

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Opera di Santa Maria del Fiore v. Ravi Shah, RAVEN DIGIMARK PRIVATE LIMITED

Case No. D2025-5248

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Opera di Santa Maria del Fiore, Italy, represented by Studio Legale Del Re, Italy.

The Respondent is Ravi Shah, RAVEN DIGIMARK PRIVATE LIMITED, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <duomoflorencetickets.com> is registered with Squarespace Domains II LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 16, 2025. On December 17, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 17, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 18, 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 18, 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 19, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 8, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 9, 2026.

The Center appointed Andrew D. S. Lothian as the sole panelist in this matter on January 15, 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

According to the Complaint and documentary annexes, the Complainant is the exclusive public body entrusted by Italian law with the ownership, administration, conservation, and enhancement of the entire monumental complex of the Cathedral of Santa Maria del Fiore (also known as “Duomo di Firenze” or “Duomo Firenze” in abbreviation), including the Cathedral, the Brunelleschi Dome, the Baptistry, the Bell Tower, the Museum, and all related cultural assets. The Complainant produces its statute which establishes its exclusive institutional role and legal personality, indicating in Article 1 thereof that the estate was established at its foundation in September of the year 1296.

The Complainant shows, per its statute, that it is the sole entity authorized to manage official communications, visitor information, and ticketing services relating to the Duomo complex (Article 2(d) specifying a power to regulate the conditions for public access). The Complainant operates a single official institutional website and a single official ticketing platform, which it says are the authorized channels from which visitors may obtain accurate information and purchase valid admission tickets. The Complainant's official website is found at the URL “duomo.firenze.it”, and its official channel for tickets to its attraction is found at the URL “tickets.duomo.firenze.it”.

The Complainant does not appear to have rights in any corresponding registered trademarks but effectively claims unregistered trademark rights in its abbreviated institutional name DUOMO FIRENZE.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 3, 2019. Little is known of the Respondent, which has not engaged with the administrative proceedings, other than that it appears to be a private individual with an address in India. The website associated with the disputed domain name appears to be inactive as of the date of this decision but the Complainant has produced a screenshot dated November 19, 2025 showing that said site purported to sell tickets to the Complainant's attraction but also to other attractions in Florence and Milan, and a further undated screenshot indicating that the Respondent's link for such tickets redirected to a commercial reseller thereof via a site in respect of which the URL features an affiliate code, thus suggesting that the Respondent intends to receive revenue from said channel as an affiliate.

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 institutional name “Duomo Firenze” identifies uniquely and exclusively the Florence Cathedral complex, exclusively owned by the Complainant. The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name consists of “duomo” together with the direct English translation of the second part of the said institutional name (“Firenze” translates to “Florence”), followed by the descriptive term “tickets”, adding that translations or transliterations of a complainant's mark remain confusingly similar when the underlying identifier is recognizable in the disputed domain name. The Complainant notes that the test hinges on recognizability, not linguistic form, adding that “Duomo Florence” is instantly understood as the English equivalent of “Duomo Firenze”, and that the term “tickets” heightens confusion because it relates directly to the Complainant's official activity.

The Complainant notes that while website content is normally irrelevant under the first element assessment, it may affirm confusing similarity where it demonstrates the respondent's intent to target the complainant. The Complainant submits that the Respondent's website offers ticket sales for the Complainant's monuments, confirming that the Respondent itself associates the disputed domain name with the Complainant.

The Complainant submits that it has never authorized the Respondent to use its institutional name or any translation, that the Respondent is not commonly known as "Duomo Florence," nor does it operate any legitimate service under that designation. The Complainant contends that a respondent cannot claim a legitimate interest under the Policy where the domain name concerned consists of a translated or transliterated version of the complainant's identifier and is used to promote competing or parasitic commercial services.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent uses the disputed domain name to sell or promote unauthorized tickets *inter alia* to the Duomo di Firenze and redirects users toward commercial resellers, adding that such conduct is not *bona fide* because it is predicated on appropriating the Complainant's institutional identity to divert users seeking official services.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent's bad faith is demonstrated by both the choice of the disputed domain name and its actual commercial use, noting that the disputed domain name is a deliberate English translation of the Complainant's institutional name, and that the Respondent could not plausibly have been unaware of Florence Cathedral, one of the world's most recognizable cultural monuments. The Complainant says that the selection of "Duomo Florence" in combination with "tickets" reveals an intentional strategy to intercept users seeking the Complainant's official ticket office, adding that the Respondent's website engages in active commercial exploitation by selling or promoting tickets to the Complainant's monuments, without any affiliation or authorization, bringing the case squarely within the terms of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, namely, attracting Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to source, affiliation, or endorsement. The Complainant says that by selling unauthorized ticket services identical to those offered by the Complainant, the Respondent's conduct confirms that the purpose of the disputed domain name is to capitalize on the Complainant's reputation and mislead consumers into believing that they are purchasing official admissions when they are not.

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.

As noted above, the Complainant has not indicated that it is in possession of any registered trademarks but effectively claims unregistered trademark rights in its abbreviated institutional name DUOMO FIRENZE. The Complainant's statute indicates that the Complainant is the official body with legal personality that administers the institution, which is famous and known by the said name, and that the institutional name itself dates back to the foundation of the Cathedral in the year 1296.

