

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Aldo Group International GmbH v. eman ali
Case No. D2025-5005

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Aldo Group International GmbH, Switzerland, represented by Markmonitor, United States of America.

The Respondent is eman ali, Pakistan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <aldoshoesus.com> is registered with CloudFlare, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 2, 2025. On December 3, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 4, 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 (DATA REDACTED) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 4, 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 December 9, 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 10, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 30, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on January 2, 2025.

The Center appointed Dietrich Beier as the sole panelist in this matter on January 8, 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 multinational company seated in Switzerland and is with affiliated companies in the business of international trade, purchase, sale, import, export, etc. of leather goods, including footwear, and leading retailers of footwear and fashion accessories. Since its establishment in 1972 in Montreal, Canada, Complainant and affiliated companies have expanded to a worldwide enterprise with currently more than 3000 points of sale around the world in over 100 countries serving almost 200 million customers and visitors to its stores each year.

The Complainant is the proprietor of several trademark registrations for ALDO, among them the European Union Trademark 9196742 registered on February 10, 2015 in classes 3, 9, 14 and 26 as well as an International Registration for ALDO 1029684 registered on December 8, 2009 in classes 18, 25 and 35, all being in effect.

In addition, the Complainant is also the owner of numerous domain names identical to, or comprising, its trademarks, both within generic and national Top-Level domains, among them, for instance, aldoshoes.com which has been registered since 1996.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 4, 2025.

The disputed domain name used to resolve to a webpage imitating the Complainant and offering ALDO branded products at heavily discounted prices, with the website title tag "Aldo Shoes Official Store _ Trendy Sneakers _ Get 40% Off".

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 Complainant contends that the trademark enjoys global fame and that the disputed domain name incorporates entirely Complainant's ALDO marks whereas the elements "shoes" and "us" do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

Further, the Respondent was not authorized by the Complainant to make use of the ALDO mark.

The Respondent did not demonstrate use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor can it be inferred that the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

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 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 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 whereas the elements "shoes" and "us" do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark 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. This is in particular the case since the Complainant did not grant any permission or consent to the Respondent to use its trademarks. Furthermore, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name since there is no indication that the Respondent is commonly known by the name "ALDOSHOESUS" nor that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of related goods or services.

In addition, the composition of the disputed domain name incorporating the Complainant's trademark along the terms "shoes" and "US" creates a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Due to the long existence and intensive use of the Complainant's marks, the Respondent must have been well aware of the Complainant and its trademarks when registering the disputed domain name. The Complainant had not authorised the Respondent to make use of its mark. This Panel does not see any conceivable legitimate use that could be made by the Respondent of this particular disputed domain name without the Complainant's authorization, even if the website under the disputed domain name is currently not active.

The disputed domain name used to resolve to a webpage imitating the Complainant. The Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark.

In addition, panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not necessarily prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the current non-use of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith in the circumstances of this proceeding.

Although panelists will look at the totality of the circumstances in each case, factors that have been considered relevant in applying the passive holding doctrine include: (i) the degree of distinctiveness of the complainant's mark, (ii) the failure of the respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, (iii) the respondent's concealing its identity in breach of its registration agreement), and (iv) the implausibility of any good faith use to which the domain name may be put. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and the reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the use of Complainant's trademark in the disputed domain name, the Respondent's concealing its identity, the Respondent's failure to file a response, and finds that in the circumstances of this case, including the initial imitation of Complainant's website and trademarks under the disputed domain name, the current passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of 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 <aldoshoesus.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Dietrich Beier/
Dietrich Beier
Sole Panelist
Date: January 22, 2026*