

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Skorpio Limited v. 英 熊
Case No. D2026-0258

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Skorpio Limited, Switzerland, represented by Keltie LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is 英 熊, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <rickowensfr.com> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with Name.com, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 22, 2026. On January 22, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 23, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response, confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that 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 27, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for the Response was February 16, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 17, 2026.

The Center appointed Ada L. Redondo Aguilera as the sole panelist in this matter on February 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.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a Swiss company managing the intellectual property rights of the internationally renowned fashion designer Rick Owens. The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations worldwide for the mark RICK OWENS, including:

- European Union Trademark Number 018510789, registered on March 2, 2022;
- United Kingdom Trademark Number UK00003666765, registered on December 31, 2021; and
- International Trademark Registration No. 1667333, registered on December 10, 2021;

The Complainant's trademarks are registered in multiple jurisdictions and cover, inter alia, goods and services in Classes 3, 9, 14, 18, 25, and 42.

The Respondent is 英熊. No further information was presented in the case, since the Respondent is in default.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on June 8, 2022.

Evidence shows that the Disputed Domain Name resolved to a website prominently displaying the Complainant's logo and offering goods purporting to be RICK OWENS products at heavily discounted prices.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the three elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name incorporates the trademark RICK OWENS in its entirety.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests regarding the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant, it has never licensed or consented to the registration or use of the Disputed Domain Name and to the best of its knowledge and belief none of the circumstances listed in paragraph 4 (c) of the Policy applies. The Complainant further alleged that the Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that:

- (i) the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 or 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. The addition of the letters "fr" does 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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Furthermore, the Panel finds that the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") in the present case, ".com", may typically be disregarded when assessing whether a domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark, as it is a technical requirement of registration. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1
The Panel finds that 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 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.

The Panel finds that there is no evidence that:

- The Respondent is commonly known by the name "Rick Owens" or the Disputed Domain Name;
- The Respondent was authorized to use the trademark for any purposes including the registration of the Disputed Domain Name; or
- The use constitutes a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The evidence indicates the website displays the Complainant's logo and offers goods presented as RICK OWENS products at heavily discounted prices, without indicating its lack of relationship to the Complainant. Such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services under paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy.

In the absence of any Response or evidence to the contrary, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name.

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 Complainant's trademark rights predate the registration of the Disputed Domain Name. Given the international reputation of the RICK OWENS trademark, the composition of the Disputed Domain Name which combines the said mark with the geographic term "fr", a country code for France, and the use to which the Disputed Domain Name has been put, the Panel finds it implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's rights at the time of the registration of the Disputed Domain Name.

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 the Respondent's use of the Disputed Domain Name to host a website offering goods under the RICK OWENS mark at heavily discounted prices, without indicating its lack of relationship to the Complainant, constitutes evidence of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy: intentionally attempting to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name 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 name <rickowensfr.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ada L. Redondo Aguilera/

Ada L. Redondo Aguilera

Sole Panelist

Date: March 4, 2026