

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Ferrari S.p.A. v. starkosha, John Lukn, Vercel Whois, Vercel Inc., semanses, greek, Asd Dsa, Andresa, hajsemiseg, olidea, iitsuk adilli, Pasquale Baumbach, Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC, Giancarlo's projects, dsadad, Ilda Pritone's projects
Case No. D2025-3730

1. The Parties

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

The Respondents are starkosha, United States of America ("United States"), John Lukn, Viet Nam, Vercel Whois, Vercel Inc., United States, semanses, Canada, greek, United States, Asd Dsa, Andresa, United States, hajsemiseg, United States, olidea, United States, iitsuk adilli, United States, Pasquale Baumbach, United Kingdom, Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Giancarlo's projects, dsadad, United Kingdom, and Ilda Pritone's projects, United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <career-ferrari.com> is registered with Cosmotown, Inc.

The disputed domain name <ferraridigitalcareers.com> is registered with Name SRS AB.

The disputed domain names <career-ferraris.com>, and <ferrari-careerhub.com> are registered with Name.com, Inc.

The disputed domain names <applications-ferrari.com>, <digital-ferrari.com>, <ferrari-careersteam.com>, <ferraridigitalteam.com>, <ferrari-meetup.com>, and <ferrarimeetup.com> are registered with Porkbun LLC.

The disputed domain names <apply-ferrari-careerapplication.com>, <careers-ferrari.com>, <careersferrari.com>, <ferrariacquisition.com>, <ferrari-careerapplication.com>, <ferrari-career.com>, <ferrari-career.com>, <ferrari-careerportal.com>, <ferrari-careerrecruitment.com>, <ferrari-careers.com>, <ferrari-careers.com>, <ferrari-careersportal.com>, <ferrari-jobs.com>, <ferrari-recruitment.com>, <ferrari-recruit.com>, <ferrari-recruitment.com>, <ferrari-recruitments.com>, <ferrari-recruit.net>, <ferrari-recruits.com>, <ferrari-support.com>, <ferrari-team.com>, <ferrariteams.com>, <jobs-ferrari.com>, <join-ferrari.com>, <recruit-ferrari.com>, <recruitment-ferrari.com>, <recruits-ferrari.com>, <team-ferrari.com>, <team-ferrari.news>, and <teamferrari.news> are registered with Tucows Domains Inc., (together the "Registrars").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 12, 2025. On September 15, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On September 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 2025, and October 3, 2025, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center the verification responses disclosing registrants and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondents (Whois Privacy Private by Design, LLC, CA, REDACTED FOR PRIVACY, Protected Protected Shield Whois, and Redacted For Privacy, Domain Protection Services, Inc.) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent email communications to the Complainant on September 24, 2025, and October 7, 2025, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on September 17, 2025, and amended Complaints on September 26, 2025, and October 8, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the Complaint, and the amended Complaints 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on October 23, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 12, 2025. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents’ default on November 13, 2025.

The Center appointed Taras Kyslyy as the sole panelist in this matter on December 4, 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 founded in Maranello, Italy, in 1947 by Enzo Ferrari. The Complainant has always manufactured vehicles at its current plant. The Complainant has been using the trademark FERRARI in connection with its activities in Italy and many other countries throughout the world for over seventy years. Since 1950, the Complainant has been at the peak of Formula1 racing. The Complainant commercializes its vehicles in over 100 countries through hundreds of official dealers.

The trademark FERRARI was and presently is supported by advertising campaigns worldwide. Besides the traditional advertising channels, the Complainant’s brand and products have been also promoted via Internet, in particular with presence online through social media, namely, on Facebook, Instagram, X (formerly known as Twitter), and YouTube. According to InterBrand Best Global Brands List 2024, the trademark FERRARI is valued USD 13.1 billion and represents the 62nd most valuable trademark in the world.

The Complainant is the owner of national and International trademark registrations worldwide incorporating FERRARI, including for instance International Trademark Registration No. 429829, registered on March 30, 1977.

