ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Cartiera di Ferrara S.p.A. v. mehmet sahin
Case No. D2025-5224

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Cartiera di Ferrara S.p.A., Italy, internally represented.

The Respondent is mehmet sahin, Türkiye.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <cartieradiferrara.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 December 15, 2025. On December 15, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 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 (Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 19, 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 December 20, 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 December 23, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 12, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any formal response. However, the Respondent sent email communications to the Center on December 19 and 23, 2025, and January 14, 2026.

The Center appointed Jeremy Speres as the sole panelist in this matter on January 20, 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.

The Panel issued Procedural Order No. 1 on January 22, 2026, inviting the Complainant to substantiate, with evidence, its claim to have unregistered trademark rights. The Complainant responded to Procedural Order No. 1 on January 22, 2026, and the Respondent responded to the Complainant's response on January 22, 2026.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant was founded in the 1940s and it has, since then, traded as a paper mill producing cardboard products from its facility in Ferrara, Italy, under the CARTIERA DI FERRARA mark.

The Complainant does not own any registered trademarks but claims unregistered rights in the aforementioned mark.

The Complainant's evidence establishes that it previously used the disputed domain name for its company website from at least as early as 2004 until the disputed domain name lapsed in early 2025.

The Respondent is a domain name investor. He has been involved in seven cases under the Policy. In four of those he was found to have acted in bad faith. In three, not. The cases are:

Travellers Exchange Corporation Limited v. mehmet sahin, and Ali Sahin, WIPO Case No. D2023-0947.

International Business Machines Corporation (IBM) v. mehmet sahin, WIPO Case No. D2023-2238.

Sodexo v. Mehmet Sahin, WIPO Case No. D2024-1468.

Kaizen Gaming International Limited v. Mehmet Sahin, WIPO Case No. D2024-2502.

PROMOGIM GROUPE v. mehmet sahin, WIPO Case No. D2024-5149.

General Dynamics Corporation v. mehmet sahin, FORUM Claim No. FA2412002129316.

Siemens Trademark GmbH & Co. KG v. mehmet sahin, CAC Case No. CAC-UDRP-108086.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 20, 2025, and redirects to a Registrar page listing the disputed domain name for sale for USD 20,000.

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 was registered and has been used in bad faith primarily for the purpose of selling it to the Complainant for valuable consideration in excess of the Respondent's out-of-pocket costs, falling within paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not file a formal Response but contends in his correspondence that the Complainant has not satisfied all three of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Respondent claims that: the Complainant does not own a trademark; the disputed domain name is generic, consisting of the descriptive words for "Ferrara paper mill" (translated from Italian) and cannot be trademarked as such; trading in generic domain names is a legitimate practice; and the Respondent chose the disputed domain name as a "high quality" domain name after seeing it on expiring domain name drop lists, registering it "in seconds", never having heard of the Complainant and never having been in Italy.

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Supplemental Filings

The Respondent sent multiple emails to the Center setting out its defenses, both before and after receiving the Complaint. The first such communication sent after receiving the Complaint was the Respondent's email to the Center of December 23, 2025. The Panel considers this as the Respondent's Response (as it was sent after the notification of the Complaint), and all other Respondent communications submitted after the Response due date as unsolicited supplemental filings except for the Respondent's response in relation to Procedural Order No 1.

Paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules in effect grant the Panel sole discretion to determine the admissibility of unsolicited supplemental filings. Admissibility of supplemental filings is to be assessed based on relevance, foreseeability, the need to conduct the proceedings with due expedition, and the equal treatment of the parties so that each has a fair opportunity to present its case. Paragraph 10(b) of the Rules; *Societé aux Loteries en Europe, SLE v. Take That Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. D2007-0214; WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("WIPO Overview 3.0"), section 4.6.

The Panel has viewed the Respondent's unsolicited supplemental filings. They all essentially restate what was stated in the Response and certainly do not present anything that was not foreseeable or available to the Respondent when filing the Response.

