

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Valentino S.p.A. v. tu he
Case No. D2025-5438

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is tu he, Algeria.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <valentinousa.shop> and <valentinous.shop> are registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 30, 2025. On January 2, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On January 3, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy Purposes, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 9, 2026, 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 January 9, 2026.

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 January 13, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 2, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 3, 2026.

The Center appointed Andrea Jaeger-Lenz as the sole panelist in this matter on February 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 fashion house seated in Italy and founded in 1960 by the fashion designer Valentino Garavani and his partner Giancarlo Giammetti. Under the brand VALENTINO, the Complainant has been offering a wide range of luxury products from haute couture and prêt-à-porter fashion to accessories including bags, shoes, small leather goods, belts, eyewear, silks and perfumes. VALENTINO branded products are available in over 90 countries around the world via 160 stores directly operated by the Complainant and more than 1,300 other points of sale. (Annexes 5.3, 5.4 and 5.5 to the Complaint). The Complainant owns trademark registrations for the term VALENTINO around the world such as the following (as per Annexes 4.1.1., 4.1.2., 4.3 and 4.4 to the Complaint):

International trademark no. 570593 VALENTINO (word), registered on April 24, 1991, for goods in Classes 3, 14, 18 and 25, with several designations;

European Union trademark no. 001990407 VALENTINO (word), registered on September 18, 2008, for goods and services in Classes 3, 9, 14, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 27, 34 and 35;

United States of America trademark no 1153226 VALENTINO (word), registered on May 5, 1981, for goods in Class 25.

The Complainant is active in social media (as per Annex 6 to the Complaint) and owns domain names consisting of or containing the trademark VALENTINO, in particular <valentino.com>, registered on July 21, 1998, which directs to its main website, and <valentino-beauty.com>, registered April 22, 2020, which promotes the Complainant's perfume and beauty products (as per Annexes 7.1, 7.2, 7.3 and 7.4 to the Complaint).

The disputed domain name <valentinousa.shop> was registered on June 10, 2025, and the disputed domain name <valentinous.shop> was registered on June 7, 2025. Both disputed domain names were redirected, prior to filing the present Complaint to websites purportedly offering for sale VALENTINO branded perfume products at discounted prices along with third party branded perfumes (as per Annexes 8.1 and 8.2 to the Complaint).

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to a trademark, in which the Complainant owns rights. The Complainant claims that it owns rights in the trademark VALENTINO. This trademark is, according to the Complainant entirely incorporated in both disputed domain names. The mere addition of the non-distinctive elements "USA" and "US", respectively, does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, as they will be held as abbreviations of "United States of America". The Complainant adds that the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") .shop shall be disregarded for the purposes of assessing confusing similarity, as it is merely instrumental for use on the Internet.

On the second element, the Complainant claims that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. The Respondent is, according to the Complainant, not a licensee, authorized agent or reseller of the Complainant, nor is the Respondent, to the knowledge of the Complainant, commonly known by the disputed domain names or has made any demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or for any legitimate non-commercial purpose. Rather, the Respondent has been using the disputed domain names to advertise and offer counterfeit VALENTINO perfume goods at prices significantly lower than the prices for the Complainant's VALENTINO branded perfumes (as per Annexes 8.1 and 8.2 to the Complaint). The Respondent does, as per a search conducted by the Complainant (as per Annex B to the Complaint) not own any trademarks in VALENTINO either.

On the third element, the Complainant states that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. As for registration in bad faith, the Complainant contends that the VALENTINO trademark registrations by far predate the registration of the disputed domain names and that VALENTINO is reputed worldwide as a top luxury brand through extensive use and advertising since decades (as per Annexes 5.1 to 5.5 to the Complaint). Accordingly, so the Complainant points out, the Respondent could not possibly have ignored it when registering the disputed domain names, which is underlined by the way the disputed domain names have been used by the Respondent. As for use in bad faith, the Complainant contends that the VALENTINO trademark was reproduced on the websites to which both disputed domain names were redirected in order to mislead Internet users into believing that they are operated or approved by the Complainant. In this way, the Respondent, according to the Complainant, was capitalizing on the Complainant's reputation for commercial gain by attracting Internet users to its own websites.

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 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7

Although the addition of other terms here, "usa" and "us", respectively, 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 3.1](#), section 1.8.

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 3.1](#), 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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain names combining the Complainant’s trademark with “us”, “usa” and the gTLD “.shop” suggests an online shop of the Complainant and carries a risk of implied affiliation.

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 the disputed domain names which essentially consist of the Complainant’s well-known VALENTINO trademark plus a generic addition. The Respondent has used the disputed domain names to redirect to websites replicating the VALENTINO trademark within wording such as “VALENTINO Fragrances” and offering for sale VALENTINO and third party perfumes at highly discounted prices using images of original VALENTINO perfumes. The addressed Internet user is without doubt likely to hold this to be, at the very least, the Complainant’s authorized online shop for perfume sales in the United States of America.

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 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

The Panel finds that by using the disputed domain names, the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain names 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 names <valentinousa.shop> and <valentinous.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrea Jaeger-Lenz/

Andrea Jaeger-Lenz

Sole Panelist

Date: February 20, 2026