

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

ICON RETAIL S.R.L. v. andrea calabretta, Reve Dore
Case No. D2025-4487

1. The Parties

The Complainant is ICON RETAIL S.R.L., Italy, represented by Bugnion S.p.A., Italy.

The Respondent is andrea calabretta, Reve Dore, Italy.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <amelieboutiques.com> is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on October 30, 2025. On October 30, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 30, 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 (Contact Privacy Inc., Customer 0167546136) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 3, 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 amended Complaint on November 5, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended 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 November 10, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 30, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on December 2, 2025.

The Center appointed Edoardo Fano as the sole panelist in this matter on December 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.

The Panel has not received any requests from the Complainant or the Respondent regarding further submissions, waivers or extensions of deadlines, and the Panel has not found it necessary to request any further information from the Parties.

Having reviewed the communication records in the case file provided by the Center, the Panel finds that the Center has discharged its responsibility under the Rules, paragraph 2(a) “to employ reasonably available means calculated to achieve actual notice to [the] Respondent”. Therefore, the Panel shall issue its Decision based upon the Complaint, the Policy, the Rules and the Supplemental Rules and without the benefit of a response from the Respondent.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is Icon Retail S.R.L., an Italian company operating in the fashion field and owning the following trademark registrations for AMELIE:

- Italian Trademark Registration No. 0001658250 for AMELIE and design, registered on November 26, 2015;
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 017902416 for AMELIE MILANO and design, registered on October 6, 2018;
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 018519063 for AMELIE and design, registered on February 25, 2025.

The Complainant also operates on the Internet, its official website being “www.amelie.it”. The Complainant has around 60 boutiques in Italy (direct shops, franchising shops, and outlet shops).

The Complainant has provided evidence in support of the above.

According to the Whois records, the disputed domain name was registered on June 15, 2023, and it is inactive. However, when the Complaint was filed, the disputed domain name was resolving to the website of a self-declared “Amélie Loren” in Italian, in which the same products as the Complainant, namely fashion products, were purportedly offered for sale.

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 states that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark AMELIE.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name since it has not been authorized by the Complainant to register the disputed domain name or to use its trademark within the disputed domain name, and it is not making either a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name resolved to a website in which the Complainant’s trademark AMELIE was reproduced and the Respondent purportedly offered for sale the same products as the Complainant, namely fashion products.

The Complainant finally submits that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in bad faith, since the Complainant's trademark AMELIE is well known in Italy in the fashion field. Therefore, the Respondent targeted the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name and the Complainant contends that, by resolving to a website in which the Respondent reproduced the Complainant's trademark and supposedly offered for sale the same products as the Complainant, namely fashion products, the use of the disputed domain name to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website, creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark, qualifies as bad faith registration and use.

B. Respondent

The Respondent has made no reply to the Complainant's contentions and is in default. In reference to paragraphs 5(f) and 14 of the Rules, no exceptional circumstances explaining the default have been put forward or are apparent from the record.

A respondent is not obliged to participate in a proceeding under the Policy, but if it fails to do so, reasonable facts asserted by a complainant may be taken as true, and appropriate inferences, in accordance with paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, may be drawn. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)) section 4.3.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists three elements, which the Complainant must satisfy in order to succeed:

- (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

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.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 Panel finds the entirety of the Complainant's 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.

While the addition of other terms, here "boutiques", 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.

It is also well accepted that a generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD"), in this case ".com", is typically ignored when assessing the similarity between a trademark and a domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

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.

While the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, UDRP panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the often impossible 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. 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 present 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 name resolved to a website in which the Complainant's trademark was reproduced and the Respondent purportedly offered for sale the same products as the Complainant, namely fashion products. The Respondent's website is in Italian, and the Complainant has a prominent presence in the Italian market. The Panel therefore concludes that the disputed domain name is not being used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services but to take an unfair advantage of the similarity with the Complainant's trademark. The inclusion of the name “Amélie Loren”, which does not match the registrant's name, and in the lack of any further explanation supported by the corresponding relevant evidence is not sufficient to give rise to rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

In the present case, regarding the registration in bad faith of the disputed domain name, the reputation of the Complainant's trademark AMELIE, especially in Italy (the country in which the Respondent is based) in the fashion field is clearly established, and the Panel finds that the Respondent likely knew of the Complainant and deliberately registered the confusingly similar disputed domain name, especially because the disputed domain name, when the Complaint was filed, resolved to a website in which the Complainant's trademark, was reproduced and the Respondent purportedly offered for sale the same products as the Complainant, namely fashion products.

As regards the use in bad faith of the disputed domain name, the Panel notes that the Respondent was trying to attract Internet users to its website by creating likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the disputed domain name's source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement, an activity clearly detrimental to the Complainant's business.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain

name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The above suggests to the Panel that the Respondent intentionally registered and was using the disputed domain name in order to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites in accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

As regards the current use of the disputed domain name, being inactive, 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. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the record, the Panel notes the reputation of the Complainant’s trademark, especially in Italy (the country in which the Respondent is based), in the fashion field, the prior use of the disputed domain name and the failure of the Respondent to submit a Response or provide any explanation for its motivations in registering the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case, the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Furthermore, the Panel considers that the nature of the inherently misleading disputed domain name, which includes the Complainant’s trademark in its entirety with the mere addition of the term “boutiques”, referring to the Complainant’s fashion field of activity, further supports a finding of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute 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, <amelieboutiques.com>, be transferred to the Complainant.

/Edoardo Fano/

Edoardo Fano

Sole Panelist

Date: December 18, 2025