As such, the Panel declines to admit the Respondent's unsolicited supplemental filings, but the Panel notes that if considered would not have altered the outcome of this decision.

B. 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 3.0, section 1.7.

While the Respondent contends that the Complainant cannot obtain trademark rights over CARTIERA DI FERRARA as it consists of descriptive words, the Panel notes that a combination of such terms may result in trademark rights if the combination acquired the necessary distinctiveness. The Panel finds the Complainant has established unregistered trademark or service mark rights for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.3. The Complainant's evidence establishes that it has used the CARTIERA DI FERRARA mark for many years since the 1940s and enjoys a reputation in the mark within its industry. The Complainant presented evidence showing recognition of the Complainant in third-party industry publications. Internet searches for the Complainant's mark return results exclusively relating to the

Complainant across the first three pages of results.[1] The Complainant's evidence shows that it used the disputed domain name for over 20 years prior to registration of it by the Respondent.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name, apart from the spaces. Spaces within a trademark can be disregarded for purposes of assessing identity (*Novomatic AG v. Oleg Bakanach*, WIPO Case No. D2020-1667). Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical 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.

C. 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 disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's mark which is longstanding in use and reputed, and the Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to register the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name is offered for sale for a significant sum likely in excess of the Respondent's out-of-pocket costs.

As discussed further in relation to bad faith below, it is most likely that the Respondent's intentions were to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant for valuable consideration in excess of its out-of-pocket costs. This cannot confer rights or legitimate interests. *Sistema de Ensino Poliedro Vestibulares Ltda., Editora Poliedro Ltda. v. Anonymize, Inc. / STANLEY PACE*, WIPO Case No. D2022-1981.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

D. 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.

Here the Respondent contends that he registered the disputed domain name for its semantic value as a descriptive term, without any knowledge of or intention to target the Complainant's mark. On balance of probabilities, the Panel finds that this is more than likely false for the following reasons.

The Complainant's mark, which is identical to the disputed domain name, indeed refers to the nature of the Complainant's business. It is, however, referential in a very specific and niche way, and refers to a single proprietor, using the singular "cartiera" (meaning "paper mill") as opposed to the plural "cartiere" (meaning "paper mills").

---

[1] In accordance with its powers articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, the Panel is entitled to conduct limited independent research into matters of public record. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 4.8.

The Respondent claims to have recognised the disputed domain name as being "high quality" when he saw it on expiring domain name drop lists, and claims to have registered it "in seconds". The Respondent does not present any evidence that he is proficient in Italian. He resides in Turkey, and his communications with the Center indicate that he had to use an AI tool to translate the disputed domain name when preparing his Response, indicating that he is indeed not proficient in Italian. Thus, in order to have established that the disputed domain name was descriptive and "high quality" before he registered it, apparently "in seconds", he would presumably have likewise resorted to Internet tools to establish its meaning prior to registering it. Having done so, he would likely have been confronted with the reality that the second-level portion of the disputed domain name and the Complainant's mark are overwhelmingly, if not exclusively, associated with the Complainant on the Internet. Combined with the fact that the disputed domain name inherently refers to something very specific and niche, this would, most likely, have indicated to the Respondent that the disputed domain name is or may be a trademark and its registration and use could well be adverse to that trademark. At the very least, the Respondent, as a domain name investor, should have known this.[2]

The fact that the Respondent has been told, by no less than four prior panels under the Policy, that his actions were in bad faith compounds this; his history with the Policy would have appraised him of the risks and made him more alert to them. If the Respondent chose to ignore the warning signs brought to his attention in the four prior cases where he was found to have cybersquatted, in circumstances where conducting a basic Internet search would have revealed that the disputed domain name is overwhelmingly if not exclusively associated with the Complainant, then he did so wilfully, in full knowledge of the risks. It is this deliberateness, in the sense of being aware of the risks but intentionally disregarding them, that characterises his conduct as being in bad faith.[3]

The disputed domain name is listed for sale for USD 20,000. This price would appear to be incongruous with the Respondent's claim to have registered the disputed domain name for its semantic value for the following reasons.