In order to establish such unregistered trademark rights for the purposes of the Policy, a complainant must typically demonstrate by way of independent evidence that such mark has acquired a secondary meaning and has become a distinctive identifier which consumers associate with its goods and services, along the lines indicated by [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.3, for example, evidence demonstrating (i) the duration and

nature of use of the mark, (ii) the amount of sales under the mark, (iii) the nature and extent of advertising using the mark, (iv) the degree of actual public (e.g., consumer, industry, media) recognition, and (v) consumer surveys. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.3 goes on to note that specific evidence supporting assertions of acquired distinctiveness should be included in the complaint, adding that conclusory allegations of unregistered or common law rights, even if undisputed in the particular UDRP case, would not normally suffice to show secondary meaning. In cases involving unregistered or common law marks that are comprised solely of descriptive terms which are not inherently distinctive, there is a greater onus on the complainant to present evidence of acquired distinctiveness/secondary meaning.

Here, the Complainant's statutes (albeit not an independent source) and its history of over 729 years go a long way towards establishing that the mark DUOMO FIRENZE, which the public use to refer to it, is a distinctive identifier associated by consumers with the Complainant's services, consisting of the provision of public access to the Cathedral buildings, its historical archive, and its library (Article 2 of the statute) together with letting of any buildings in the Cathedral complex that are not required for administrative, cultural, and representative functions (Article 8 of said statute). The Complainant likewise inserts its website available at the URL "duomo.firenze.it" into the evidence, from where the Complainant sells tickets ("official passes") and guided tours to the said complex. This serves to support the Complainant's effective assertion of longstanding commercial activity under the corresponding DUOMO FIRENZE name. The Complainant's various official audited annual reports, available on its said website, indicate that it has been receiving substantial revenue from sales and services since at least 2014, being the earliest report available online, and in which year the Complainant reported revenues of over EUR 11 million.

The fact that a respondent is shown to have been targeting the complainant's mark (e.g., based on the manner in which the related website is used) may support the complainant's assertion that its mark has achieved significance as a source identifier. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.3. Here, it is evident to the Panel that the Respondent aims to benefit commercially from a scheme concerning the sale of tickets to the Complainant's Cathedral complex and guided tours without the Complainant's authorization under both the term "Duomo Florence" and (as also mentioned on the website associated with the disputed domain name) the untranslated Italian name Duomo Firenze. It is clear from said website that the Respondent intends these terms to refer to the Complainant's attraction as a source of services. In these circumstances, the manner in which the Respondent's website is being used supports the complainant's assertion that its DUOMO FIRENZE mark has achieved significance as a source identifier.

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.

In a comparison between said mark and the disputed domain name, it may be seen that the disputed domain name does not replicate the mark in its entirety (although it replicates the "duomo" element) but rather contains a translation of "Firenze" into the English "Florence". A domain name that consists or is comprised of a translation or transliteration of a trademark will normally be found to be identical or confusingly similar to such trademark for purposes of standing under the Policy, where the trademark – or its variant – is incorporated into or otherwise recognizable, through such translation/transliteration, in the domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.14.

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable 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 "tickets", 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 applicable Top-Level Domain ("TLD") in a domain name (here ".com"), is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such may be disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

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.

The essence of the Complainant’s case is that the Respondent is not authorized to use the Complainant’s (partially translated) institutional name, is not commonly known thereby, does not make a bona fide offering of goods or services thereby, and uses the disputed domain name to promote competing commercial services by appropriating the Complainant’s institutional identity, diverting users seeking official services. The evidence before the Panel, uncontradicted by the Respondent, indicates that the Respondent has adopted the Complainant’s DUOMO FIRENZE mark, in partial translation, to divert users to an online ticket reseller, under an affiliate link, for its own commercial purposes.

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 has not engaged with the administrative proceedings and has therefore provided no submissions or evidence to rebut the Complainant’s case.

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 has registered and used the disputed domain name containing the Complainant’s official institutional name and unregistered mark, in abbreviated form and partial translation, together with the word “tickets” which gives the impression of being an authorized channel for tickets when it is not, i.e., in order to divert Internet users away from the official source of tickets to the Complainant’s attraction. WIPO Overview 2.5.1 and 2.5.2. The Respondent appears to seek commercial gain by way of monetization from a reseller. Consequently, the Respondent is capitalizing on the Complainant’s mark and its reputation by misleading consumers into believing that they are purchasing official or authorized tickets, directly from the Complainant, when they are not.

The Respondent has not engaged with the administrative proceedings, and it has therefore failed to provide any alternative explanation for its registration and use of the disputed domain name. Further, the Respondent moreover appears to have taken down the website associated with the disputed domain name as a response to the Complaint, suggesting that it may have accepted the Complainant’s contentions. In

light of the present record, the Panel finds that by using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of such website, conform to paragraph 4(b)(iv) 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 <duomoflorencetickets.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrew D. S. Lothian/

Andrew D. S. Lothian

Sole Panelist

Date: January 28, 2026