

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Prada S.A. v. ZONGMAO Wu

Case No. D2025-4778

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is ZONGMAO Wu, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <miumiustoreoutlet.com> is registered with NameCheap, 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 19, 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, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 21, 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 November 21, 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 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, No. 004253191, registered on February 16, 2006, for MIU MIU, in classes 18 and 25;
- European Union figurative trademark, No. 009002734, registered on August 24, 2010, for MIU MIU, in classes 3, 26 and 35;
- International word trademark MIU-MIU, No. 593101, registered on October 16, 1992, in classes 18 and 25;
- International figurative trademark, No 686197 for MIU MIU, registered on December 2, 1997 in classes 3, 9, 14, 16, 18, 25, 34 and 42; and
- Chinese trademark, No. 11645338, registered on April 28, 2014 in class 18.

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 March 28, 2025.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website prominently displaying the Complainant's figurative mark and offering the products describes as replica of the Complainant's products at discounted prices.

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 registered by the Respondent is confusingly similar to the Complainant's registered trademark and incorporates its whole trademark.

According to the Complainant, the mere addition of the generic terms "store" and "outlet" does not affect the confusing similarity, and may be apt to increase confusion.

The Complainant asserts that the addition of a Top-Level Domain ("TLD") in a domain name is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant asserts that it is not in possession of, nor aware of the existence of any evidence demonstrating that the Respondent might be commonly known by a name corresponding to the disputed domain name as an individual, business, or other organization. Indeed, also in view of the use of a privacy protection service to conceal its identity, the Respondent cannot have been commonly known by the disputed domain name before any notice of the dispute.

The Complainant contends that it is not aware of the use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services before any notice of the dispute.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to redirect users to a website misappropriating the Complainant's trademarks and offering for sale purported Complainant's products, expressly described by the Respondent as "replicas", at discounted prices, without providing any disclaimer as to the Respondent's lack of relationship with the Complainant.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. According to the Complainant, it is inconceivable that the Respondent was not well aware of the Complainant's trademark rights at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name.

According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name is used to capitalize on the reputation of the Complainant's trademark, by attracting Internet users seeking the Complainant's branded products to its own website for commercial gain and intentionally creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website and the goods offered and promoted through said website.

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, “store” and “outlet” 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 name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The addition of a TLD is a mere standard registration requirement and will be disregarded.

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.

The disputed domain name directs to a website including the following information at the top of the main page and in the descriptions of the products offered for sale: “Replica Miu Miu Outlet Online Store” and “In this [...] store you can find [...] fake miu miu backbag [...]”. While the lack of authorization, the severely discounted prices and the Respondent’s own description suggest that, should any products be sold at the disputed domain name, they are likely to be counterfeit, it is not necessary for the Panel to make any ultimate determination as to the nature of the goods, as the evidence clearly shows the Respondent has attempted to pass itself off as the Complainant.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed: sale of counterfeit goods, 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 registered the disputed domain name to offer for sale likely counterfeit products bearing the Complainant’s trademark at prices presented as discounted, while

mentioning on the website that the products are replicas of the Complainant's trademarked products.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed: sale of counterfeit goods, impersonation/passing off constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. 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 <miumiustoreoutlet.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Zineb Naciri Bennani/

Zineb Naciri Bennani

Sole Panelist

Date: January 5, 2026