In the three prior cases under the Policy where the Respondent successfully defended himself on the basis that the domain names in question were registered for their semantic value, the composition of the domain names were all less specific and of broader, or at least equivalent, appeal compared with the disputed domain name in the present case. In each of those cases, the domain names were listed for sale for prices that are multiple times lower than in the present case. Specifically:

PROMOGIM GROUPE v. mehmet sahin, WIPO Case No. D2024-5149 involving the domain name <franco-suisse.com> listed for sale for EUR 2,856.97.

General Dynamics Corporation v. mehmet sahin, FORUM Claim No. FA2412002129316 involving the domain name <generaldynamics.net> listed for sale for USD 3,000.

Siemens Trademark GmbH & Co. KG v. mehmet sahin, CAC-UDRP-108086 involving the domain name <siemens.app> listed for sale for EUR 5,738.40.

Thus, the asking price in the present case is not consistent with the Respondent's own pricing history for domain names that are arguably more or at least similarly valuable, based on their semantic content, compared with the present disputed domain name, and which have been found legitimate. This points to targeting of the only party who would, in reality, be willing to pay a high price for the domain name, specifically the party with whom the domain name appears to be overwhelmingly if not exclusively associated – the Complainant.

In this regard, and in the particular circumstances of this case, the Panel adopts the reasoning of the three-member panel in *All Star C.V., Converse, Inc. v. Narendra Ghimire*, WIPO Case No. DCO2024-0014, wherein it was stated:

---

[2] WIPO Overview 3.0, section 3.2.2.

[3] WIPO Overview 3.0, section 3.2.3.

"While the Panel understands dictionary word domain names can fetch a high price tag, this price likely filters out buyers who are interested in the non-trademark meaning of the term 'converse'. The Panel also infers that the Respondent, an experienced domain name investor, was likely aware that the price would filter out purchasers interested in only the dictionary, geographic, or surname connotations of the term. The Panel, therefore, infers that the price was knowingly set to limit the set of potential purchasers with a particular focus on the owner of both the CONVERSE mark and the valuable Domain Name."

It is unlikely that the Respondent, an experienced domain name investor, would have genuinely believed such a specific, niche domain name would have attracted a buyer who was interested in the disputed domain name for its semantic as opposed to its brand value for a price of USD 20,000.

In *Kaizen Gaming International Limited v. Mehmet Sahin*, WIPO Case No. D2024-2502 involving the Respondent, the Respondent had also listed the relevant domain name for sale for USD 20,000. That domain name also referred to something very specific and niche, as in this case, specifically a village in East Timor. In that case involving similar circumstances to the present, the Panel found the same high price to support a finding of bad faith.

The Respondent has not presented any evidence showing that the second-level portion of the disputed domain name or the Complainant's mark are used by or associated with anyone else besides the Complainant. Noting the rather specific composition of the disputed domain name, if the disputed domain name has value as a generic or descriptive term justifying a high price tag of USD 20,000, then presumably there would be evidence of the use of such composition by third parties.

The Panel accepts that a high asking price does not, in and of itself, suggest targeting, and that legitimate registrants can set whatever asking price they like for their domain names. *SAIL Fusion, Inc v. Fandi Pei*, WIPO Case No. D2025-3832. The Panel also accepts that the relevance of an asking price will vary according to the facts of any given case. However, in the particular circumstances of this case, the high asking price serves to support the inference of bad faith.

In the circumstances, the Panel finds, on balance of probabilities, that the Respondent more likely than not registered and has used the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of selling it to the Complainant for valuable consideration in excess of his out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name, falling within paragraph 4(b)(i) of 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 <cartieradiferrara.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Jeremy Speres/
Jeremy Speres
Sole Panelist
Date: February 5, 2026