

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Seven S.p.A. v. raskj sakjdkm, ealjaskasdj
Case No. D2025-3411

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Seven S.p.A., Italy, represented by Studio Sindico e Associate, Italy.

The Respondent is raskj sakjdkm, ealjaskasdj, United States of America (the “United States”).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <zainoseven.com> 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 August 25, 2025. On August 26, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 27, 2025, 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 (UNKNOWN due to privacy rules / Redacted for privacy / Domain Admin, Whoisprotection.cc) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 27, 2025, 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 September 1, 2025.

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 proceeding commenced on September 3, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 23, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 24, 2025.

The Center appointed Sebastian M.W. Hughes as the sole panelist in this matter on September 26, 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

A. Complainant

The Complainant is an Italian company conducting business as a designer, manufacturer and retailer of backpacks, bags, trolleys and school accessories under the trade mark SEVEN (the “Trade Mark”).

The Complainant is the owner of numerous registrations in jurisdictions worldwide for the Trade Mark, including International Registration No. 1231145 for 7SEVEN (figurative), with a registration date of January 27, 2014; and Italian registration No. 0001379395 for SEVEN, with a registration date of November 29, 2010.

B. Respondent

The Respondent is an individual located in the United States.

C. The Disputed Domain Name

The disputed domain name was registered on August 14, 2024.

D. Use of the Disputed Domain Name

The disputed domain name is resolved to an English and Italian language website apparently offering for sale the Complainant’s products under the Trade Mark at discounted prices (the “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, in light of the repute of the Trade Mark, the fact the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trade Mark, and the content of the Website, the Respondent has targeted the Complainant and its Trade Mark in bad faith in registering and using the disputed domain name. The Complainant contends further that the Website does not accurately and prominently disclose the Respondent’s (lack of any) relationship with the Complainant, the Trade Mark holder.

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 Trade Mark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ([“WIPO Overview 3.0”](#)), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Trade Mark SEVEN 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.

Although the addition of other terms (here, “zaino”, meaning “backpack” in Italian) may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such a 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.

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 disputed domain incorporates the Complainant’s SEVEN Trade Mark with the term “zaino” meaning “backpack” in Italian, being descriptive of the goods marketed and sold by the Complainant under the Trade Mark. The Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name for a Website apparently offering for sale the Complainant’s products, while displaying a variation of the Complainant’s figurative Trade Mark, and without disclosing its lack of relationship with the Complainant, is not a bona fide offering. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.8.1.

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.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name in respect of the Website constitutes 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 <zainoseven.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Sebastian M.W. Hughes/

Sebastian M.W. Hughes

Sole Panelist

Date: October 3, 2025