

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Iveco S.p.A. v. Will Rich, McGill Landscaping, Inc
Case No. D2026-0313

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Will Rich, McGill Landscaping, Inc, United States of America (“United States”).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ivecogroup.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 26, 2026. On January 27, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 27, 2026, 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, 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 28, 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 29, 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 30, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 19, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Alvaro Loureiro Oliveira as the sole panelist in this matter on February 26, 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, Iveco S.p.A., is an Italian company active in the manufacture and commercialization of commercial vehicles and related products and services.

The record indicates that the Complainant was created on January 1, 1975 through the merger of several European companies in the industrial vehicle sector. The name “IVECO” derives from the acronym “Industrial Vehicle Corporation”.

Over the decades, the Complainant has developed extensive international operations. According to the evidence submitted, the Complainant employs more than 25,000 people worldwide, operates production facilities in several countries, and maintains thousands of sales and service outlets across more than 160 countries.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for the mark IVECO as well as IVECO GROUP, including among others:

- International Trademark Registration No. 426061 – IVECO (registered October 21, 1976)
- International Trademark Registration No. 782547 – IVECO (registered April 22, 2002)
- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 001006725 – IVECO (figurative) (registered March 27, 2000)
- International Trademark Registration No. 1688211 – IVECO GROUP (registered October 27, 2021)

These registrations significantly predate the registration of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant has also registered a large number of domain names incorporating the mark IVECO, including <iveco.com>, registered on March 15, 1996, and <ivecogroup.com>, registered on February 5, 2014.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 10, 2025. According to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the disputed domain name resolved to a parking page displaying sponsored links related to the Complainant’s business and products, as well as to competing offerings.

The record further indicates that Mail Exchanger (“MX”) records have been configured for the disputed domain name. The Complainant also sent cease-and-desist correspondence to the Respondent, which remained unanswered.

The Complainant states that the Respondent is not affiliated with it and has never been authorized to use its trademarks.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its IVECO and IVECO GROUP trademarks. In particular, the Complainant emphasizes that the disputed domain name incorporates the whole of the Complainant's distinctive trademark IVECO. According to the Complainant, the addition of the term "grroup" merely represents a typographical variation of the word "group", is a misspelling of the Complainant's IVECO GROUP mark, and does not meaningfully distinguish the disputed domain name from the Complainant's marks.

The Complainant further notes that the disputed domain name closely resembles the domain name <ivecogroup.com>, which is used in connection with the activities of the Complainant's corporate group. In the Complainant's view, the insertion of an additional letter "r" in the term "group" in the disputed domain name increases confusion since users could believe that the disputed domain name is owned by the Complainant. The Complainant submits that such conduct constitutes a typical form of typosquatting, designed to capture Internet traffic.

With respect to the second element of the Policy, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant states that it has never authorized the Respondent to use the IVECO or IVECO GROUP trademarks, whether as part of a domain name or otherwise. According to the Complainant, the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant in any manner and is neither a licensee, nor an authorized agent of the Complainant.

The Complainant also asserts that the Respondent is not commonly known by a name corresponding to the disputed domain name. The Respondent bears no resemblance to the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is not being used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Rather, according to the evidence submitted with the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolves to a parking page displaying sponsored links related to the Complainant's business and products, as well as to competitors' products. The Complainant argues that such use demonstrates an attempt to capitalize on the reputation of its trademarks by confusing and attracting Internet users to the Respondent's website.

The Complainant finally contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. In support of this contention, the Complainant points to the longstanding use and reputation of the IVECO mark, which has been registered and used internationally for several decades. The Complainant argues that, given the distinctive nature of the mark and the identity or confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's marks, the Respondent could not plausibly have registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant and its trademarks.

The Complainant further submits that the typosquatting character of the disputed domain name constitutes evidence of bad faith. In the Complainant's view, the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a famous trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith.

The Complainant also points to the fact that the disputed domain name resolves to a parking page containing pay-per-click links, which generate revenue when Internet users click on them. According to the Complainant, this use indicates that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in order to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks.

Finally, the Complainant notes that MX records have been configured for the disputed domain name, suggesting that the disputed domain name could potentially be used for email communications, supporting a finding of bad faith

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 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

The Complainant has demonstrated rights in the trademarks IVECO and IVECO GROUP through numerous trademark registrations.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's IVECO trademark in its entirety.

Further, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's IVECO GROUP trademark. The term "grroup" in the disputed domain name appears to be a typographical variation of the word "group" in the IVECO GROUP mark. Such minor alteration does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

Panels have consistently held that domain names consisting of common typographical variations of a complainant's mark constitute typosquatting and remain confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademarks in which the Complainant has rights.

The Complainant has therefore satisfied the first element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no authorization to use the Complainant's trademarks and no affiliation with the Complainant.

The registrant name disclosed by the Registrar bears no resemblance to the disputed domain name, and nothing in the record suggests that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name resolved to a parking page displaying sponsored links related to the Complainant's business and products, and to competing products.

Panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name incorporating a complainant's mark to host pay-per-click links capitalizing on the reputation and goodwill of the complainant's mark does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services.

In the absence of any response from the Respondent, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name which has not been rebutted.

The Panel therefore concludes that the second element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been satisfied.

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.

Given the longstanding and distinctive character of the IVECO mark and the Complainant's extensive international presence, it is difficult to conceive of any plausible explanation for the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name other than awareness of the Complainant and its trademarks.

The composition of the disputed domain name strongly indicates targeting of the Complainant. The disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's mark and introduces only a minor typographical variation of the term "group", resulting in a domain name closely resembling the Complainant's IVECO GROUP trademark and associated domain name. Such conduct constitutes a classic form of typosquatting, which panels have repeatedly recognized as evidence of bad faith registration.

The Panel also notes that the disputed domain name resolves to a parking page displaying sponsored links related to the Complainant's products and competitors' offerings. This conduct falls squarely within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, as it involves using the confusingly similar disputed domain name to attract Internet users to the Respondent's website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks.

The presence of MX records associated with the disputed domain name further reinforces the risk of abusive conduct, particularly as the disputed domain name itself causes confusion with the Complainant and its domain name <ivecogroup.com>.

The Respondent's failure to reply to the Complainant's cease-and-desist correspondence or to participate in the present proceeding is also consistent with the inference of bad faith.

Hence, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name deliberately in order to take advantage of the Complainant's trademark and reputation.

In the totality of the circumstances, the Panel finds the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The Complainant has therefore satisfied the third element of paragraph 4(a) 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 <ivecogroup.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Alvaro Loureiro Oliveira/

Alvaro Loureiro Oliveira

Sole Panelist

Date: March 12, 2026