In order to protect and promote its trademark on the Internet, the Complainant has registered numerous domain names worldwide consisting of or comprising its trademark FERRARI, including, amongst others, <ferrari.com>, registered on February 28, 1997, used by the Complainant for its main global web portal, promoting, inter alia, the Complainant's sports and luxury vehicles as well as other products and related services. The Complainant's website includes a section dedicated to job opportunities, where users can search for open positions within Ferrari.

The disputed domain names were registered from May 19, 2025 to September 24, 2025.

The disputed domain names <apply-ferrari-careerapplication.com>, <career-ferrari.com>, <career-ferraris.com>, <careersferrari.com>, <careers-ferrari.com>, <digital-ferrari.com>, <ferrari-career.com>, <ferrari-careerapplication.com>, <ferrari-careers.com>, <ferrari-careersportal.com>, <ferrari-careersteam.com>, <ferrari-digitalcareers.com>, <ferrari-digitalteam.com>, <ferrari-meetup.com>, <ferrari-meetup.com>, <ferrari-recruitment.com>, <ferrari-recruit.com>, <ferrari-recruitment.com>, <ferrari-recruitments.com>, <ferrari-support.com>, <ferrari-team.com>, <ferrari-teams.com>, <jobs-ferrari.com>, <recruit-ferrari.com>, <recruitment-ferrari.com>, <recruits-ferrari.com>, and <team-ferrari.com> resolved to a website reproducing the content of an internal page of the Complainant's official website dedicated to career opportunities within the Complainant, publishing the Complainant's trademark and impersonating the Complainant.

The disputed domain names <ferrari-recruit.net>, <team-ferrari.news>, and <teamferrari.news> redirected to the website at "www.ferrari-support.com". The disputed domain name <join-ferrari.com> redirected to the website at "www.careersferrari.com".

The disputed domain names <applications-ferrari.com>, <ferrari-careers.com>, and <ferrari-recruits.com> resolved or redirected to a website displaying a warning message about malicious content.

The disputed domain name <ferrari-jobs.com>, <ferrari-acquisition.com>, <ferrari-careerhub.com>, <ferrari-careerrecruitment.com>, <ferrari-careerportal.com> resolved to a website displaying error message or did not resolve to any 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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. All the disputed domain names reproduce the Complainant's trademark in its entirety, with the addition of the dictionary terms "application", "applications", "apply", "acquisition", "career", "careers", "digital", "hub", "jobs", "join", "meetup", "portal", "recruit", "recruits", "recruitment", "recruitment" (misspelling of "recruitment"), "recruitments", "steam", "support", "team", "teams", hyphens and the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com", ".net", and ".news", which are not distinguishing features and are not sufficient to prevent confusing similarity. The addition of the letter "s" to the Complainant's trademark in the disputed domain name <career-ferraris.com> is a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of the Complainant's trademark.

The Complainant also contends that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Respondents are not licensees, authorized agents of the Complainant or in any other way authorized to use the Complainant's trademark. The Complainant is not in possession of, nor aware of the existence of any evidence demonstrating that the Respondents, which have shielded their identity and contact details in the public Whois records, might be commonly known by names corresponding to the disputed domain names as individuals, business, or other organizations. The Respondents cannot claim

