

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Valentino S.p.A. v. Jeronimo Armenta, Valentinoborninromashop
Case No. D2025-5419

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Jeronimo Armenta, Valentinoborninromashop, Colombia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <valentinoborninroma.shop> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 29, 2025. On December 30, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On December 30, 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 (Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0176372059) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 6, 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 8, 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 9, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 29, 2026. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on February 5, 2026. On February 16, 2025, the Center informed the Parties that it would proceed to panel appointment.

The Center appointed Isabelle Leroux as the sole panelist in this matter on February 27, 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 globally notorious Italian company founded in 1960, one of the leaders in the fashion industry, specialized in luxury goods (from Haute Couture and Prêt-à-Porter), including a wide range of clothing, accessories such as bags, shoes, small leather goods, eyewear, and perfumes (through licenses and collaborations).

The Complainant is present across the globe in more than 90 countries with 160 directly managed Valentino stores and over 1,300 points of sale.

The name of the Complainant and the “Valentino” brand comes from the name of one of its founders, the Italian fashion designer and couturier Valentino Garavani.

Valentino competes at the very top of the luxury market. The brand has been popular with icons like Jackie Onassis and Elizabeth Taylor for over 40 years. Its advertising campaigns, collections, and fashion shows are widely covered by the press and social media.

The Complainant claims it owns over 1,000 domain names including its flagship site at the domain name <valentino.com>.

The Complainant holds numerous trademark registrations for the word mark VALENTINO in various jurisdictions, including the following:

- International Trademark Registration No. 570593 of April 24, 1991 (duly renewed) in Classes 3, 14, 18 and 25;
- International Trademark Registration No. 764790 of November 20, 2000 (and duly renewed) in Classes 3, 9, 14, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 27, 34 and 35;
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 001990407, filed on December 7, 2000, registered on September 18, 2008 (duly renewed) in Classes 3, 9, 14, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 27, 34 and 35; and
- United States of America Trademark Registration No. 1153226, filed on November 24, 1978, and registered on May 5, 1981 (duly renewed), in Class 25.

The Complainant also owns specific marks for its popular fragrance lines, such as:

- European Union Trademark VALENTINO DONNA BORN IN ROMA, Registration No. 018034455, filed on March 12, 2019, registered on September 5, 2019, in Class 3; and
- European Union Trademark VALENTINO UOMO BORN IN ROMA, Registration No. 018034458, filed on March 12, 2019, registered on September 5, 2019, in Class 3.

The Respondent is reportedly located in Colombia. The Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name on October 9, 2025. According to the evidence in the Complaint, the Disputed Domain Name was used by the Respondent to resolve to a website offering for sale a perfume purportedly from VALENTINO at a discounted price. At the date of rendering this Decision, when accessed by the Panel, the Disputed Domain Name resolves to an error page. On October 21, 2025, the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter but has 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:

- the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's VALENTINO trademark
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name; and
- the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and it is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply substantively to the Complainant's contentions. In his email communication of February 5, 2026, the Respondent stated that he was not aware of [the] regulations and was trying to start a business idea. He further stated that he "did not know that I had done something wrong. What could I do to resolve this matter peacefully so that no one is negatively affected?"

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 Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

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

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Disputed Domain Name also contains the term "borninroma, but 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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

According to the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8, where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element.

According to the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1, the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".shop" in the Disputed Domain Name is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test.

Further to all the above, 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 that 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 with 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 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.

It is accepted by the Panel that the Respondent is not related to the Complainant in any way and that the Complainant has not authorized, nor licensed the Respondent to use the Complainant’s trademark. The Respondent is not an authorized reseller of the Complainant either. There is also no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name.

Although at the time of this Decision, the Disputed Domain Name resolves to an error page, as per the evidence filed by the Complainant, it seems that the Disputed Domain Name used to resolve to a webpage where “Valentino” branded perfume (Valentino Born in Roma, i.e. the same exact name than the Disputed Domain Name and trademark) was offered for sale at a very low amount (approximately USD 40) suggesting that it is possibly a counterfeit. Accordingly, the Respondent has not made fair use of the Complainant’s trademark in the Disputed Domain Name, noting especially that, according to the evidence provided by the Complainant, the website did not disclose the absence of relationship with the Complainant.

In view of the above, the Panel considers that the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name with the ultimate intent to mislead Internet users and to erroneously make them believe that the Disputed Domain Name is operated by or associated with the Complainant. Moreover, the composition of the Disputed Domain Name (the Complainant’s trademark VALENTINO + the terms “born in Roma” while the Complainant also owns marks VALENTINO DONNA BORN IN ROMA and VALENTINO UOMO BORN IN ROMA for its women’s and men’s fragrance lines), combined with its use as explained above, demonstrates the Respondent’s intention of taking unfair advantage of the Complainant’s mark.

The Panel finds that the composition of the Disputed Domain Name combining the Complainant’s trademark with “borninroma” and the gTLD “.shop” suggests an online shop of the Complainant and carries a risk of implied affiliation.

Further to the above, the Panel is of the opinion that the Respondent does not use the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor does it make legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name as per the Policy.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel refers to its considerations under section 6. B. above.

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.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Complainant registered and used its VALENTINO trademark long before the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name. In view of the worldwide reputation of the Complainant, the well-known character of its trademark, the composition of the Disputed Domain Name, as well as its previous use for offering possibly fake perfumes bearing the Complainant's trademark (as explained above), it is unlikely that the Respondent was not aware of the Complainant's trademark and business when registering the Disputed Domain Name. The Panel considers that the Respondent targeted the Complainant when registering the Disputed Domain Name.

Moreover, panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is confusingly similar (particularly domain names incorporating the mark plus a descriptive or geographical term) to a well-known trademark can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4

The Panel is of the opinion that the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name with the intent to mislead Internet users into believing that the website at the Disputed Domain Name is affiliated with or endorsed by the Complainant, which is a clear proof of bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy provides that the use of a domain name to intentionally attempt "to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [the respondent's] website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of [the respondent's] website or location or of a product or service on [the respondent's] website or location" is evidence of registration and use in bad faith. In view of all of the above, the Panel is of the opinion that the Respondent's intention was to attract Internet users to the webpage at the Disputed Domain Name, by creating a likelihood of confusion and making them believe that said webpage is held, controlled or related to the Complainant, for the Respondent's commercial gain.

At the time of this Decision, the Disputed Domain Name does not resolve to an active webpage. However, panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and worldwide reputation of the Complainant's trademark, as well as the composition and prior use of the Disputed Domain Name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case, the current passive holding of the Disputed Domain Name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel also notes the Respondent's failure to submit a substantive response in the present proceeding (in addition to the absence of answer from the Respondent to the cease-and-desist letter sent by the Complainant's representative before filing of the Complaint, which may be considered as a further indication of the Respondent's bad faith. In view of the above, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name constitute 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 <valentinoborninroma.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Isabelle Leroux/

Isabelle Leroux

Sole Panelist

Date: March 11, 2026