, and innovative approach to contemporary design. The brand operates globally with flagship stores in major fashion capitals and has built a dedicated following among discerning consumers seeking unique, high-quality fashion pieces.

As for the argumentation itself, the Complainant states that:

- the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to their trademarks RICK OWENS. The inclusion of the term "outlet" does not alleviate confusion;
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, because the Respondent incorporates the Complainant's trademarks in the disputed domain name without any license or authorization from the Complainant. The Complainant's trademarks are not descriptive in any way, nor do they have any generic, dictionary meaning, the Respondent is unable to demonstrate a right or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name;
- the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith as he incorporates the Complainant's trademarks in their entirety and the disputed domain name is thus suited to divert or mislead potential web users from the website they are actually trying to visit. The disputed domain name was established in bad faith to take advantage of the Complainant's reputation in the brand RICK OWENS and to attract for commercial gain, Internet users to the disputed domain name, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that the Complainant must establish each of the following:

- (i) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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.

[x] 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.

[x] The entirety of the mark 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.

[x] Although the addition of other terms here, "outlet", 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 3.0](#), 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 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.

[x] 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.

From the evidence, it is also clear that the Respondent is not sponsored by or associated with the Complainant in any manner. Moreover, the Complainant has not granted the Respondent any permission, license, or authorization to use the Complainants' trademark in any capacity, including within domain names.

"In the absence of any license or permission from the Complainant to use its trademark, no actual or contemplated bona fide or legitimate use of the Disputed Domain Name could reasonably be claimed." See *Sportswear Company S.P.A. v. Tang Hong*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-1875](#).

Furthermore, the Respondent does not appear to be commonly known by the disputed domain name and there is no evidence that might support such finding. See *World Natural Bodybuilding Federation, Inc. v. Daniel Jones TheDotCafe*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-0642](#) "finding that a Respondent, or his/her organization or business, must have been commonly known by the at-issue domain at the time of registration in order to have a legitimate interest in the domain".

There is also no indication that the Respondent uses (or has made bona fide preparations to use) the disputed domain name in a business or otherwise. The disputed domain name based on its composition also carries a high risk of implied 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.

There are already many UDRP panel decisions that reasoned that passive holding of a domain name also constitutes bad faith, especially when its good faith use is in no way plausible, considering the specificity of the activity (see section 3.3 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#)), namely:

- (i) the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's mark,
- (ii) the failure of the Respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use.

As the trademarks of the Complainant have already been proved as well-known trademarks by other UDRP decision and as Respondent failed to submit a response, the Panel is persuaded about bad faith registration condition to be met.

It was also established in another UDRP decision that "Examples of what may be cumulative circumstances found to be indicative of bad faith include the Complainant having a well-known trademark, no response to the complaint having been filed, and the registrant's concealment of its identity. Panels may draw inferences about whether the domain name was used in bad faith given the circumstances surrounding registration, and vice versa". See *Missoni S.p.A. v. 米索尼股份有限公司 / Missoni Limited*, WIPO Case No. [D2015-0843](#).

Furthermore, the Complainant has submitted evidence that the disputed domain name resolved previously to a website that sold a range of goods, including jewellery, clothing, footwear and headgear goods, imitating the look and feel of the Complainant's official website.

The Panel is convinced that there cannot exist any plausible future active use of the disputed domain name that would not be illegitimate, considering the specificity of the Complainant's undertaking and the wording of the disputed domain name. See *Audi AG v. Hans Wolf*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0148](#).

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 <rickowens-outlet.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Martin Švorčík/

Martin Švorčík

Sole Panelist

Date: September 26, 2025