rights over the names corresponding to the disputed domain names since they do not own any trademark registrations for the terms encompassed in the disputed domain names. The Respondents have not provided the Complainant with any evidence of use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services before or after any notice of the dispute. 32 of the disputed domain names were redirected to the websites mirroring an internal page of the Complainant's official website dedicated to job opportunities within the Complainant. The websites reproduced images and text of the Complainant's official website, including the Complainant's company information, inviting users to submit applications providing their personal information. Such use does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services or to a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names without intent of commercial gain, since the Respondents have wilfully impersonated the Complainant to induce users to believe to be dealing with the Complainant and obtain their personal information. The disputed domain name, <recruitment-ferrari.com>, was cited in a job scam email which was reported by a third party to the Complainant. Such email communication, sent in the name of "Ferrari Talent Acquisition", was falsely promoting a position as "Social Media Manager" at the Complainant, and invited recipients to submit their application through the website. 9 of the disputed domain names have been redirected to websites displaying security alerts. 28 disputed domain names resolve to inactive websites or error sites. The disputed domain names incorporate the well-known Complainant's trademark in combination with dictionary terms which refer to job opportunities or the Complainant's online presence, the disputed domain names are inherently misleading as they carry a high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. The Complainant's trademark is well-known, it is inconceivable that the Respondents were unaware of the existence of the Complainant's trademark and its worldwide reputation at the time of registration of the disputed domain names. Since the Respondents used most of the disputed domain names in connection with websites featuring the Complainant's trademark, content taken from the Complainant's official website and the Complainant's company information, the Respondents were actually aware of, and intended to target, the Complainant and its trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain names. 32 of the disputed domain names redirected to websites reproducing the content of an internal page of the Complainant's official website dedicated to career opportunities within the Complainant, publishing the Complainant's trademark and impersonating the Complainant. Therefore, by using the disputed domain names, the Respondents intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to their websites for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of their websites. In view of the use of the disputed domain names with the deliberate intent to mislead Internet users passing off as the Complainant, the Respondents have used the disputed domain names for illegitimate purposes. 9 of the disputed domain names resolve to security alert pages warning users that the websites linked to the disputed domain names may be harmful since they were reported for use for malicious activities such as phishing attempts aimed at obtaining personal or financial information from misled internet users. 28 of the disputed domain names resolve to error pages or inactive websites. In view of i) the confusing similarity of the disputed domain names with the Complainant's well-known trademark, ii) the Respondents' lack of any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names, iii) the Respondents' concealing of their contact details, and iv) the implausibility of any good faith use to which the disputed domain names may be put considering their composition, the Respondents' passive holding should not prevent a finding of bad faith use. The Respondents have set up MX records for 12 of the disputed domain names, meaning that such disputed domain names might actually be used – or could previously be used – for email communication purposes. In view of the confusingly similarity of the disputed domain names with the Complainant's well-known trademark, encompassed in the disputed domain names with the addition of terms which are apt to reinforce the impression that the disputed domain names are owned by the Complainant, the configuration of the disputed domain names for use in connection with email communication amounts to bad faith use.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes as follows.

The disputed domain names were registered from May 19, 2025 to September 24, 2025.

The disputed domain names <apply-ferrari-careerapplication.com>, <career-ferrari.com>, <career-ferraris.com>, <careersferrari.com>, <careers-ferrari.com>, <digital-ferrari.com>, <ferrari-career.com>, <ferrari-careerapplication.com>, <ferrari-careers.com>, <ferrari-careersportal.com>, <ferrari-careersteam.com>, <ferrari-digitalcareers.com>, <ferrari-digitalteam.com>, <ferrari-meetup.com>, <ferrari-meetup.com>, <ferrari-recruitment.com>, <ferrari-recruit.com>, <ferrari-recruitment.com>, <ferrari-recruitments.com>, <ferrari-support.com>, <ferrari-team.com>, <ferrari-teams.com>, <jobs-ferrari.com>, <recruit-ferrari.com>, <recruitment-ferrari.com>, <recruits-ferrari.com>, and <team-ferrari.com> reproducing the content of an internal page of the Complainant's official website dedicated to career opportunities within the Complainant, publishing the Complainant's trademark and impersonating the Complainant. The disputed domain names <ferrari-recruit.net>, <team-ferrari.news>, and <teamferrari.news> redirected to the website at "www.ferrari-support.com". The disputed domain name <join-ferrari.com> redirected to the website at "www.careersferrari.com".

The disputed domain names <applications-ferrari.com>, <ferrari-careers.com>, and <ferrari-recruits.com> resolved or redirected to a website displaying a warning message about malicious content.

The disputed domain names <ferrari-jobs.com>, <ferrari-acquisition.com>, <ferrari-careerhub.com>, <ferrari-careerrecruitment.com>, <ferrari-careerportal.com> resolved to a website displaying error message or did not resolve to any website.

The MX records are configured for the disputed domain names <careersferrari.com>, <careers-ferrari.com>, <ferrari-acquisition.com>, <ferrari-jobs.com>, <ferrari-recruit.net>, <ferrari-recruitments.com>, <ferrari-support.com>, <ferrari-team.com>, <ferrari-teams.com>, <jobs-ferrari.com>, <join-ferrari.com>, and <team-ferrari.com> and share the same hostnames route1.mx.cloudflare.net, route2.mx.cloudflare.net, and route3.mx.cloudflare.net.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

6.2 Substantive Issues

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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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.

