

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Prada S.A. v. Muhammad Sohaib  
Case No. D2025-4772

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is Muhammad Sohaib, Pakistan.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <miumiubags.shop> is registered with Name.com, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 18, 2025. On November 18, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 21, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response, confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that 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 November 24, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 14, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on December 15, 2025.

The Center appointed Zineb Naciri Bennani 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.

#### **4. Factual Background**

The Complainant is a producer and distributor of luxury clothes, leather goods, beauty products, and accessories since 1913.

In 1993, a new brand, MIU MIU, was established, offering women's ready-to-wear, leather goods and shoes, eyewear and fragrance.

The Complainant operates in 70 countries through directly operated stores and franchise stores with 15,200 employees.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations, including the following:

- European Union word trademark MIU MIU, No. 004253191, registered on February 16, 2006, in classes 18 and 25;
- European Union figurative trademark MIU MIU, No. 009002734, registered on August 24, 2010, in classes 3, 26 and 35;
- International word trademark MIU-MIU, No. 593101, registered on October 16, 1992, in classes 18 and 25; and
- International figurative trademark, No. 686197 for MIU MIU, registered on December 2, 1997 in classes 3, 9, 14, 16, 18, 25, 34 and 42.

The Complainant includes full listings of marks registered in jurisdictions around the world.

The Complainant also owns numerous domain names including <miumiu.com> registered on November 9, 1997, and social networks accounts.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 13, 2025.

The disputed domain name prominently displayed the Complainant's figurative mark and offered the Complainant's products at discounted prices and resolves currently to an inactive 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 the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the registered trademark in which Complainant has rights as the disputed domain name incorporates the whole of Complainant's trademark.

According to the Complainant, the addition of the generic term "bags" does not affect the confusing similarity and may to the contrary be apt to increase confusion as the term "bags" is related to the Complainant's core businesses.

The Complainant argues that the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ".shop" shall be disregarded.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name as it is not a licensee, authorized agent of the Complainant or in any other way authorized to use Complainant's trademark. According to the Complainant, the Respondent is not commonly known by a name corresponding to the disputed domain name and does not own any trademark registrations for MIU MIU.

The Complainant argues that the disputed domain name was originally directed to a website misappropriating the Complainant's trademark, publishing images taken from the Complainant's official advertising campaigns and offering for sale prima facie counterfeit Complainant's products at discounted prices, without providing any disclaimer as to the Respondent's lack of relationship with the Complainant.

The current inactive website does not constitute, according to the Complainant, a legitimate noncommercial or fair use, especially in case of prior infringing uses.

The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, noting the well-known character of the trademark that the Respondent could not ignore, the fact that purported MIU MIU products were offered for sale and the Complainant's trademarks have been published on the website to which the disputed domain name resolved.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

The Panel should decide a complaint based on the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy and Rules, and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that the Complainant must establish each of the following:

- (i) that the disputed domain name registered to the Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) that 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 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, "bags" 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 addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".shop" is standard registration requirement and is generally disregarded for the purpose of assessing confusing similarity.

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.

According to the Complainant, Respondent is not a licensee, authorized agent of the Complainant or in any other way authorized to use the Complainant’s trademark.

Moreover, the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name previously directed to a website offering products similar in appearance to those marketed by the Complainant, displayed images of products presented as bearing the Complainant’s brand at discounted prices and prominently displayed the Complainant’s figurative mark, all without disclosing its lack of relationship with the Complainant, which does not amount to a bona fide offering.

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

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent was offering through the disputed domain name products bearing the Complainant’s trademarks at discounted prices, with images taken from the Complainant’s official advertising campaigns without disclosing its lack of relationship with the Complainant.

The website at the disputed domain name also included a copyright notice “© 2025 Miu Miu Bags ...” and generated the impression of visiting an official Complainant’s website.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed impersonation/passing off, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

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.

The disputed domain name currently directs to an inactive page.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the composition and prior use of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the current passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

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 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 <miumiubags.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Zineb Naciri Bennani/*

**Zineb Naciri Bennani**

Sole Panelist

Date: January 5, 2026