

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Hunza G Limited v. Nikos Kalouris

Case No. D2025-3956

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Hunza G Limited, United Kingdom ("UK"), represented by Briffa Legal Limited, UK

The Respondent is Nikos Kalouris, United States of America ("United States" or "US").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <hunzagbikini.com> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 29, 2025. On September 29, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On the same day, 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 (Redacted for Privacy Purposes, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 30, 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 October 3, 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 proceedings commenced on October 9, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 29, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 30, 2025.

The Center appointed Erica Aoki as the sole panelist in this matter on November 6, 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 well-known British fashion company incorporated on May 4, 2018, specializing in high-end swimwear and apparel and operating globally. The Complainant owns trademark rights in the HUNZA and HUNZA G marks, which have been used in connection with swimwear since 1984 by companies within the Complainant's group.

The Complainant owns a significant portfolio of HUNZA G trademark registrations around the world, including, by way of non-exhaustive example:

United Kingdom (UK) Registration No. 3100102 registered on June 12, 2015 (Class 25).

European Union (EU) Registration No. 017896483 registered on September 6, 2018 (Class 25).

United States (US) Registration No. 6132758 registered on August 25, 2020 (Class 25).

(All of these registrations predate the registration's date of the disputed domain name.)

The Complainant operates its official website at "www.hunzag.com", which is widely used for worldwide promotion and sale of its products.

The Complainant has experienced substantial commercial success: its products are sold in the top 250 luxury retail stores worldwide, including Harrods, Selfridges, Net-a-Porter, Revolve, and Saks Fifth Avenue.

The Complainant's publicly filed accounts show a turnover of GBP 26,952,164 for the year ended May 31, 2024, and it maintains a strong online presence with over 535,000 Instagram followers, as well as frequent media coverage.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 6, 2025. The evidence demonstrates that it resolved to a website prominently displaying the Complainant's HUNZA G trademark, copying official product images, branding, layout, and overall visual identity, and offering what appeared to be HUNZA G swimwear for sale at unusually low prices. The website created the false impression of being an official or authorized online shop of the Complainant.

The Respondent is not affiliated with, authorized by, or licensed by the Complainant in any way. There is no evidence that the Respondent has ever been commonly known by the disputed domain name or the name "HUNZA G".

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied all three elements required under the Policy for the transfer of the disputed domain name.

First, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its HUNZA and HUNZA G trademarks. The disputed domain name wholly incorporates the term "hunzag", which is identical in sound and appearance to the Complainant' trademarks, and adds only the descriptive term "bikini".

The Complainant argues that such minor additions do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, particularly where the added term directly relates to the Complainant's core business of swimwear.

Second, the Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has never been authorized or licensed to use the Complainant's trademarks.

According to the Complainant, there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Complainant states that the website to which the disputed domain name resolved reproduced the Complainant's product images which are copyright-protected works and imitated its branding, layout, and overall presentation.

The Complainant states that it has never authorized the Respondent to use its HUNZA or HUNZA G trademarks, nor granted any permission to reproduce its copyrighted product images or branding materials.

The Complainant further submits that the Respondent's only interest in the disputed domain name is the diversion of Internet traffic away from the Complainant for illegal purposes, including phishing, malware attacks, and the sale of counterfeit products.

According to the Complainant, the website connected to the disputed domain name reproduced its product images (which are its copyright-protected works), misappropriated its trade dress, and presented what appears to be a counterfeit version of its official store. Such conduct, the Complainant argues, cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or any legitimate non-commercial purpose.

Third, the Complainant argues that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Respondent intentionally incorporated the Complainant's well-known trademark into the disputed domain name, added a descriptive term directly linked to the Complainant's products, and created a website designed to mimic the Complainant's own.

The Complainant states that this was done for the purpose of misleading consumers, diverting traffic, and engaging in fraudulent activity, including the sale of counterfeit products. Such conduct, the Complainant submits, constitutes bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove:

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

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

It is well established that the first element under the Policy functions primarily as a standing requirement ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7).

The Complainant has demonstrated trademark rights in the HUNZA and HUNZA G trademarks through multiple registrations in the UK, the EU, the US, and numerous other jurisdictions. These trademark registrations, as well as extensive evidence of longstanding commercial use, all predate the registration of the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's HUNZA G trademark in its entirety. The only addition is the descriptive term "bikini," which directly relates to the Complainant's core business of swimwear.

Panels have consistently held that the addition of a descriptive term to a complainant's trademark does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity where the mark remains clearly recognizable within the domain name ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8).

In this case, the Complainant's trademark is recognizable in the disputed domain name. The addition of "bikini" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. Furthermore, the Panel notes that this term describes the products for which the Complainant is widely known.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. The first element of the Policy is satisfied.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Under paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, a respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a domain name by showing, for example, a bona fide offering of goods or services, being commonly known by the domain name, or making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of it.

Once a complainant establishes a *prima facie* case that the respondent lacks such rights, the burden shifts to the respondent to produce evidence to the contrary ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1).

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant, has never been authorized or licensed to use the HUNZA or HUNZA G trademarks, and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The evidence shows that the disputed domain name resolved to a website reproducing the Complainant's HUNZA G trademark, copying product images that are copyright-protected works, and imitating the Complainant's branding, design, and overall trade dress. The website purported to sell HUNZA G swimwear at reduced prices.

Such conduct does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity like impersonation, as is the case here, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

Furthermore, the composition of the disputed domain name (comprising of the Complainant's trademark with the term associated with its activity) creates a risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy. Nor is there any legitimate noncommercial or fair use under paragraph 4(c)(iii); the Respondent's mimicry of the Complainant's website demonstrates the opposite.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The second element of the Policy is satisfied.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

To satisfy the third element under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, the Complainant must demonstrate that the disputed domain name was both registered and used in bad faith. Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out illustrative circumstances of bad faith, including intentional attempts to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark.

The evidence in the record establishes that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The Complainant's HUNZA and HUNZA G trademarks significantly predate the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name on March 6, 2025. By the time of registration, the Complainant had developed substantial goodwill worldwide, with its products sold through leading global retailers and its online presence well established.

Given the Complainant's reputation and the distinctive nature of its HUNZA G trademark, it is highly likely that the Respondent knew or should have known of the Complainant's rights when registering the disputed domain name.

The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name confirms this finding: the disputed domain name resolved to a website that copied the Complainant's trademark, reproduced its copyrighted product images, imitated its layout, and presented itself as an official online store for HUNZA G products.

Such conduct constitutes bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. Panels consistently hold that using a domain name to impersonate a complainant, copy its product images, and pass off as its official store, is unequivocal evidence of bad faith registration and use. It also aligns with bad faith scenarios described in [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 3.1, 3.2, and 3.4.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. The third element of the Policy is satisfied.

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 <hunzagbikini.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Erica Aoki/
Erica Aoki
Sole Panelist
Date: November 20, 2025