

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

PizzaExpress Limited v. Antonio Perna
Case No. D2025-4832

1. The Parties

The Complainant is PizzaExpress Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Abion AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Antonio Perna, Italy.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <pizzaexpress.shop> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 20, 2025. On November 20, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 20, 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 24, 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 28, 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 December 2, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 22, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on December 26, 2025.

The Center appointed W. Scott Blackmer as the sole panelist in this matter on January 6, 2026. 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 limited company established under English law, with its seat in Uxbridge, United Kingdom. The Complainant traces its roots to entrepreneur and philanthropist Peter Boizot's first Italian pizzeria in London's Soho district in 1965, followed by a second location near the British Museum and then by many others throughout the United Kingdom. The Complainant now heads a multinational group operating a chain of more than 470 pizza restaurants in Europe (Gibraltar, United Kingdom, Ireland, Spain, and United Kingdom), Asia, and the Middle East under the marks PIZZAEXPRESS and PIZZA EXPRESS. In addition to serving customers in its pizzerias, the Complainant offers home delivery and also sells its products in supermarkets. Since 2021 the Complainant has operated a popular loyalty scheme, the PizzaExpress Club, registering more than two million members by the end of 2023. The Complainant's PIZZAEXPRESS mark is also associated with the Complainant's hosting of more than 1,500 musical shows annually under the name "PIZZAEXPRESS Live" and its philanthropic activities such as charity partnerships described on the Complainant's website.

The Complainant operates a website at "www.pizzaexpress.com" (created on November 4, 1998) with linked social media sites that cumulatively claim hundreds of thousands of followers. The Complainant owns other domain names that redirect to the Complainant's website, such as <pizzaexpress.in> and <pizzaexpress.sg>.

The Complainant holds multiple relevant trademark registrations, including the following:

Mark	Jurisdiction	Reg. Number	Reg. Date	International Class(es)
PIZZA EXPRESS (words and design)	International (multiple designations including Italy)	782231	May 24, 2002	30
PIZZA EXPRESS (word)	United Kingdom	UK00002547285	August 13, 2010	8, 9, 11, 16, 18, 21, 24, 25, 28, 29, 30, 31
PIZZAEXPRESS (word)	United Kingdom	UK00915183668	March 19, 2018	30
PIZZAEXPRESS (word)	European Union	015183668	March 19, 2018	30

The disputed domain name was registered on July 28, 2025, and is registered to the Respondent, listing no organization, a postal address in Italy, and a Gmail contact email address.

The disputed domain name resolves to a landing page hosted by the Registrar advertising that the disputed domain name is available "for sale" for USD 500 (with a "Buy now" button and a "Lease to own" option) and promoting the Registrar's capabilities.

In October 2025 the Complainant sent the Respondent a notification of violation of trademark rights through the Registrar but received no response. Subsequent reminders also received no response.

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 its registered PIZZAEXPRESS and PIZZA EXPRESS marks are clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name, which incorporates them in their entirety. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, as the Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use its marks, the disputed domain name does not correspond to the Respondent's name, the Respondent has not used the disputed domain name for any business or for a legitimate noncommercial fair use, and the Respondent has not replied to the Complainant's demands with any claims of legitimate interests.

The Complainant argues for a finding of bad faith, noting that simple Internet search results for "pizzaexpress" "directly relate" to the Complainant, suggesting that "the Respondent would have inevitably learnt about the Complainant, its trademarks and business". Moreover, the Complainant observes that the distinctive string used for the Respondent's Gmail contact email address (not shown above) corresponds to a username on the Sotwe platform that republishes X content, a username that is employed to promote the sale of domain names and cryptocurrency, which would be consistent with the posting of the disputed domain name for sale for a profit.

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 (the registered PIZZAEXPRESS and PIZZA EXPRESS marks) for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Complainant's word marks and the textual element of the Complainant's composite mark are reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar, respectively, to the marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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 Respondent does not have a corresponding name and has not published an associated website reflecting a bona fide commercial offering or a legitimate noncommercial fair use.

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 more likely than not aware of the Complainant and its mark, as it is well-established and preeminent in relevant English-language Internet search results, and the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant’s word marks. The Respondent has offered the disputed domain name for sale, which is consistent with the Respondent’s apparent trade in domain names.

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.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the reputation of the Complainant’s trademark and the composition of the disputed domain name, identical to the Complainant’s word marks (and essentially identical to the Complainant’s own domain name), and finds that in the circumstances of this case the offering of the disputed domain name for sale supports a finding of bad faith under the Policy. The Panel notes that the Respondent has failed to reply to communications from the Complainant, both prior to and during this dispute, and—despite apparently receiving notice of the proceedings, both via the email address provided to the Registrar during registration of the disputed domain name, and via the Registrar’s contact form—the Respondent has not come forward in this proceeding to offer an alternative explanation for its registration of the disputed domain name and offering it for sale.

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 <pizzaexpress.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/W. Scott Blackmer/

W. Scott Blackmer

Sole Panelist

Date: January 20, 2026