The applicable gTLD in a domain name (e.g., ".com", ".club", ".nyc") is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. Thus, the Panel disregards gTLDs ".com", ".net", and ".news" for the purposes of the confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are 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, "career", "application", "apply", "acquisition", "digital", "hub", "jobs", "join", "meetup", "portal", "recruit", "recruitment", "steam", "support", "team", and the variants thereof, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names 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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The available evidence does not confirm that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain names, which could demonstrate its rights or legitimate interests (see, e.g., *World Natural Bodybuilding Federation, Inc. v. Daniel Jones TheDotCafe*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-0642](#)).

The Complainant did not license or otherwise agree for use of its prior registered trademark by the Respondent, thus no actual or contemplated bona fide or legitimate use of the disputed domain names could be reasonably claimed (see, e.g., *Sportswear Company S.P.A. v. Tang Hong*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-1875](#)).

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed impersonation of the Complainant as regards to the disputed domain names <apply-ferrari-careerapplication.com>, <ferrari-careers.com>, <ferrari-recruit.com>, <ferrari-recruitment.com>, <career-ferrari.com>, <ferrari-career.com>, <recruit-ferrari.com>, <ferrari-recruitment.com>, <ferrari-careerapplication.com>, <ferrari-careersteam.com>, <ferrari-meetup.com>, <recruits-ferrari.com>, <ferrarimeetup.com>, <ferraridigitalcareers.com>, <ferrari-team.com>, <team-ferrari.com>, <ferraridigitalteam.com>, <recruitment-ferrari.com>, <jobs-ferrari.com>, <ferrari-recruitments.com>, <careers-ferrari.com>, <digital-ferrari.com>, <careersferrari.com>, <ferrari-recruit.net>, <teamferrari.news>, <team-ferrari.news>, <ferrari-support.com>, <ferrariteams.com>, <ferrari-careersportal.com>, <career-ferraris.com>, and <join-ferrari.com> can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent.

The Panel also finds that the un rebutted record demonstrates that the disputed domain names <applications-ferrari.com>, <ferrari-careers.com>, and <ferrari-recruits.com> resolved to webpages that are blocked because they may contain unsafe content that can harm the device or compromise personal information, confirming the illegitimate activity. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names <ferrariacquisition.com>, <ferrari-jobs.com>, <ferrari-careerhub.com>, <ferrari-careerrecruitment.com>, and <ferrari-careerportal.com> resolving to an inactive website under the circumstances of this case (see, e.g., *Philip Morris USA Inc. v. Daniele Tornatore*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-1302](#)).

Noting the risk of implied affiliation between the disputed domain names and the confusingly similar well-known trademark of the Complainant, the Panel finds that there is no plausible fair use to which the disputed domain names could be put that would not have the effect of being somehow connected to the Complainant (see, e.g., *Instagram, LLC v. Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot / Zayed*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-2897](#)).

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent launched a massive registration of 40 disputed domain names within a considerably short period of time featuring the Complainant's trademark with further immediate use, namely, for the websites impersonating the Complainant and featuring its trademark via at least via the disputed domain names <apply-ferrari-careerapplication.com>, <ferrari-careers.com>, <ferrari-recruit.com>, <ferrari-recruitment.com>, <career-ferrari.com>, <ferrari-career.com>, <recruit-ferrari.com>, <ferrari-recruitment.com>, <ferrari-careerapplication.com>, <ferrari-careersteam.com>, <ferrari-meetup.com>, <recruits-ferrari.com>, <ferrarimeetup.com>, <ferraridigitalcareers.com>, <ferrari-team.com>, <team-ferrari.com>, <ferraridigitalteam.com>, <recruitment-ferrari.com>, <jobs-ferrari.com>, <ferrari-recruitments.com>, <careers-ferrari.com>, <digital-ferrari.com>, <careersferrari.com>, <ferrari-recruit.net>, <teamferrari.news>, <team-ferrari.news>, <ferrari-support.com>, <ferrariteams.com>, <ferrari-careersportal.com>, <career-ferraris.com>, and <join-ferrari.com>. The Panel finds this confirms the Respondent knew and targeted the Complainant and its trademark when following the pattern of registering the series of the disputed domain names, which is bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2.

The mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. The Panel is convinced that the Complainant's trademark is well established through long and widespread use and the Complainant has acquired a significant reputation and level of goodwill in its trademark both in Italy and internationally. Thus, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark was registered in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

According to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith: by using the domain name, you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your website or location or of a product or service on your website or location. In this case, the disputed domain names <apply-ferrari-careerapplication.com>, <ferrari-careers.com>, <ferrari-recruit.com>, <ferrari-recruitment.com>, <career-ferrari.com>, <ferrari-career.com>, <ferrari-career.com>, <recruit-ferrari.com>, <ferrari-recruitment.com>, <ferrari-careerapplication.com>, <ferrari-careersteam.com>, <ferrari-meetup.com>, <recruits-ferrari.com>, <ferrari-meetup.com>, <ferrari-digitalcareers.com>, <ferrari-team.com>, <team-ferrari.com>, <ferrari-digitalteam.com>, <recruitment-ferrari.com>, <jobs-ferrari.com>, <ferrari-recruitments.com>, <careers-ferrari.com>, <digital-ferrari.com>, <careersferrari.com>, <ferrari-recruit.net>, <teamferrari.news>, <team-ferrari.news>, <ferrari-support.com>, <ferrari-teams.com>, <ferrari-careersportal.com>, <career-ferrari.com>, and <join-ferrari.com> were resolving or redirecting to a website featuring the Complainant's trademark and falsely pretended to be the official Complainant's local website to intentionally attract Internet users by creating likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source of the website and its products. The Panel finds the above confirms the disputed domain names were registered and used in bad faith.

The disputed domain names <applications-ferrari.com>, <ferrari-careers.com>, and <ferrari-recruits.com> resolved or redirected to a website displaying a warning message about malicious content.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed phishing, distributing malware and impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and the use of the above mentioned disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. In this regard the Panel takes into account (i) the high degree of distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, (ii) the failure of the Respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, (iii) the failure of the Respondent to address the Complainant's cease-and-desist letters, (iv) the Respondent's concealing its identity while registering the disputed domain names, and (v) the implausibility of any good faith use to which all the disputed domain names may be put. The Panel finds that non-use of the disputed domain names <ferrari-acquisition.com>, <ferrari-jobs.com>, <ferrari-careerhub.com>, <ferrari-careerrecruitment.com>, and <ferrari-careersportal.com> does not prevent a finding of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3.

The disputed domain name <recruitment-ferrari.com> was reported by a third party as used in connection with spam, phishing, or other domain name abuse activities, which confirms the bad faith use (see e.g., *Instagram, LLC v. Yusuf Polat, Schowix*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-2791](#)).

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 names <career-ferrari.com>, <ferraridigitalcareers.com>, <career-ferraris.com>, <ferrari-careerhub.com>, <applications-ferrari.com>, <digital-ferrari.com>, <ferrari-careersteam.com>, <ferraridigitalteam.com>, <ferrari-meetup.com>, <ferrarimeetup.com>, <apply-ferrari-careerapplication.com>, <careers-ferrari.com>, <careersferrari.com>, <ferrariacquisition.com>, <ferrari-careerapplication.com>, <ferrari-career.com>, <ferrari-career.com>, <ferrari-careerportal.com>, <ferrari-careerrecruitment.com>, <ferrari-careers.com>, <ferrari-careers.com>, <ferrari-careersportal.com>, <ferrari-jobs.com>, <ferrari-recruitment.com>, <ferrari-recruit.com>, <ferrari-recruitment.com>, <ferrari-recruitments.com>, <ferrari-recruit.net>, <ferrari-recruits.com>, <ferrari-support.com>, <ferrari-team.com>, <ferrariteams.com>, <jobs-ferrari.com>, <join-ferrari.com>, <recruit-ferrari.com>, <recruitment-ferrari.com>, <recruits-ferrari.com>, <team-ferrari.com>, <team-ferrari.news>, and <teamferrari.news> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Taras Kyslyy/

Taras Kyslyy

Sole Panelist

Date: December 18, 2025