

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

L'Inglesina Baby S.p.A. v. liu shan
Case No. D2025-4491

1. The Parties

The Complainant is L'Inglesina Baby S.p.A., Italy, represented by Bird & Bird Società tra Avvocati s.r.l., Italy.

The Respondent is liu shan, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <maclarenstroller.com> is registered with Dynadot 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 31, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 3, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) 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 7, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 27, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on December 2, 2025.

The Center appointed Mehmet Polat Kalafatoglu as the sole panelist in this matter on December 5, 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 an Italian company that specializes in the design and manufacture of strollers, prams, and accessories for early childhood and childcare. In 2024, the Complainant acquired the stroller brand MACLAREN, founded in England by Owen Maclaren. In the 1960s, Owen Maclaren used his knowledge of lightweight load-bearing airplane structures to create a new type of folding stroller, the Maclaren Baby Buggy. It is also noted that the Maclaren Baby Buggy has been recognized as a design icon and is treasured in the permanent collections of the Museum of Modern Art in New York and the Design Museum in London, as well as in various design reference books.

The Complainant affirms that the trademark MACLAREN and its “M” stylized logo are protected in several jurisdictions through numerous registrations. These registrations include, among others, the following ones:

- the United States of America trademark registration No. 3648063 for MACLAREN, registered on June 30, 2009, in class 12;
- the European Union trademark registration No. 000025502 for MACLAREN, registered on October 14, 1999, in classes 12, 18, 20, 24, 25, and 28; and
- the Chinese trademark registration No. 5936276 for MACLAREN, registered on January 28, 2010, in class 12.

The Complainant asserts that the Maclaren product line is presented, promoted, and sold on its official website located at the domain name <maclarenbaby.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 30, 2025. At the time of filing the Complaint and rendering this Decision, it resolves to a website that clearly displays the Complainant’s trademarks, provides information about the Complainant and its products, but shows images of strollers from third-parties’ brands, and “Buy on Amazon” denominated links that redirect visitors to the domain name <amazon.com> that feature listings of strollers of the Complainant’s competitors.

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. The Complainant’s contentions regarding the three elements under the Policy can be summarized as follows.

First, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the MACLAREN trademark.

Second, the Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in respect of the disputed domain name. In this regard, the Complainant asserts that it has neither authorized nor given consent to anyone to register and use the disputed domain name. The Complainant notes that the disputed domain name is being used for a website that purports to be an official Maclaren website but instead displays and diverts Internet users to strollers from third-party brands. In addition, the website contains a notice that it is a participant in an Amazon affiliate program designed to generate advertising revenues by advertising and linking to the Amazon platform.

Third, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant notes that the trademark MACLAREN is renowned, as well as that it has established rights

in and to the trademark MACLAREN before the registration date of the disputed domain name. The Complainant also notes that the disputed domain name and the website connected to it had been conceived to capitalize on the reputation of the MACLAREN trademark and to impersonate the Complainant to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to this website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the MACLAREN trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of such website.

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 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.

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 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.

Although the addition of other terms here, "stroller", 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.

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. In particular, the Panel notes the following points. The Complainant asserted that the Respondent is not authorized to register the disputed domain name incorporating the MACLAREN trademark. The disputed domain name fully incorporates the MACLAREN trademark with the addition of the descriptive term "stroller", which is directly connected to the Complainant's products. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant and cannot constitute fair use as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#),

section 2.5.1. When the content of the website located at the disputed domain name is also considered, this risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant and of confusion among Internet users increases even further. This website resembles an official website of the Complainant. The website provides information about the Complainant and its products by using text that impersonates the Complainant (for example, “It all started in 1965 when our founder, Owen Maclaren, was inspired by a mother struggling to fold her pram while holding her baby” and “At Maclaren, safety is our number one priority.”). In addition, the website clearly displays the Complainant’s MACLAREN trademark and “M” stylized logo, but it shows images of strollers from the Complainant’s competitors. Therefore, these facts suggest that the Respondent has attempted to impersonate the Complainant. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, such as impersonation, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1. Lastly, the website contains links that redirect Internet users to a third-party e-commerce platform featuring listings of strollers from competing brands. Considering the possibility of earning revenue by advertising and linking to the said e-commerce platform, the Panel concludes that the Respondent uses the disputed domain name for its commercial gain by taking unfair advantage of the MACLAREN trademark.

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.

Accordingly, 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.

Regarding the registration in bad faith condition, the Panel notes that the MACLAREN trademark largely predates the registration of the disputed domain name; the MACLAREN trademark is also protected in China, where the Respondent is located; the disputed domain name fully incorporates the MACLAREN trademark with the addition of the descriptive term “stroller”; and the website at the disputed domain name clearly refers to the Complainant, its trademark and products. Therefore, the Panel finds that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant’s trademark and targeted it when registering the disputed domain name.

Considering the use of the disputed domain name described above, the Panel finds that the Respondent, by using the disputed domain name, has attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant and the MACLAREN trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent’s website.

Lastly, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Here, as explained above, the Respondent has attempted to impersonate the Complainant.

In light of the above and based on the available record, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. Therefore, 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 <maclarenstroller.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mehmet Polat Kalafatoglu/

Mehmet Polat Kalafatoglu

Sole Panelist

Date: December 19, 2025